File No. 220751

Petitions and Communications received from June 9, 2022, through June 23, 2022, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on June 28, 2022.

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, submitting a response to the 2021-2022 Civil Grand Jury report, titled “Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco’s Capital Construction Program,” pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury, submitting a substitute report, titled “Buried Problems and a Buried Process: The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change.” Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the President of the Board of Supervisors, calling a Special Board of Supervisors meeting to be scheduled on Wednesday, June 22, 2022, at 10:00 a.m. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the City and County of San Francisco Pooled Investment Report for the month of May 2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Police Department, regarding the First Quarter 2022 Report, per Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements and Crime Victim Data Reporting, pursuant to Administrative Code Chapter 96A. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, pursuant to Health Code, Section 227(c), submitting the Report on Accidental Overdose Deaths for June 2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Human Services Agency, Department of Disability and Aging Services, submitting the County Veterans Services Office Semimanual Report, July 1, 2021 - December 31, 2021. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Office of the City Administrator, submitting the Annual Healthy Air and Clean Transportation Ordinance Report for Fiscal Year 2021. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the Office of the City Attorney, making the following appointment to the Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

Nomination pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 5.44-2(b)(11):
- Steve Lipton

From the Department of Elections, submitting the Certification of Local Results from the June 7, 2022, Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the Department of Public Health, submitting Directive of the Health Officer Nos. 2020-02h, 2020-03g, 2020-33j; Updates to Directive of the Health Officer No. 2020-14k; Updates to Order of the Health Officer No. C19-07y. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the Department of Public Health, submitting the weekly COVID-19 update, as of June 13, 2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From the Office of the Controller, submitting the Mental Health San Francisco (MHSF) Implementation Working Group (IWG) Crisis Stabilization Unit Recommendations. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), regarding the General Election on November 8, 2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a notice of Proposed 90-Day Extension of Emergency Regulations. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Spencer Winston, regarding the Warriors parade on June 20, 2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From the Service Provider Working Group, regarding an Ordinance to amend the Campaign and Government Conduct code to expand the definition of interested parties. File No. 201132. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From SF YIMBY, regarding an Ordinance amending the Planning, Administrative, and Subdivision Codes to rezone certain zoning districts. File No. 210866. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Ben Seisdedos, regarding the Treasure Island Child Development Center at 850 Avenue D. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE) Local 16, regarding the Market Street Linkage Center. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From David Romano, regarding light pollution. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Glen Harvey, regarding an Ordinance amending the Park Code to adopt the Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program. File No. 220339. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding street trees. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From concerned citizens, regarding COVID-19. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Richard Wood Massi, regarding sidewalk safety. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Leah Culver, regarding a Resolution disapproving the Mills Act Historical Property Contract for 714 Steiner Street. File No. 220738. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding San Francisco State University and California State University growth and housing. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Roma Guy, regarding funding for the Sheriff's Department. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From Jim Bowlby, regarding drought surcharges. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From UNITE HERE Local 2, regarding a Resolution of Intention to renew and expand the Tourism Improvement District. File No. 220649. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From Shaun Evans, regarding Electronic Benefit Transfer, General Assistance, and Inflation. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From Marlon Lee regarding a CCSF tuition collection. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From the Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, regarding financing for projects at 2550 Irving St., and 730 Stanyan St., pursuant to Health & Safety Code, Subsection 50675.7(3). Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From Fred Wise, regarding a Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Grant Agreements for Baker Places, Inc., and Positive Resource Center. File No. 220674.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From Emily Bugos, regarding allocation of funding collected by Proposition C, placed on the June 2018 San Francisco ballot. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From David Romano, regarding micro-plastic pollution. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding density on the West side of San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From the SF Climate Emergency Coalition, regarding funding for the City's Climate Action Plan. Copy: Each Supervisor. (38)

From the Ingleside Merchants Association, regarding a Resolution receiving and approving an annual report for the Ocean Avenue Community Benefit District for FY 2019-2020. File No. 211014. Copy: Each Supervisor. (39)

From concerned citizens, regarding a Hearing on Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan. File No. 220619. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (40)

From Zoox, regarding an Ordinance amending the Planning Code - Electric Vehicle Charging Locations. File No. 220036. Copy: Each Supervisor. (41)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Welcome Ambassador Program. 53 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (42)

From concerned citizens, regarding homelessness. 25 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (43)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Tenderloin. 23 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (44)

From concerned citizens, regarding funding for the San Francisco Police Department. 14 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (45)

From concerned citizens, regarding a Charter Amendment to create the Homelessness Oversight Commission. File No. 220535. 6 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (46)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Shared Schoolyard Program. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (47)

From concerned citizens, regarding downtown economic recovery. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (48)

From concerned citizens, regarding the 2022 Dyke March. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (49)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Great Highway. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (50)

From concerned citizens, regarding funding for the Department of Disability and Aging Services. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (51)

From concerned citizens, regarding funding for the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (52)

From concerned citizens, regarding an Ordinance amending the Administrative Code - Shelter and Permanent Supportive Housing Expansion Program. File No. 220281. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (53)

From:	Major, Erica (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Anatolia Lubos; michael.hofman@sfcgj.org; Hang, Xang (MYR); Paulino, Tom (MYR); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Campbell, Severin (BOS); Holober, Reuben (BUD)
Subject:	Department Response Received - (File No. 220505/220506) Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco"s Capital Construction Program
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 6:33:13 PM
Attachments:	60 Day Memo Receipt to BOS 061722.pdf 2021- 2022 CGJ Continuity Matrix of Findings and Recommendations Mayor.xlsx 2021- 2022 CGJ Continuity Matrix of Findings Mayor.pdf 2021- 2022 CGJ Continuity Matrix Recommendations Mayor.pdf

Greetings,

Attached please find the Mayor's response to the 2021-2022 Civil Grand Jury report titled "Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program". This matter is anticipated to be heard at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee where the departments will be requested to present and the Board will respond to the listed findings and recommendations in the report.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please email me directly and cc Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org.

ERICA MAJOR
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

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.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 544-5227

DATE: June 17, 2022

TO: Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: for Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

SUBJECT: 2021-2022 Civil Grand Jury Report " Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program"

We are in receipt of the following required response to the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury report released April 11, 2022, entitled: **"Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program".** Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the City Departments shall respond to the report within 60 days of receipt, or no later than June 10, 2022.

For each finding the Department response shall:

1) agree with the finding; or
2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

As to each recommendation the Department shall report that:

1) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation; or
2) the recommendation has not been implemented but will be within a set timeframe as provided; or
3) the recommendation requires further analysis. The officer or agency head must define what additional study is needed. The Grand Jury expects a progress report within six months; or
4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

The Civil Grand Jury Report identified the following City Departments to submit responses (attached):

- The Office of the Mayor
  Received June 10, 2022, for Findings F1, F2, F3, F5, F6, F7, F8, and F9 and Recommendations R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9

These departmental responses are being provided for your information, as received, and may not conform to the parameters stated in California Penal Code, Section 933.05 et seq. The Government Audit and Oversight Committee will consider the subject report, along with the responses, at an upcoming hearing and will prepare the Board's official response by Resolution for the full Board's consideration.

cc: Honorable Samuel K. Feng, Presiding Judge
Michael Hofman, Foreperson, 2021-2022 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
Xang Hang, Mayor's Office
Tom Paulino, Mayor's Office
Anne Pearson, Deputy City Attorney
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy
Severin Campbell, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Reuben Holober, Budget and Legislative Analyst

Report Title [Publication Date]	**F#**	**Finding**	**Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]**	**Finding Response** (Agree/ Disagree)	**Finding Response Text**
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F1	Without a clear project manager with full responsibility and authority, the contractor performance evaluation database project lacked sufficient momentum to be completed, fully adopted and used.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree partially	The Project Manager did not have full authority to compel contributions to, and use of, the contractor performance evaluation database, which was a significant barrier to successful completion of the project. A larger contributing factor is the fact that contracting agencies were not able to develop a defensible means to interpret and apply the performance data within the contract procurement process--that is, how evaluations are to be scored and weighted along side other important selection criteria. Without being able to tie information contained in the database directly, departments and contractors alike did not feel the effort was worth the investment of time.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F2	The existing project team and Chapter 6 departments failed to implement the database in a timely manner, delaying the benefits it could provide in improving construction quality, meeting budgets and timelines, and improving contractor relationships.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree partially	The Mayor agrees that implementation of the database was not delivered in a timely basis for a number of reasons, diversion of resources due to the pandemic amongst them. The Mayor also agrees that potential benefits from having a fully implemented database have been deferred because of this delay. Because the efficacy of a fully functional and populated database has not been tested, the Mayor believes that an evaluation of the program should be made starting one year after go-live, to ensure the resources being put to the project are producing promised results of improved construction quality, budget and schedule adherence and improved contractor relationships.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F3	Chapter 6 departments failed to enter performance evaluations into the database, thus negating its value.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Agree	

Report Title [Publication Date]	**F#**	**Finding**	**Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]**	**Finding Response** (Agree/ Disagree)	**Finding Response Text**
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F5	In designing and developing the database, the project team neglected to add the technical capability to see who consults the database, making it difficult to hold departments accountable for using the database.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Agree	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F6	When evaluators omit "Lessons Learned" entries in that data field, the evaluations lack the most critical information to help inform future contractor selections.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree partially	It makes sense that Lessons Learned entries would be valuable in assisting evaluators in selecting contractors for construction jobs. However, there is a myriad of selection criteria that evaluators are required to consider, so it is not clear that it is the most critical information for contractor selection. The program evaluation discussed in F2 will help elucidate the importance of lessons learned data.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F7	The Controller's Office inadvertently complicated matters by recommending the creation of a second performance evaluation database to note how well PUC contractors comply with its Social Impact Partnership ("SIP") program.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree wholly	While streamlining collection of performance evaluation data is a worthy goal, the PUC data on contractor compliance with its SIP program is not relevant to five of the six Chapter 6 contracting departments. Including this data in the contractor performance evaluation database is likely introduce an element of confusion for these departments which, in turn, will make it more difficult for these agencies to adopt and utilize the database.

Report Title [Publication Date]	**F#**	**Finding**	**Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]**	**Finding Response** (Agree/ Disagree)	**Finding Response Text**
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F8	The database fails to provide a way for non-Chapter 6 departments to provide feedback on both contractors and Chapter 6 department performance, resulting in no accountability for either the contracting department or the contractor.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree partially	It is true that the contractor performance evaluation database did not provide an avenue for non-Chapter 6 departments to provide feedback. It is not clear that this is the best avenue for providing this feedback to the contracting department or the contractor.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F9	Construction audit reports are a helpful way to provide oversight of the City's capital construction program.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Agree	

Report Title [Publication Date]	**R# [for F#]**	**Recommendation**	**Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]**	**Recommendation Response** (Implementation)	**Recommendation Response Text**
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R1 [for F1]	We recommend that by 6/15/22 the Mayor specify which department shall manage and have responsibility and authority for the contractor performance evaluation database to improve compliance, monitoring and consistent use. We further recommend that the director of the specified department appoint the project manager by 6/30/22.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	By June 15, 2022, the Mayor will designate Public Works as the department that shall manage and have responsibility and authority for the contractor performance evaluation database, and to expedite implementation of the the project. Furthermore, the Mayor will direct departments to work with the City Attorney to identify a defensible way to incorporate performance evaluation data in the Chapter 6 contractor procurement process. The appointment of a Project Manager by 6/15/22 is not realistic considering there are currently no available project managers available for this assigment, so a recruitment process will have to be undertaken.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R2 [for F2]	We recommend that by 9/30/22, the database project manager specified in R1 complete implementation, training sessions and “go live” workshops with all Chapter 6 departments.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Requires further analysis	Implementation of Civil Grand Jury recommendations are a high priority for the Mayor. Because the role of Project Manager is unfilled and the challenges the City is facing filling positions, the timeline recommended by the CGJ is probably unrealistic. To help speed the implementation process, the Mayor intends to ask Chapter 6 departments to find opportunities to streamline the implementation of the database by adapting existing contract evaluations for inclusion in the database.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R3 [for F3]	We recommend that by 12/31/2022, the Mayor require all Chapter 6 departments to begin submitting evaluations into the database.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	By December 31, 2022, the Mayor plans to direct all Chapter 6 departments to begin submitting evaluations for inclusion in the contractor performance evaluation database. As stated in response to R3, the Mayor intends to ask Chapter 6 departments to find opportunities to streamline the implementation of the database by incorporating evaluation data that is currently collected by departments as part of their project close out process.

Report Title [Publication Date]	**R# [for F#]**	**Recommendation**	**Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]**	**Recommendation Response** (Implementation)	**Recommendation Response Text**
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R4 [for F4]	We recommend that by 12/31/2022, the Mayor explicitly directs all Chapter 6 departments to consult the database when selecting contractors.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	By December 31, 2022, or when the database has gone live, the Mayor plans to direct all Chapter 6 departments to consider evaluations of contractor performance evaluation database when selecting contractors. As stated in response to F1, departments will need to work with the City Attorney to identify a defensible way to incorporate performance evaluation data in the Chapter 6 contractor selection process. As stated in response to F2, the Mayor believes that an evaluation of the program should be made starting one year after go-live, to ensure the resources being put to the project are producing promised results of improved construction quality, budget and schedule adherence and improved contractor relationships.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R5 [for F5]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023 the project manager update the database technology to include the capability to hold evaluators accountable by observing who is using the database and when.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Requires further analysis	The Mayor agrees that departments should be held accountable for knowing and considering information in the database when evaluating contractor proposals. Because the software platform on which the original database was built is no longer supported by the vendor, it will be up to the Project Manager to determine how best to provide the needed accountability.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R6 [for F6]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager update the database technology to require the "Lessons Learned" data field be filled out before an evaluation can be marked “complete.”	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Requires further analysis	The Mayor agrees that information in the database, including "lessons learned" is valuable to evaluators selecting contractors, as well as to those preparing construction bid documents and contracts. Rather than dictate software requirements, Chapter 6 departments participating in the project should work together with the Project Manager to identify the best way to insure this data is available to contract evaluators.

Report Title [Publication Date]	**R# [for F#]**	**Recommendation**	**Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]**	**Recommendation Response** (Implementation)	**Recommendation Response Text**
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R7 [for F7]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager include sections in the database to cover contractor compliance with the SIP program.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	PUC data on contractor compliance with its SIP program is not relevant to five of the six Chapter 6 contracting departments. Including this data in the contractor performance evaluation database is likely introduce an element of confusion which would make it more difficult for these agencies to adopt and utilize the database.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R8 [for F8]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager expand the database to include input from non-Chapter 6 departments receiving construction services from Chapter 6 departments.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Requires further analysis	Improving capital project delivery in San Francisco is a high priority of the Mayor. In addition to the Civil Grand Jury, the issue is receiving attention from the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, the Controller's City Services Auditor and the Transportation Authority. The Capital Planning Committee is probably the best forum to receive input from non-Chapter 6 departments.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R9 [for F9]	We recommend that starting in FY 2022-2023, the City Services Auditor Department within the Controller’s Office conduct performance audits of the City construction program every two years focusing on use of best practices, collaboration, and other successes and challenges. The Controller’s report from 2014 can serve as a template.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	This is a sound recommendation, but it is under the purview of the Controller's Office to prioritize their audit work plan.

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	R# [for F#]	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Implement? Yes/No	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Recommendation Response Text
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F1	Without a clear project manager with full responsibility and authority, the contractor performance evaluation database project lacked sufficient momentum to be completed, fully adopted and used.	R1 [for F1]	We recommend that by 6/15/22 the Mayor specify which department shall manage and have responsibility and authority for the contractor performance evaluation database to improve compliance, monitoring and consistent use. We further recommend that the director of the specified department appoint the project manager by 6/30/22.		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F2	The existing project team and Chapter 6 departments failed to implement the database in a timely manner, delaying the benefits it could provide in improving construction quality, meeting budgets and timelines, and improving contractor relationships.	R2 [for F2]	We recommend that by 9/30/22, the database project manager specified in R1 complete implementation, training sessions and "go live" workshops with all Chapter 6 departments.		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F3	Chapter 6 departments failed to enter performance evaluations into the database, thus negating its value.	R3 [for F3]	We recommend that by 12/31/2022, the Mayor require all Chapter 6 departments to begin submitting evaluations into the database.		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F4	Prior updates to Section 6.26 of the Administrative Code excluded language that the database must be used to evaluate contractors going forward.	R4 [for F4]	We recommend that by 12/31/2022, the Mayor explicitly directs all Chapter 6 departments to consult the database when selecting contractors.		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F5	In designing and developing the database, the project team neglected to add the technical capability to see who consults the database, making it difficult to hold departments accountable for using the database.	R5 [for F5]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023 the project manager update the database technology to include the capability to hold evaluators accountable by observing who is using the database and when.		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F6	When evaluators omit "Lessons Learned" entries in that data field, the evaluations lack the most critical information to help inform future contractor selections.	R6 [for F6]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager update the database technology to require the "Lessons Learned" data field be filled out before an evaluation can be marked "complete."		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F7	The Controller's Office inadvertently complicated matters by recommending the creation of a second performance evaluation database to note how well PUC contractors comply with its Social Impact Partnership ("SIP") program.	R7 [for F7]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager include sections in the database to cover contractor compliance with the SIP program.		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F8	The database fails to provide a way for non-Chapter 6 departments to provide feedback on both contractors and Chapter 6 department performance, resulting in no accountability for either the contracting department or the contractor.	R8 [for F8]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager expand the database to include input from non-Chapter 6 departments receiving construction services from Chapter 6 departments.		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F9	Construction audit reports are a helpful way to provide oversight of the City's capital construction program.	R9 [for F9]	We recommend that starting in FY 2022-2023, the City Services Auditor Department within the Controller's Office conduct performance audits of the City construction program every two years focusing on use of best practices, collaboration, and other successes and challenges. The Controller's report from 2014 can serve as a template.		Mayor [June 10, 2022]	

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F1	Without a clear project manager with full responsibility and authority, the contractor performance evaluation database project lacked sufficient momentum to be completed, fully adopted and used.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree partially	The Project Manager did not have full authority to compel contributions to, and use of, the contractor performance evaluation database, which was a significant barrier to successful completion of the project. A larger contributing factor is the fact that contracting agencies were not able to develop a defensible means to interpret and apply the performance data within the contract procurement process--that is, how evaluations are to be scored and weighted along side other important selection criteria. Without being able to tie information contained in the database directly, departments and contractors alike did not feel the effort was worth the investment of time.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F2	The existing project team and Chapter 6 departments failed to implement the database in a timely manner, delaying the benefits it could provide in improving construction quality, meeting budgets and timelines, and improving contractor relationships.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree partially	The Mayor agrees that implementation of the database was not delivered in a timely basis for a number of reasons, diversion of resources due to the pandemic amongst them. The Mayor also agrees that potential benefits from having a fully implemented database have been deferred because of this delay. Because the efficacy of a fully functional and populated database has not been tested, the Mayor believes that an evaluation of the program should be made starting one year after go-live, to ensure the resources being put to the project are producing promised results of improved construction quality, budget and schedule adherence and improved contractor relationships.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F3	Chapter 6 departments failed to enter performance evaluations into the database, thus negating its value.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Agree	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F5	In designing and developing the database, the project team neglected to add the technical capability to see who consults the database, making it difficult to hold departments accountable for using the database.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Agree	
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F6	When evaluators omit "Lessons Learned" entries in that data field, the evaluations lack the most critical information to help inform future contractor selections.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree partially	It makes sense that Lessons Learned entries would be valuable in assisting evaluators in selecting contractors for construction jobs. However, there is a myriad of selection criteria that evaluators are required to consider, so it is not clear that it is the most critical information for contractor selection. The program evaluation discussed in F2 will help elucidate the importance of lessons learned data.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F7	The Controller's Office inadvertently complicated matters by recommending the creation of a second performance evaluation database to note how well PUC contractors comply with its Social Impact Partnership ("SIP") program.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree wholly	While streamlining collection of performance evaluation data is a worthy goal, the PUC data on contractor compliance with its SIP program is not relevant to five of the six Chapter 6 contracting departments. Including this data in the contractor performance evaluation database is likely introduce an element of confusion for these departments which, in turn, will make it more difficult for these agencies to adopt and utilize the database.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F8	The database fails to provide a way for non-Chapter 6 departments to provide feedback on both contractors and Chapter 6 department performance, resulting in no accountability for either the contracting department or the contractor.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Disagree partially	It is true that the contractor performance evaluation database did not provide an avenue for non-Chapter 6 departments to provide feedback. It is not clear that this is the best avenue for providing this feedback to the contracting department or the contractor.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	F9	Construction audit reports are a helpful way to provide oversight of the City's capital construction program.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Agree	

Report Title [Publication Date]	R# [for F#]	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Recommendation Response (Implementation)	Recommendation Response Text
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R1 [for F1]	We recommend that by 6/15/22 the Mayor specify which department shall manage and have responsibility and authority for the contractor performance evaluation database to improve compliance, monitoring and consistent use. We further recommend that the director of the specified department appoint the project manager by 6/30/22.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	By June 15, 2022, the Mayor will designate Public Works as the department that shall manage and have responsibility and authority for the contractor performance evaluation database, and to expedite implementation of the the project. Furthermore, the Mayor will direct departments to work with the City Attorney to identify a defensible way to incorporate performance evaluation data in the Chapter 6 contractor procurement process. The appointment of a Project Manager by 6/15/22 is not realistic considering there are currently no available project managers available for this assigment, so a recruitment process will have to be undertaken.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R2 [for F2]	We recommend that by 9/30/22, the database project manager specified in R1 complete implementation, training sessions and “go live” workshops with all Chapter 6 departments.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Requires further analysis	Implementation of Civil Grand Jury recommendations are a high priority for the Mayor. Because the role of Project Manager is unfilled and the challenges the City is facing filling positions, the timeline recommended by the CGJ is probably unrealistic. To help speed the implementation process, the Mayor intends to ask Chapter 6 departments to find opportunities to streamline the implementation of the database by adapting existing contract evaluations for inclusion in the database.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R3 [for F3]	We recommend that by 12/31/2022, the Mayor require all Chapter 6 departments to begin submitting evaluations into the database.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	By December 31, 2022, the Mayor plans to direct all Chapter 6 departments to begin submitting evaluations for inclusion in the contractor performance evaluation database. As stated in response to R3, the Mayor intends to ask Chapter 6 departments to find opportunities to streamline the implementation of the database by incorporating evaluation data that is currently collected by departments as part of their project close out process.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R4 [for F4]	We recommend that by 12/31/2022, the Mayor explicitly directs all Chapter 6 departments to consult the database when selecting contractors.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	By December 31, 2022, or when the database has gone live, the Mayor plans to direct all Chapter 6 departments to consider evaluations of contractor performance evaluation database when selecting contractors. As stated in response to F1, departments will need to work with the City Attorney to identify a defensible way to incorporate performance evaluation data in the Chapter 6 contractor selection process. As stated in response to F2, the Mayor believes that an evaluation of the program should be made starting one year after go-live, to ensure the resources being put to the project are producing promised results of improved construction quality, budget and schedule adherence and improved contractor relationships.

Report Title [Publication Date]	**R# [for F#]**	**Recommendation**	**Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]**	**Recommendation Response** (Implementation)	**Recommendation Response Text**
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R5 [for F5]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023 the project manager update the database technology to include the capability to hold evaluators accountable by observing who is using the database and when.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Requires further analysis	The Mayor agrees that departments should be held accountable for knowing and considering information in the database when evaluating contractor proposals. Because the software platform on which the original database was built is no longer supported by the vendor, it will be up to the Project Manager to determine how best to provide the needed accountability.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R6 [for F6]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager update the database technology to require the "Lessons Learned" data field be filled out before an evaluation can be marked “complete.”	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Requires further analysis	The Mayor agrees that information in the database, including "lessons learned" is valuable to evaluators selecting contractors, as well as to those preparing construction bid documents and contracts. Rather than dictate software requirements, Chapter 6 departments participating in the project should work together with the Project Manager to identify the best way to insure this data is available to contract evaluators.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R7 [for F7]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager include sections in the database to cover contractor compliance with the SIP program.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	PUC data on contractor compliance with its SIP program is not relevant to five of the six Chapter 6 contracting departments. Including this data in the contractor performance evaluation database is likely introduce an element of confusion which would make it more difficult for these agencies to adopt and utilize the database.
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R8 [for F8]	We recommend that by 6/30/2023, the project manager expand the database to include input from non-Chapter 6 departments receiving construction services from Chapter 6 departments.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Requires further analysis	Improving capital project delivery in San Francisco is a high priority of the Mayor. In addition to the Civil Grand Jury, the issue is receiving attention from the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, the Controller's City Services Auditor and the Transportation Authority. The Capital Planning Committee is probably the best forum to receive input from non-Chapter 6 departments.

Report Title [Publication Date]	**R# [for F#]**	**Recommendation**	**Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]**	**Recommendation Response** (Implementation)	**Recommendation Response Text**
Shovel Ready: Best Practices and Collaboration to Improve San Francisco's Capital Construction Program [April 11, 2022]	R9 [for F9]	We recommend that starting in FY 2022-2023, the City Services Auditor Department within the Controller's Office conduct performance audits of the City construction program every two years focusing on use of best practices, collaboration, and other successes and challenges. The Controller's report from 2014 can serve as a template.	Mayor [June 10, 2022]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	This is a sound recommendation, but it is under the purview of the Controller's Office to prioritize their audit work plan.

From:	Major, Erica (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Anatolia Lubos; michael.hofman@sfcgj.org; Hang, Xang (MYR); Paulino, Tom (MYR); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Campbell, Severin (BOS); Holober, Reuben (BUD); Perkinson, Jessica (BOS)
Subject:	Updated Substitute Report - "Buried Problems and a Buried Process - The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change"
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 6:19:17 PM
Attachments:	COB Memo Receipt 061422.pdf

Greetings,

Attached please find the updated report submitted by the 2021-2022 Civil Grand Jury for "Buried Problems and a Buried Process - The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change". This matter is anticipated to be assigned to the Government Audit and Oversight Committee. The City agencies listed in the report will be required to respond within 60 days issuance and the Board will be required to respond within 90 days of the issuance of the report.

If you have any questions please contact me and Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org.

ERICA MAJOR
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

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.*

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 544-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 17, 2022

To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: 2021-2022 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT - "Buried Problems and a Buried Process: The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change" June 15, 2022

We are in receipt of the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (CGJ) substitute report released Tuesday, June 14, 2022, entitled: **"Buried Problems and a Buried Process: The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change"** (attached).

Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the Board must:

1. Respond to the report within 90 days of receipt, or no later than October 19, 2022.
2. For each finding:
   - agree with the finding or
   - disagree with the finding, wholly or partially, and explain why.
3. For each recommendation indicate:
   - that the recommendation has been implemented and a summary of how it was implemented;
   - that the recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation;
   - that the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of the analysis and timeframe of no more than six months; or
   - that the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10, in coordination with the Committee Chair, the Clerk will schedule a public hearing before the Government Audit and Oversight Committee to allow the Board the necessary time to review and formally respond to the findings and recommendations.

The Budget and Legislative Analyst will prepare a resolution, outlining the findings and recommendations for the Committee's consideration, to be heard at the same time as the hearing on the report.

Attachment

cc: Honorable Samuel K. Feng, Presiding Judge
Michael Hofman, Foreperson, 2021-2022 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
Xang Hang, Mayor's Office
Tom Paulino, Mayor's Office
Anne Pearson, Deputy City Attorney
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy
Severin Campbell, Budget and Legislative Analyst
Reuben Holober, Budget and Legislative Analyst

Buried Problems and a Buried Process:

The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard
in a Time of Climate Change

June 14, 2022



City and County of San Francisco
Civil Grand Jury
2021-2022

About the Civil Grand Jury

The Civil Grand Jury is a government oversight panel of volunteers who serve for one year. It makes findings and recommendations based on its investigations. Reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals by name, and disclosure of information about individuals interviewed by the Jury is prohibited. (California Penal Code §929)

2021-2022 Jurors

Michael N. Hofman, Foreperson

Will McCaa, Foreperson Pro Tem

Sara Miles, Corresponding Secretary

Charles Lai, Recording Secretary

Mark Seielstad, Parliamentarian

Tony An

Rick Crane

Tony David

Phyllis V. Deets

Jason Golz

Cort Gross

Jeanine Jue

Tim Novacic

Cynthia Travis

Joanie van Rijn

Dylan Walker

Jeffrey D. Weitzel

Cover Image from: Pathways Climate Institute and San Francisco Estuary Institute-Aquatic Science Center, "Shallow Groundwater Response to Sea Level Rise in the San Francisco Bay Area: Existing and Future Conditions,"estimated release date 2022

SUMMARY

The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard is a Superfund site on the southeastern shore of San Francisco. The Navy, overseen by EPA and state regulators, has been cleaning up radiological and chemical contamination in the Shipyard for over thirty years. As the cleanup is completed and approved, the Navy has agreed to transfer the property to the City in stages to create San Francisco's biggest housing development. A developer, working with the San Francisco Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, plans to build thousands of homes at the Shipyard, along with office towers, parks, a school and millions of feet of commercial space.

The Civil Grand Jury began this investigation with a question about the potential impact of groundwater rise due to climate change on the future of the Shipyard. Over the past decade, new coastal adaptation science has emerged to show the ways shallow groundwater reacts to sea level rise. In brief, as the sea level rises, shallow groundwater near the shore rises with it, and can cause flooding, damage infrastructure, and mobilize any contaminants in the soil. The Jury asked if rising groundwater could pose special risks to health and safety in the low-lying, heavily polluted landscape of the Shipyard.

The Jury learned that experts believe the Shipyard's soil and topography make it very likely that shallow groundwater there will be strongly affected by sea level rise. The Jury further found that rising groundwater in the Shipyard could interact in dangerous ways with future infrastructure, and with hazardous toxins the Navy plans to leave buried in the soil.

We wanted to know if this new science and these risks had been taken into account by the City, by OCII, or by the Navy and its regulators. We found that they had not.

To address this lack of information, the Jury recommends that the City hire expert scientists to examine these risks in detail. The City of Alameda set an example with a recent study predicting how shallow groundwater on the island would react to sea level rise, and how rising groundwater might interact with contaminants at different sites. The Jury recommends that San Francisco, acting through the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, commission a similar independent study specific to the Shipyard, so that future development plans can be informed by a thorough, professional analysis of rising groundwater there.

The Jury also wished to issue recommendations about how such a groundwater study might help improve the Shipyard cleanup. But the Jury cannot issue recommendations to the Navy or to the EPA and state regulators, and so looked for a solution that could come from inside the City. The Jury discovered that the process that governs the cleanup is forbiddingly complex, and essentially invisible within the City. Yet the stakes for San Francisco in that process—for health,

for environmental safety, and for the resilience of future development in the Shipyard—are enormous. But hardly anyone in the City is paying attention.

Within the City, expertise about the Superfund process that governs the cleanup exists only in the San Francisco Department of Public Health's Hunters Point Shipyard Program, a program that until recently had only one employee. Several other departments in the City have familiarity with the science of groundwater rise and might have flagged the risks to the Shipyard, but these departments are unfamiliar with the cleanup and the Superfund process, and do not communicate with SFDPH about the Shipyard.

This leaves the City poorly prepared to address emerging issues such as groundwater rise at the Shipyard—or any other risks the Navy and its regulators may overlook. There is no mechanism in place to discover such issues, to develop a response, or to follow through with the Navy and regulators to a resolution.

The Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors create, without delay, a permanent Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee, made up of representatives from City departments with pertinent expertise. This committee should proactively look out for the City's best interests in the cleanup. It should perform general due diligence, and communicate the City's concerns to the Navy and regulators ahead of major decision-making about the cleanup.

To address the opacity of the Superfund governance process, the Jury recommends that SFDPH create all necessary explanatory materials to support the work of the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee. To ensure that the Committee is informed about key cleanup decision points with enough time to weigh in, the Jury recommends that a representative of SFDPH appear before the Committee frequently for briefing.

Finally, to return to where this report started, the Jury recommends that the Cleanup Oversight Committee review the results of the recommended groundwater rise study, determine what it means for the future of the Shipyard, and respectfully but assertively share the City's position with the Navy, EPA, and state regulators. The intersection of rising ground water and buried contaminants poses a credible risk to human health and well-being. Given the rapidity with which the climate is changing, the City needs to take immediate and sustained action to protect its residents.

An initial report on this subject was issued on June 1, 2022, but has been rescinded, with this substitute report issued. This substitute report changes certain words and/or passages on pages 14, 22, 29, and 31, and in Appendices E and G, from the initial report. These changes have no bearing on any of the Findings or Recommendations, other than to place a later date on certain of the recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY **3**

TABLE OF CONTENTS **5**

INTRODUCTION **7**

BACKGROUND **8**

The Soil and the Poison: How Did They Get There? 8

Who Bears the Burden? 9

The Cleanup and Beyond 10

THE THREAT OF RISING GROUNDWATER **15**

The Basics 15

Rising Groundwater in the Shipyard: What Could Go Wrong? 19

Groundwater Rise and the Navy's Cleanup Plans 23

The Groundwater Maps San Francisco Needs 24

A DISCONNECT IN THE CITY **26**

A Steep Hill 26

Roles and Responsibilities 27

The Disconnect 28

Taking a Position 28

THE JURY'S REMEDY **30**

Lifting the Fog 32

Tracking Progress 33

Closing the Loop 34

CONCLUSION **35**

METHODOLOGY **36**

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS **37**

REQUIRED AND INVITED RESPONSES **39**

Appendix A: General Audience Media **40**

Appendix B: Scientific Papers **41**

Appendix C: Municipal and Regional Planning for Groundwater Rise **42**

Appendix D: Community and Environmental Advocacy Groups **44**

Appendix E: Cleanup Documentation **45**

Appendix F: Superfund Legal Framework **47**

Appendix G: Hunters Point Shipyard Litigation **49**

INTRODUCTION

Like every Civil Grand Jury investigation, this one began with a question. The Jury looked at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, a 638-acre Superfund site on the southeastern shore of San Francisco, where the Navy has been cleaning up radiological and chemical contamination for over thirty years. If all goes to plan, once the cleanup is complete, the Shipyard, along with adjacent Candlestick Point, will become the largest redevelopment in San Francisco since the 1906 earthquake, with thousands of homes and millions of square feet of commercial property.

The Jury posed the question: When the sea level rises, what will happen to the shallow groundwater in the residually-contaminated soil under those apartment buildings and office towers? The science is relatively new, but among coastal adaptation experts, this is now understood to be true: as the seas rise, shallow groundwater near the coast will tend to rise with them, and when groundwater rises through polluted soil, it's bad.

This led the Jury to a second question: Have the Navy and the regulators that oversee the cleanup evaluated the risks posed by groundwater rising with sea level rise in the Shipyard? Has the City and County of San Francisco? In both cases, the Jury found that they had not.

The Jury followed this thread and discovered that, within the City, too few people are paying too little attention to the Shipyard cleanup, leaving the City structurally unprepared for any challenging situation related to the cleanup. The City is not actively searching for overlooked risks such as groundwater rise. And the City is not performing sufficient due diligence on the decisions made by the Navy and regulators, to ensure that they are aligned with the interests and priorities of the people of San Francisco.

This is a solvable problem. Those who are not paying attention can be made aware, and the full spectrum of the City's resources can be applied to protecting our interests in the Shipyard cleanup, and making sure the Navy and regulators don't miss anything else in the years to come. And there is still hope that groundwater rise will be addressed in the Shipyard before it is too late.

An initial report on this subject was issued on June 1, 2022, but has been rescinded, with this substitute report issued. This substitute report changes certain words and/or passages on pages 14, 22, 29, and 31, and in Appendices E and G, from the initial report. These changes have no bearing on any of the Findings or Recommendations, other than to place a later date on certain of the recommendations.

BACKGROUND

The Soil and the Poison: How Did They Get There?

The history of the Hunters Point Shipyard begins in 1867, when the first dry dock opened on the peninsula.[1] In 1941, the Navy bought the site, recruited tens of thousands of workers, and turned the Shipyard into a major repair and maintenance facility for warships. Through 1944, the Navy built four new large dry docks, and expanded the peninsula by smashing an adjacent hill into gravel and dumping it into the Bay.[2] Figure 1 shows the work in progress.[3]

Figure 1: The Shipyard Under Construction



San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library

[1] Kelley & VerPlanck Historical Resources Consulting, "Bayview Hunters Point Area B Survey," p 41, prepared for the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, February 11, 2010
[2] "Bayview Hunters Point Area B Survey," p 93
[3] San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library

In 1946, the United States conducted Operation Crossroads, a pair of atom bomb tests in the Pacific that went wrong, leaving the Navy with dozens of vessels badly contaminated by radioactive fallout. A new laboratory at Hunters Point developed a technique of decontaminating ships by sandblasting them in dry dock, and many of the radioactive vessels ultimately passed through the Shipyard. The laboratory became the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL), which operated until 1969, and was the site of extensive radiological experimentation and research. The Shipyard became a regional hub for the disposal of radioactive waste, with workers packing NRDL's voluminous waste and material from decontaminated ships, as well as material from other nuclear facilities all over the Bay Area, into 47,000 large steel drums and sinking them in the ocean near the Farallon Islands.[4]

In 1974, the Navy ceased operations at the Shipyard, and in 1976 leased the site to Triple A Machine Shop. By 1984, not long after the passage of the Federal Superfund law, the writing was on the wall that the Navy would have to take responsibility for what had been left behind in the Shipyard, and it started taking stock of the mess.[5]

Forty years on, what we now know about the witches' brew in the Shipyard defies easy summarization. Radioactive material had been spilled, burned, or improperly disposed of, and still pollutes the soil, the base landfill, and the Bay.[6] Conventional shipyard operations left behind piles of asbestos, ponds of oil, crushed heavy metals, discarded batteries, spilled acids, and other toxic chemicals.[7] Triple A Machine Shop illegally dumped large amounts of extremely carcinogenic PCBs and heavy metals at the site.[8]

Who Bears the Burden?

The history of the Bayview Hunters Point community in the last century is complex, but two salient trends stand out: what the land was used for, and who lived there. Before World War II, the neighborhood had already been a locale for unpleasant, industrial uses, such as the Shipyard and slaughterhouses. After the war, as industrial real estate became scarce in other parts of the City, the Bayview became a destination for more and dirtier industrial development.

By 1945, over 18,000 workers, a third of them Black, had come to work at the Hunters Point Shipyard, most housed in Navy barracks there or in nearby Bayview. After the war, racist housing policies blocked Black workers and their families from moving to safer, less polluted parts of the City, so many stayed in the shadow of the Shipyard. By 1970, the census counted

---

[4] Chen, Kevin, and Gabrielle Hecht, "Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL) Briefing Book," Nuclear Insecurity in the Bay Area and Beyond, Stanford University, 2020

[5] US Navy, "'Initial Assessment Study of Hunters PointNaval Shipyard (Disestablished) San Francisco, California,Chapter 2, pp 2-3, Naval Energy and Environmental Support Activity, October 1984

[6] US Navy, "Hunters Point Shipyard History of the Use of General Radioactive Materials, 1939 – 2003 Final Historical Radiological Assessment,"Chapters 6-7, 2003

[7] "Initial Assessment Study of Hunters PointNaval Shipyard (Disestablished) San Francisco, California"

[8] Zamora, Jim Heron and Jane Kay, "Triple A Machine Shop Toxics Case," SFGate, December 9, 1996

over twenty thousand Black residents in Bayview Hunters Point, two thirds of the area's population.[9]

The history of environmental racism in Bayview Hunters Point has been met by a decades-long history of Black-led environmental justice activism. Community leaders have fought not only for responsible cleanup of the Shipyard, but to shut down a dirty power plant,[10] clean up the City's biggest sewage treatment plant,[11] stop industrial dumping,[12] and monitor local air quality.[13] (See Appendix D for an overview of environmental and community activism around Hunters Point.)

But the statistics remain grim. In 2018, the San Francisco Department of Public Health found that Bayview Hunters Point is significantly more at risk of health and environmental catastrophes than other neighborhoods.[14] 27% of the neighborhood is situated within a quarter-mile of a contamination risk, and Bayview Hunters Point residents have worse health outcomes, higher maternal deaths, twice the rate of breast cancer, and three times more "preventable hospitalizations" than other San Franciscans. The California EPA's CalEnviroScreen, a metric combining the pollution burden and social vulnerabilities of communities, shows the most beleaguered census tract in Bayview Hunters Point, just inland of the Shipyard, scoring worse than 92% of census tracts in the entire state.[15] Contamination from the Shipyard is part of a long, toxic history.

The Cleanup and Beyond

On November 21, 1989, the decommissioned Shipyard was added to the National Priorities List;[16] in lay terms, it became a Superfund site. According to the Superfund law, properly known as the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), responsibility for cleaning up the Shipyard lies with the Navy. Section 120 of CERCLA, which covers toxic sites owned by the federal government, obliges the Navy to enter into a formal agreement with the regulators who oversee the cleanup, to establish the ground rules of their working relationship. That agreement[17] was signed by the Regional Administrator

[9] " Bayview Hunters Point Area B Survey," pp 136-143
[10] Fulbright, Leslie, "Big Victory for Hunters Point Activists; As PG&E Closes its Old, Smoky Power Plant, the Neighborhood Breathes a Sigh of Relief," *San Francisco Chronicle,* May 15, 2006
[11] Katz, Mitchell, "Health Programs in Bayview Hunter's Point & Recommendations for Improving the Health of Bayview Hunter's Point Residents," p. 8, San Francisco Department of Public Health, September 19, 2006
[12]Mojadad, Ida, "City Struggles to Rein in Illegal Dumping in Bayview," *SF Weekly*, February 22, 2019
[13] Wolfram, Jessica, "Bayview Air Monitoring Program Helps Residents Breathe Easier," *San Francisco Examiner,* October 8, 2021
[14]"San Francisco Department of Public Health, "The Bayview Hunters Point Community Resilience Assessment," 2018
[15]California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, "Cal EnviroScreen," October 2021
[16] US Environmental Protection Agency, "National Priorities List Sites"
[17]US Navy, "Federal Facility Agreement for Naval Station Treasure Island, Hunters Point Annex," January 1992

of EPA, Region 9, on January 22nd, 1992. (See Appendix F for more detail on the Superfund legal framework.)

"Federal Facility Agreement signatories" is a very important bit of jargon: when it comes to the cleanup at the Hunters Point Shipyard, the agencies that signed the agreement are the deciders. The Navy makes and carries out the plans for cleanup. The regulators approve the plans and oversee their execution. The Federal Facility signatories for the Hunters Point Shipyard site are:

- the Navy
- the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- the California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

The City and County of San Francisco is not a signatory, and does not have a decision-making role, but SFDPH participates in the process and routinely offers written comment on cleanup documents.

In April of 1992, the Navy divided the 638-acre Shipyard into more manageable administrative units called "parcels"[18] so that it could clean up the Shipyard piece by piece, and transfer each parcel separately to the City once its cleanup was approved. (See Figure 2)

Parcel A sits on top of a hill, the site of former Navy barracks, and so was believed to be relatively clean. Parcels B, C, D, and E sliced up the remainder of the peninsula like a pie. Parcel F was later added to encompass the underwater portion of the site, and the most desirable portion of Parcel D was separated out into Parcel G. Later carve-outs and subdivisions have increased the total number of parcels to north of a dozen.

[18] US Navy, "Final Site Assessment Report, Potentially Contaminated Sites Parcels B,C,D, and E, Naval Station Treasure Island Hunters Point Annex, San Francisco California," p.6.

Figure 2: Parcel Map



Parcel Map

Fourth Five-Year Review of Remedial Actions, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California

In January of 1994, the Navy and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA)[19] signed a memorandum of understanding,[20] setting in motion a multi-decade quest to transform the Shipyard into a mini-city in its own right. In 1997, the Board of Supervisors approved SFRA's redevelopment plan[21] for the Shipyard, and in 1999, SFRA selected Lennar Corporation as the master developer.[22]

In April 2004, the City, the Navy, and SFRA signed a Conveyance Agreement[23] to outline a framework for the transfer of each parcel to the City, after the Navy completes the parcel's environmental cleanup and state and federal regulators confirm it is safe. The City is not required to accept any parcel.

The hilltop Parcel A was transferred to the City in December 2004, marking the beginning of Phase I of the redevelopment project, and Lennar soon began construction. After 2012, SFRA's successor agency, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), took over responsibility for working on Shipyard redevelopment. By 2015, new homeowners were moving into what Lennar branded "The San Francisco Shipyard," advertising "luxury condominiums and townhomes with breathtaking bay views…the ultimate experience in urban living." [24]

In 2016, Lennar restructured the Shipyard project under a new spinoff company, FivePoint Holdings, in which it is an investor.[25] Optimism and grand visions are still the order of the day in promoting Phase II development in the Shipyard's low-lying parcels. FivePoint's 2017 Request for Statements of Interest described its plans for "new infrastructure, state-of-the-art amenities, parks and open space, neighborhood retail centers, and a diverse range of housing and employment opportunities along the picturesque waterfront," calling the Shipyard "the largest redevelopment effort in San Francisco since the 1906 earthquake."[26] OCII's 2018 project update proposed to add hotels, parks, "artist and maker space," and 4.5 million square feet of office

---

[19] The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA)was incorporated in 1948 under the California Community Redevelopment Law. Though separate from the City and County of San Francisco, the agency carried out redevelopment efforts authorized by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. All redevelopment agencies were dissolved in 2012 by order of the California Supreme Court. The Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment (OCII) is SFRA's state-approved local successor agency.

[20] US Navy, "Transmittal of Interim Update for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Plan (BCP) of March 1995," p. 12 (ES 6), August 8, 1995

[21] San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, "Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan," July 14, 1997

[22] San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, "Resolution No. 68-99 Authorizing An Exclusive Negotiations Agreement With Lennar/Bvhp, Llc, a California Limited Liability Company, for The Hunters Point Shipyard; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area," June 1, 1999

[23] San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, "Resolution No. 50-2004, Adopting Environmental Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and Authorizing Execution of the Following Documents with the United States Department of the Navy Concerning the Former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Site," April 21, 2004

[24] https://liveatsfshipyard.com/

[25] Five Point Holdings PR Newswire, "Strategic Combination of FivePoint Holdings Creates Largest Developer of Mixed-Use Communities In Coastal California,"May 4, 201

[26] Gensler for FivePoint Development LLC, "Request for Statements of Interest and Qualifications ("RFQ") for Design, Engineering, & Professional ConsultingServices, SF Shipyard," September 6, 2017

space to “embrace the legacy, authenticity and unique character of the Shipyard as we look to the future and create a model for city-making.”[27]

At the time of the original redevelopment plan back in 1997, the hope was that the Shipyard could be cleaned up so completely that people could live there as if it had never been polluted; in Superfund language, it was to be made suitable for “unrestricted use.”[28]

But by the time cleanup plans were documented for the parcels beyond Parcel A, around 2009-10, the documents left no doubt that unrestricted use was out of reach. The very rock that had been dumped into the Bay to make the shipyard was poisonous,[29] and some pollutants in the soil and groundwater were so pervasive it was impossible to remove them completely. The plans were adjusted. In developed areas, pavement would be required everywhere to shield people from the toxic dirt. In open spaces, thick layers of clean, imported soil would have to be laid down in order for the parks to be safe. In many areas, new buildings would be required to be fitted with special equipment to divert poisonous vapors away from their interiors.[30]

Then, in a trickle of reports throughout the 2010s,[31] ultimately followed later by criminal convictions and lawsuits,[32] allegations emerged that former employees of Tetra Tech EC, Inc., the Navy contractor responsible for testing and cleaning up radiological contamination in the Shipyard, had been falsifying data. The safety of the Shipyard was thrown into doubt, public trust was damaged, and homeowners who had bought properties in Parcel A sued the developer, claiming they were misled about the extent of contamination.[33] Ultimately, in light of the safety concerns raised, the solution agreed to by the FFA signatories was for the Navy to repeat much of the soil testing, thus delaying the cleanup and the transfer of remaining parcels to the City by years. At the time of this report, only retesting in Parcel G is underway. The cleanup of the Shipyard, which was supposed to be winding down by the early 2020s, will continue for years to come.

---

[27] “TheShipyard and Candlestick Project Update,” OCII Commission, March 20, 2018
[28] https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/unrestricted-use-remedial-action
[29] San Francisco Department of Public Health, “Draft Executive Summary Regarding the Environmental Remediation of the Hunters Point Shipyard,” Attachment 8, Attachment 10, April 2010
[30] US EPA, “Hazard Ranking System Subsurface Intrusion Component,” January 9, 2017
[31] Nguyen, Vicky, Liz Wagner, Felipe Escamilla, “Contractor Submitted False Radiation Data at Hunters Point,” *NBC Bay Area,* October 13, 2014; Brinklow, Adam, “Alleged Radiation Cover-Up at Hunters Point Prompts EPA Investigation,” *Curbed SF,* September 22, 2016; Roberts, Chris, “Almost Half of Toxic Cleanup at Hunters Point Shipyard is Questionable or Faked, According to Initial Review,” *Curbed SF,* January 26, 2018
[32] US Attorney’s Office, District of Northern California, “United States Joins Lawsuits Against Tetra Tech EC Inc. Alleging False Claims In Connection With Shipyard Cleanup,” US Department of Justice, October 26, 2018
[33] CBS Bay Area, ”Settlement Approved For San Francisco Hunters Point Homeowners In Lawsuit Over Alleged Contamination,” April 1, 2022

THE THREAT OF RISING GROUNDWATER

The Basics

Much of the low, flat portion of Hunters Point that extends into the Bay was constructed during World War II, out of a nearby hill that had been pulverized and dumped into the water. When a shoreline is made of such permeable material, salt ocean water soaks in, effectively extending the ocean under the ground. But the soil usually also contains shallow fresh water, from rain and other sources. Because salt water is heavier than fresh, this fresh groundwater floats on top of the saltwater layer underground.

As shown in Figure 3,[34] the shallow groundwater surface near the shore fluctuates with the sea: with the tides on a daily basis, and with sea level rise as the planet warms. When it rises enough, emergent groundwater can be pushed up from the earth—often years before there is overland flooding from the sea itself. Conventional defenses against sea level rise, such as sea walls, offer no protection from flooding from below, and can even exacerbate flooding by creating a barrier that keeps risen groundwater from flowing out.[35] (For more about the effects of sea level rise on groundwater see Appendix A, a selection of general audience media on this subject, and Appendix B, a selection of scholarly articles.)

The first time this concept appears in the scientific literature is in 2007,[36] when the Navy's plans for cleaning up most of the Shipyard were already being prepared. In 2012, a pair of landmark papers about the cases of Honolulu[37] and New Haven[38] explored how groundwater propelled upward by sea level rise could create hazards in urban environments. By 2019, scientists had awakened to the risks rising groundwater posed along the shoreline of the San Francisco Bay,

[34] City of Alameda, "The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise," September 2020
[35] Habel, Shellie, Charles H. Fletcher & Tiffany R. Anderson, *et al.* "Sea-Level Rise Induced Multi-Mechanism Flooding and Contribution to Urban Infrastructure Failure," *Scientific Reports,* March 2, 2020
[36] Masterson, John P. and Stephen Garabedian, "Effects of Sea-Level Rise on Ground Water Flow in a Coastal Aquifer System,"pp. 209-217, *Groundwater* 45, no. 2, March-April 2007
[37] Rotzoll, Kolja and Charles H. Fletcher, "Assessment of groundwater inundation as a consequence of sea-level rise," pp 477–481, *Nature Climate Change*, 2013
[38] Bjerklie, David M., John R. Mullaney, Janet R. Stone, Brian J. Skinner, and Matthew A. Ramlow, "Preliminary investigation of the effects of sea-level rise on groundwater levels in New Haven, Connecticut," U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2012–1025, 2012

and two papers —one from UC Berkeley[39] and the other from the US Geological Survey (USGS)[40]—created maps of how sea level rise might affect groundwater along the Bay edge.

Figure 3



City of Alameda, The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise

A new Bay Area project[41] builds on the work of the UC Berkeley paper and will release its results in the second half of 2022. This study is the work of the Pathways Climate Institute (Pathways) and the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI), and will produce the most detailed maps to date of the groundwater surface under different sea level rise scenarios in Alameda, Marin, and San Mateo counties, as well as in San Francisco. In San Francisco, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (ORCP) has partnered with Pathways and SFEI to support

[39] Plane, Ellen, Kristina Hill, and Christine May, "A Rapid Assessment Method to Identify Potential Groundwater Flooding Hotspots as Sea Levels Rise in Coastal Cities" *Water* 11, no. 11, 2019

[40] Bufus, Kevin M, P. L. Barnard, D. J. Hoover, J. A. Finzi Hart, and C. I. Voss, "Increasing threat of coastal groundwater hazards from sea-level rise in California." pp 946–952 *Nature Climate Change*, 2020

[41] Pathways Climate Institute and San Francisco Estuary Institute-Aquatic Science Center, "Shallow Groundwater Response to Sea Level Rise in the San Francisco Bay Area: Existing and Future Conditions,"estimated release date 2022. See advance study summary here.

mapping the city's groundwater surface—a crucial step in understanding how to plan for sea-level rise in different parts of the city.

The Jury has obtained permission to include a preview of the Pathways+SFEI maps for Hunters Point in this report. Figure 4 shows where the highest annual shallow groundwater surface is currently, and where it would be with a scenario of four feet of sea level rise—well within the range scientists expect to see by the end of the century.[42]

Refer back to Figure 2 for the outlines of Shipyard Parcels C and G, both areas with buried contaminants, and both slated for development. With four feet of sea level rise, the wettest conditions are expected to bring groundwater within three feet of the surface in large portions of these parcels, and the southwest corner of Parcel G is predicted to be surrounded by flooding. Those floodwaters could be poisoned with toxic metals and volatile organic compounds. Throughout the century, as groundwater rises in Parcels C and G (as well as in Parcel B, also planned for development,) buried contaminants that are now dry and stationary could become wet and mobile.

As vivid and alarming as the maps in Figure 4 are, they have significant limitations, and are not adequate for the City to use to inform important decisions about the future of the Shipyard.

- In the Shipyard, the Pathways+SFEI maps are based on very limited data. Plentiful groundwater data has been generated by the Navy, but it is not made available in a format useful to outside researchers. The Pathways+SFEI maps for the Shipyard are based on data from just two wells.
- The regional nature of the Pathways+SFEI study limits it from taking into account the specific characteristics of the soil in the Shipyard.
- The site cleanup and future development will change the terrain of the Shipyard, and maps are needed that take these changes into account.
- Most crucially, the Pathways+SFEI study does not model groundwater flows in the Shipyard that could predict how soil and groundwater contaminants might move around under different sea level rise scenarios.

With all that's at stake in the Hunters Point Shipyard, the City urgently needs better, more detailed predictions of how groundwater will react to sea level rise at this site.

[42] National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, "2022 Sea Level Rise Technical Report, Coastal County Snapshots," U.S. Department of Commerce

Figure 4: Groundwater Rise in the Shipyard





Pathways Climate Institute and San Francisco Estuary Institute-Aquatic Science Center,, "Shallow Groundwater Response to Sea Level Rise in the San Francisco Bay Area: Existing and Future Conditions,"estimated release 2022

Rising Groundwater in the Shipyard: What Could Go Wrong?

Build a peninsula out of fill dirt and crushed rock. Run an oily, messy shipyard on it for decades. Site a radiological research laboratory there. Process thousands of tons of radioactive waste on its way to disposal in the ocean. Put out fires in the landfill, and mop up chemical spills. Then spend decades scrubbing the place clean as best you can, and build a small, new city with thousands of homes, schools, and extensive commercial properties on top of the remains. What could go wrong? What could go wrong if the average height of the water table was three feet higher than assumed, back when all this cleanup and construction was originally planned? What if it were six feet higher? What could go wrong during an extreme precipitation event at the end of a wet winter, supercharged by climate change and rising tides, when the ground cannot hold any more water?

There are so many things that have gone wrong already, both in the toxically burdened Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood and in the Shipyard itself. Anything that could subject the people of this community and the people who will eventually live in the Shipyard to further risks must be taken very seriously.

Earthquakes, Flooding and Infrastructure

Even before toxic and radioactive materials are considered, the lens of straight engineering offers a junk drawer full of problems. Fill soil like that in the Shipyard is at high risk of liquefaction during an earthquake,[43]and rising groundwater can increase the likelihood and severity of liquefaction.[44] Setting aside earthquakes, when groundwater rises and encounters an impermeable surface like pavement, the foundation of a building, or a sewer line, the water pushes up on it as if it were a boat. Pavement can crack and leak under this pressure.[45] Buildings with underground parking garages can float and settle back down, less stable than before.[46] High groundwater can shove around underground infrastructure like sewers, gas mains and storm drains, and the water can remove soil when it drains away again, leading to other structural problems.[47]

Mobilized Contaminants

The Navy and its regulators have deemed it safe to leave some hazardous material buried on site throughout the Shipyard. These decisions did not take into account, however, that every inch of

[43] United States Geological Survey, "Liquefaction Susceptibility," USGS, Earthquakes Hazard Program
[44]. Grant, Alex R,, Anne M. Wein, Kevin M. Befus, Juliette Finzi Hart, Mike T. Frame, Rachel Volentine, Patrick Barnard, and Keith L. Knudsen,"Changes in Liquefaction Severity in the San Francisco Bay Area with Sea-Level Rise," *Geo-Extreme 2021: Climatic Extremes and Earthquake Modeling ,* 2021
[45] May, Christine, A.T. Mohan, O. Hoang, M. Mak, Y Badet, "The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise," City of Alameda, September 2020
[46] NYC Economic Development Corporation, "Lower Manhattan Climate Resilience Study,"p. 23, 2019
[47] Chisolm, Elizabeth and John C. Matthews, "Impact of Hurricanes and Flooding on Buried Infrastructure," *Leadership and Management in Engineering* 12 , pp 151-156, 2012

groundwater rise has the potential to bring the water table into contact with previously stationary contaminants. In the areas of the Shipyard where development is planned, pavement is intended to serve as an important line of defense against toxins in the soil.[48] But if the pavement is not elevated well above the future water table, water will eventually batter through the pavement from below, and may carry toxins with it. In areas planned for parks, layers of imported soil are supposed to serve as protection. But if they are not thick enough, the soil will periodically become soaked through with water that may bear contaminants.

Volatile Organic Compounds

The most pernicious toxins that are known to remain in the Shipyard are Volatile Organic Chemicals (VOCs.) Throughout the site, the Navy's remediation plans are to excavate and remove the most concentrated VOC spills, or to chemically treat them in place. But like discarded plastic litter, VOCs get everywhere, and keep turning up in unexpected places for years.

According to Navy plans, any VOCs that remain in the Shipyard's soil and in the groundwater are to be managed with "institutional controls."[49] Institutional controls are active measures that have to be maintained into the future—potentially indefinitely—to maintain safety. They include remedies such as the ongoing monitoring of wells, or requiring "vapor barriers" in buildings to divert vaporized VOCs away from indoor spaces.

Experts the Jury consulted were skeptical of the ability of institutional controls to protect people from VOCs in a time of climate change. VOCs mix easily with water, and as groundwater moves faster, or in new directions, it will carry VOCs with it. If groundwater rises all the way to the surface to cause flooding, VOCs will come along for the ride. And VOCs have a superpower: where sewer lines have been damaged by age, rising groundwater, or earthquakes, water carrying VOCs can leak into the sewers. Toxic vapors can then rise off that water and travel up the pipes into homes and other structures.[50] In the multi-story residential buildings planned for the Shipyard, those toxic vapors would have many stories to rise, and could reach into a large number of bathrooms and sleeping areas.

---

[48] See Appendix E for documents. Parcel G ROD, p. 33. Amended Parcel B ROD, Chapter 9, p. 5. Parcel C ROD, p. 56

[49] See Appendix E for documents. Parcel G ROD, p. 42. Amended Parcel B ROD, Chapter 12, p. 11. Parcel C ROD, p. 57

[50] P. Wong-Yim, T.L. Taras, B.K. Davis, M.J. Wade,"Risk Assessment for Sites with Volatile Contaminants in Shallow Groundwater," Appendix E: Cleanup Documentation, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2007

Toxic Metals

The Navy's Records of Decision (RODs) for the Shipyard are full of references to "ubiquitous metals"[51] in the fill material that composes much of the peninsula. The most prevalent toxic metals in this fill are manganese and arsenic, and groundwater sits in this material continuously and stews. These metals don't dance around in groundwater like VOCs, but they are mobile enough that the Navy makes numerous references to the risk of groundwater transmitting toxic metals into the Bay.[52] The Jury believes serious study is needed to find out if rising groundwater might also create a pathway for the toxic metals in Shipyard soil to affect human beings— either through flooding, or by pushing the metals up into a cap of previously clean, imported soil.

Paper Workarounds

Then there is the curious case of Parcel G, which is expected to be the next parcel transferred to the City. In 2009, a Record of Decision stated that Parcel G would be mostly restricted from residential use, though the developer had recently created new plans for residential development throughout the parcel.

Under the aegis of the Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, a creative solution was devised in 2016. A Feasibility Study[53] divided Parcel G into fifty-foot by fifty-foot grid squares. In each grid square, if a soil sample taken earlier in the process contained any one of twelve dangerous chemicals in concentrations higher than a chosen threshold, that square failed the test, and was restricted from residential use. In some cases, when the failing soil sample was directly surrounded on all sides by passing samples, only the immediate area of the failing soil sample was restricted.[54] Despite a scattering of dangerous chemicals known to be in the soil, consultants working for OCII had found a way to clear almost all of Parcel G for residential development.

Under this solution, the dense neighborhood of apartment buildings and condo towers planned for Parcel G will be shot through with patches—from the size of a parking space to the size of a few basketball courts—where, on paper, it is deemed unsafe for people to live. The argument the Feasibility Study seems to make is that the real protection will come from required covers of pavement or clean soil, and that restricted grid squares are just a bureaucratic workaround to adhere to the letter of the rules.[55] But under conditions of rising groundwater, soil contaminants may not stay put in the restricted grid squares, and flooding may carry them right up to the surface, onto the sidewalks where children play. That paper workaround needs to be revisited in the light of a credible prediction of future groundwater behavior.

---

[51] See Appendix E for documents. Amended Parcel B ROD, Chapter 1, p. 4; US Navy, "Explanation of Significant Differences to the Final Record of Decision for Parcel G", p. 5, April 18, 2017. Parcel C ROD, p. 18

[52] See Appendix E for documents. Parcel C ROD, p. 13 Parcel G ROD, p. 23, 42

[53] Langan Engineering, "Feasibility Assessment for Evaluating Areas with Residential Land Use Restrictions, Parcel G, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard," Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, November 30, 2016

[54] "Feasibility Assessment,"p. 22, pp 27-28.

[55] "Feasibility Assessment," p. 23

Unexpected Conditions

The most worrisome risks that rising groundwater poses in the Shipyard, though, are the ones we don't yet know about—and aren't necessarily looking for. The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Risk Management Plan[56] is a document describing the procedures that must be followed during construction in the Shipyard, to minimize the risks posed by the hazardous materials there, and it explicitly acknowledges that more dangers could be hiding in the soil. The Plan's Appendix E, the "Unexpected Condition Response Plan," is a 28-page sub-document describing what to do if workers find something in the dirt that wasn't supposed to be there.

> *By way of example, Unexpected Conditions may include visibly discolored soil and/or contaminated groundwater in an area not previously identified by the Navy, soil and/or groundwater exhibiting a strong chemical odor in an area not previously identified by the Navy, unexpected subsurface structures (e.g., pits, sumps, underground storage tanks, etc.), radioactive materials, material potentially presenting an explosive hazard (MPPEH), and/or other visual or olfactory evidence of a historical release at a location not previously identified by the Navy.*[57]

The Shipyard was, after all, a shipyard. It was also home to a radiological research laboratory, from which the Navy has documented first-hand accounts of radioactive materials being mishandled.[58] Radioactive ships were decontaminated via sandblasting in the open air. Tons of radioactive waste from other nuclear facilities were brought to the Shipyard to be prepared for disposal. A radioactive deck marker turned up buried in a supposedly clean parcel near newly built homes.[59] The Navy has not tested every inch of soil in the Shipyard, nor is there any plan to do so; it's to be expected that additional dangerous materials lurk underground where the Navy didn't look. That's why there is a 28-page, break-glass-in-case-of-emergency manual about what to do if a backhoe operator stumbles onto something that literally smells bad, is explosive—or worse.

The implicit assumption in this entire risk management strategy is that anything that remains in the soil won't become a problem unless someone digs it up. In a world of rapid climate change, in which groundwater is rising into previously dry soil, that assumption no longer works.

---

[56] Geostyntec Consultants, "Risk Management Plan for Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California," 2019

[57] "Risk Management Plan," Appendix E, p E-1

[58] US Navy, "Hunters Point Shipyard History of the Use of General Radioactive Materials, 1939 – 2003 Final Historical Radiological Assessment," Chapter 6, 2004.

[59] Heenan, Catherine, "Highly radioactive object found at former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard," *KRON News,* September 14, 2018

Some of the risks described in this section may not manifest as serious problems in the decades to come, and possibly many of them won't. But with cancer-causing chemicals and radioactive materials, only one thing needs to go wrong. Two or three things going wrong can add up to a disaster.

Many of these risks can be avoided with foresight. It is critical that decisions about the Shipyard's future safety are informed with the best predictions science can provide about how shallow groundwater there will react to sea level rise.

Finding 1:

In the Hunters Point Shipyard, shallow groundwater rising with sea level rise and residual hazardous substances pose serious but poorly understood risks that should concern the City and County of San Francisco, the Navy, future developers, future property owners, and future residents.

Groundwater Rise and the Navy's Cleanup Plans

These serious risks have not been accounted for by the Navy in designing its remedies. They have not been accounted for, either, by the other Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) signatories.

The Records of Decision in which the Navy described its selected remedies for cleaning up the Shipyard were published mostly in 2009-10, before all but the earliest scientific literature about groundwater rise was published. Even years later, as the body of literature grew, new RODs and revisions to old ones still lacked any mention of groundwater rise. (See Appendix E.)

The Superfund law requires reviews of cleanups every five years at sites where hazardous materials remain, to ensure that remedies have been designed and carried out appropriately.[60] The most recent Five-Year Review for Hunters Point was published in 2019.[61] Had the Navy considered the new risks of rising groundwater, revisions to its previous plans would have appeared there, most likely in answers to two questions in the Technical Assessment section.

Question B in the section is, *"Are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels, and [remedial goals] used at the time of the remedy still valid?"* In its answer, the Navy does not mention any new exposure pathways related to groundwater rise.[62] Question C is, *"Has any other information come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy?"* Here, the Navy muses about whether it needs to make any changes to its plans in light of updated sea level rise guidance from the State of California—and concludes that it does not.[63]

[60] US Environmental Protection Agency, "Superfund: Five Year Reviews," updated March, 2021
[61] US Navy, "Final Fourth Five Year Review," Section Six, July 2019
[62] "Final Fourth Five Year Review," pp 6-14
[63] " Final Fourth Five Year Review," pp 6-16

The Jury spoke with several individuals from directly involved regulatory agencies, and with leading experts deeply ensconced in studying groundwater rise in the Bay Area. All confirmed that, aside from some glimmers of awareness at regulatory agencies, groundwater rise has not yet been meaningfully considered in the cleanup at the Hunters Point Shipyard.

Finding 2:

The Federal Facility Agreement signatories have neglected to investigate how groundwater rise may lessen the effectiveness of the Navy's cleanup at the Hunters Point Shipyard Superfund site.

The Groundwater Maps San Francisco Needs

Much like Hunters Point, the island of Alameda is low-slung and home to a decommissioned Naval facility. Among the communities along the Bay shore concerned with groundwater rise, the City of Alameda has led the way in improving upon approximate regional models with high-quality, locale-specific, actionable analysis. As an input to its 2020 Climate Action and Resiliency Plan, Alameda commissioned a detailed, professional study[64] of how sea-level rise will affect shallow groundwater and soil contamination on and around the island. The study's authors diligently extracted local groundwater data from multiple sources to create a detailed map of the groundwater surface under the wettest, most flood-prone current conditions. They then performed rigorous modeling to predict how that groundwater surface would rise under a progressively more severe set of sea-level rise scenarios. The study then evaluated the future risks posed by groundwater flooding in known areas of contaminated soil, providing the planners of Alameda with high-quality analysis to use in preparing their community for sea level rise. (See Appendix C for a selection of reports and planning documents by cities, states and regions that address groundwater rise.)

In support of its cleanup efforts at the Shipyard, the Navy has already sunk dozens of groundwater monitoring wells. The City must persuade the Navy to make that water level data available to expert, independent scientists. The City should follow Alameda's lead and commission a study to create detailed maps of the groundwater surface at the Shipyard site under different sea-level rise scenarios. It should take into account planned changes to the site, such as shoreline structures and the addition of clean soil, and carefully map projected groundwater flows and the locations of known contaminants.

The Navy and other Federal Facility Agreement signatories should consider this new information in their updated planning. But even if they do not, the City must act. It is critical for the City and OCII to understand these forecasts in order to inform decisions about development, to make

[64] City of Alameda, "The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise," 2020

Hunters Point as safe and resilient as possible, and to know where to watch out for trouble in the future.

Recommendation 1:

By September 1st, 2022, the Mayor and/or the City Administrator should direct the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, in collaboration with the Department of Public Health, to commission and manage an independent, third-party study of Hunters Point Shipyard to predict the future shallow groundwater surface, groundwater flows, and potential interactions of groundwater with hazardous materials and planned modifications to the site under multiple sea level rise scenarios.

Recommendation 2:

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should collaborate to provide funding for the study recommended in R1, in the Fiscal Year 22-23 budget, or by October 1st, 2022.

Thanks to its involvement in the forthcoming Pathways+SFEI Shallow Groundwater project, ORCP has institutional knowledge of groundwater rise and existing relationships with outside experts. The Jury believes ORCP is the best City agency to take responsibility for this study.

The Jury wishes to emphasize that this research must be conducted with utmost impartiality and thoroughness by experts familiar with the science of groundwater rise in contaminated soil. San Francisco has understandably placed great importance on the future development of the Shipyard. It cannot cut corners in an era of climate change, as it carefully weighs all risks to the health and safety of the city's people.

A DISCONNECT IN THE CITY

Information is power, especially good information. But outcomes depend on what the City does with it. Within the City, perhaps findings from the recommended groundwater study may eventually inspire updates to codes for construction and infrastructure in the Shipyard. But most urgently, the Jury believes that good new groundwater rise information needs to be considered by decision-makers in the cleanup.

To make that happen, the City must engage fully with the cleanup governance process. The Shipyard cleanup is governed by the Federal Facility Agreement signatories: the Navy, EPA, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. The City does not get a veto or a vote in decisions about the cleanup. To bring groundwater rise—or any other issue it considers important—to the attention of the signatories, the City must use diplomacy and persuasion, strategic engagement, and its own written comments on cleanup documents.

A Steep Hill

The first problem identified by this report is that rising groundwater threatens to damage the future infrastructure of the Shipyard and expose future residents to hazardous substances. And that neither the City, OCII, nor the signatories are paying sufficient attention to these risks.

But if the City is aware of the risks rising groundwater poses elsewhere in San Francisco, why is it not paying attention in the Shipyard? This question leads to the second, more essential problem identified in this report.

A fundamental challenge posed by the Shipyard is that the process which governs the cleanup is arcane and very difficult to understand. Dozens of documents are generated every year, all written in dense technical jargon, and overwhelming for the uninitiated to navigate or to even locate. The workflow in which these documents exist is equally daunting. And yet the process is critical to understand if the City is to persuade the FFA signatories to consider its perspective on groundwater rise—or on other important issues. For someone with knowledge of the process, there are windows of opportunity and avenues of approach the City can use to productively engage with the signatories.[65] But for most of the City, the cleanup governance process is inaccessible, even invisible.

However, hidden inside this impenetrable system, the signatories are engaging with important questions that concern anyone who might someday live in the Shipyard. They should certainly concern the leaders of San Francisco.

[65] In 2016-2017, OCII worked with the signatories to modify the ROD for Parcel G to make most of the parcel available for residential development.

What does it mean for a parcel of land to be safe for people to live on? What does it mean for it to be safe to go to work there? If a community is safe only if certain rules are followed, how can we be sure those rules will be enforced, today and in the future? There are an infinity of such questions that could be asked as the cleanup proceeds. Some are addressed directly by the signatories, others implicitly, and many are not considered at all. But it is very difficult to follow the signatories' thinking by reading the documents.

The Navy is obligated to engage in community outreach and make an effort to help the public understand the answers to some of these questions. But a City leader trying to understand the priorities of cleanup decision-makers, or a resident who isn't satisfied with an answer from a Navy representative, or a City employee trying to determine exactly what risks have been considered—that person has a steep hill to climb.

Finding 3:

The process governing the cleanup at the Shipyard encompasses decisions and value judgments that matter to all San Franciscans, but the extremely technical nature of the process inhibits City leaders and citizens alike from understanding it, or even knowing what is at stake.

Roles and Responsibilities

Inside the City, the Hunters Point Shipyard Program in SFDPH is the only entity with significant experience with the process governing the Shipyard cleanup. Other City departments have little if any responsibility in the Shipyard. Most of the Shipyard remains Navy property, and even after it is transferred it will be a redevelopment area with special rules.

Those City departments with domain knowledge about groundwater rise do not engage with the process by which decisions are made about the Shipyard cleanup. Because the process is functionally invisible, there is no prompt for those departments to ask questions, or to reach out and invite someone who knows about the Shipyard cleanup to join in their groundwater rise discussions.

These obstacles are not confined to groundwater rise. Take any sphere where the City has roles to play in an ordinary neighborhood: water and sewer infrastructure, planning, building, climate change adaptation, the environment, and more. The departments, offices, and programs responsible for this range of work have little incentive to ask if the problems they think about every day are also problems in the Shipyard. If they did ask, the daunting entry into understanding the cleanup governance process might well dissuade them before they got an answer. It might never occur to them that their expertise could be applied to solving problems in the Shipyard.

Finding 4:

Despite the enormous stakes of the process governing the Shipyard cleanup, there is little understanding of the process throughout the City, or of how the City can influence this process.

The Disconnect

For thirty years, SFDPH has worked with the signatories on the cleanup, sending a representative to the monthly meetings prescribed by the Federal Facility Agreement and issuing written comments on cleanup documents. It has done so with minimal staff and little input or participation from other experts in the City. Over time, SFDPH's role in the Shipyard cleanup has evolved organically into a detail-oriented focus on the technical aspects of the cleanup governance process, and on enforcing City health codes related to the Shipyard.

In the case of groundwater rise, SFDPH's health-oriented mandate, limited Shipyard Program staffing, and its narrow, technical approach to the cleanup process were not sufficient to spot this emerging risk. Because the City departments with the relevant expertise were not involved with the Shipyard, the City was not prepared to catch the oversight when the FFA signatories, following their rigorous, regimented process, also failed to take notice of the risk.

Beyond groundwater rise, the City is exposed to *any* future mistake, overlooked issue, or questionable decision the signatories might make that is outside the skill set of SFDPH's Hunters Point Shipyard Program. So long as the full spectrum of the City's expertise is not proactively brought to bear, the City cannot properly look out for the important interests San Franciscans have in the Shipyard cleanup.

Finding 5:

The City and County of San Francisco is poorly prepared to discover new information pertinent to the Shipyard cleanup, to proactively look for risks and problems overlooked or under-prioritized by the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, or to develop responses to new information or problems.

Taking a Position

Looking out for the interests of San Francisco in the Shipyard cleanup also means the City must take a position about what it wants out of the cleanup, and express that position effectively to the signatories. Through SFDPH's Shipyard Program, the City has well-developed relationships with the signatories and can communicate with them informally in meetings and phone calls, or formally in comments on cleanup documents. But with most of the City disengaged from the

cleanup, there is no working group that can synthesize the City's position so that it can be conveyed.

For the City to articulate a well-considered stance about the Shipyard cleanup is not a simple matter. Difficult material needs to be digested; diverse perspectives need to be voiced and debated. When the City takes a strong position, as it should on the issue of groundwater rise, its concerns are likely to be just the beginning of a lengthy dialogue with the signatories, and will require follow-through.

The City's inability to adopt a position and convey it directly to the signatories was evident after the scandal involving former employees of Tetra Tech EC, Inc, the Navy contractor responsible for testing and cleaning up radioactive materials at the Shipyard, who were revealed to have been falsifying data. In 2016, Mayor Ed Lee and Malia Cohen, then Supervisor for District 10, where the Shipyard is located, sent a strongly-worded letter to the head of the EPA:[66]

> *The safety of our residents and workers is paramount, and we are committed to a thorough cleanup at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. This cleanup must be done in a way that protects the public health of our residents and the environment….San Francisco will not accept the transfer of any land until federal and state regulators are satisfied that the land is clean and safe, and our own Department of Public Health validates that decision.*

Had the City been comprehensively engaged in the cleanup governance process, this strong opening from the Mayor and Supervisor Cohen could have been followed by more specific messaging, delivered not to distant Washington D.C., but to the actual case workers in the Bay Area doing the hard negotiations about how to proceed in the aftermath of the scandal. This messaging could have been delivered via the very same channels the signatories use to communicate with each other.

For those paying attention, the following years saw EPA expressing pointed displeasure at the Navy in its written comments on major documents.[67] [68] The City could have used its own written comments to support the EPA's calls for better transparency from the Navy and more thorough corrective measures. But there was no venue in which key stakeholders in the City could convene to articulate a position, and the City missed the opportunity to weigh in with the signatories about what must happen to have a better, more accurate testing process.[69]

---

[66] "Letter from San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee and District 10 Supervisor Malia Cohen to Environmental Protection Agency Regarding Investigation into Cleanup at the Former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard," September 19, 2016
[67] US Navy, "Final Fourth Five Year Review, Appendix F, p. 1, July 2019
[68] Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan, Appendix A, Attachment 2.1, EPA Recommendations for Task Specific Plan for Parcel G, p. 1
[69] SFDPH's comments on these documents can be found at: "Final Fourth Five Year Review, Appendix F, p. 44. Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan, Appendix A, "Responses to Comments," p. 24.

Finding 6:

No proactive mechanism exists for the City and County of San Francisco to articulate its interests and concerns about the cleanup to the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, nor does a mechanism exist for the City to monitor progress towards obtaining satisfactory responses to such interests and concerns from the signatories.

THE JURY'S REMEDY

The Jury believes that the essence of the City's disconnect from the Shipyard cleanup lies in the lack of attention paid to it by leaders throughout the City. And if they did pay attention, the Superfund process would demand a great investment of effort to understand. To address the first part of the problem, the Jury's recommendation is to create a serious and effective body whose explicit purpose is paying attention to the cleanup.

Recommendation 3:

By October 1st, 2022, the Board of Supervisors should pass an ordinance to create a permanent Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee that includes the Controller or their designee, relevant technical experts from the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Public Works, and representatives from other relevant City departments, to perform due diligence on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco into the Federal Facility Agreement signatories' decision-making, and to prepare an agenda of questions and requests to be communicated to the signatories by the Department of Public Health in advance of major cleanup document releases.

In light of the widespread poor understanding of the cleanup governance process highlighted in Finding 4, the Jury offers the following discussion to help the Board create an effective oversight committee as quickly as possible, and aid the inaugural members of the committee as they begin their work.

The Jury believes this permanent Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee should:

Perform Due Diligence on Major Cleanup Documents on Behalf of the City

The heartbeat of the Superfund process is documentation. If there are important things happening in the cleanup, they will be described in a document. If there is an important upcoming issue that the committee wishes to weigh in on, the venue to engage with the signatories is the process

surrounding the documents concerning that issue. The Committee should complement the detailed-oriented review performed by SFDPH with a big-picture assessment of how new developments in the cleanup interact with the interests of San Francisco. The documents are difficult to understand, but Recommendation 4 offers a solution to that problem.

A partial list of important documents that the committee should consider reviewing if they appear on the schedule are:

- The Fifth Five-Year Review (scheduled for 2023)
- Documents that modify existing Records of Decision (Amendments and "Explanations of Significant Differences")
- The Record of Decision for Parcel F (the parcel in the Bay)
- Retesting Work Plans for Parcels B, C and D (correcting for the falsification in testing performed by former employees of Tetra Tech EC, Inc.)
- Findings of Suitability for Transfer

Work with SFDPH to Communicate with the FFA Signatories

After familiarizing itself with the content of a draft or upcoming document, the Committee may have questions, concerns, or priorities to communicate to all the signatories. The Committee may invite signatories to speak with it directly, but often it will be appropriate to communicate via the existing channel of SFDPH's Shipyard Program, especially for matters that require extended discussion. The Committee should coordinate with SFDPH on written comments on documents.

Periodically Update a Standing Position on the Cleanup

The Jury believes that even when the Committee finds little to disagree with in an important cleanup document, it should make a written statement of its priorities and standing goals for the cleanup, and that SFDPH should include these in written comment on that document.

When an issue demands a stronger position, such as in the case of groundwater rise or a crisis such as the scandal involving the falsification of testing data, the committee may also refer the issue to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, so that the City's elected leaders are empowered to make a well-informed response on behalf of the City.

Routinely Look for What is Missing from the Documents

It should not be forgotten that the issue of groundwater rising with sea level rise is not discussed in the cleanup documents. The committee should periodically undertake exercises to apply its members' expertise and knowledge of San Francisco to spot important issues the signatories overlooked.

The Committee's Members

The Jury sees the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee as a vehicle to give City departments that are currently disengaged from the cleanup a responsibility to pay attention. As such, the Jury believes that the committee should be composed mostly or entirely of representatives from relevant City departments. As a starting point, the Jury suggests:

- Departments that employ people with expertise relevant to the cleanup, broadly defined
- Departments whose responsibilities in the Shipyard, even decades in the future, will be affected by the presence of contaminants in the soil and groundwater

To this end, the Jury named the Department of Public Works and the Public Utilities Commission in the recommendation as departments that clearly meet both criteria. The Jury also named the Office of the Controller as a center of excellence for impartial oversight in the City. Other departments the Board might consider include:

- The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
- The Port
- The Planning Department
- The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
- The Department of the Environment
- The Department of Public Health, not limited to the Shipyard Program

An Upcoming Milestone and the Need for Urgency

Five-Year Reviews are important milestones in the Superfund process calendar, when the signatories re-examine the continued suitability of cleanup actions that were decided upon in the past. As it is a time of reflection and discussion for the signatories, this is probably the best window of opportunity for the City to engage with them. It is certainly the best opportunity to persuade the signatories to consider the impact of groundwater rise on their remedial actions in the Shipyard.

The scheduled date given to the Jury for the draft version of the Fifth Five-Year Review is April 18th, 2023, although that date may slip. The Jury strongly urges the Board of Supervisors to pass the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee ordinance and populate the committee with all due urgency, so that the Committee has time to orient itself and become familiar with the issues in time to inform its comments on the Fifth Five-Year Review draft.

Lifting the Fog

If the Jury could direct recommendations to the Navy, it would have some stern words about the importance of writing cleanup documents in plain English so they are comprehensible to any reasonably well-informed lay reader.

But whether or not the Navy does a better job, the City must address the incomprehensibility of the Superfund process so it is not an obstacle to the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee's work.

Recommendation 4:

By October 1st, 2022, the Mayor should direct the Department of Public Health to support the Cleanup Oversight Committee in its due diligence function by providing explanatory materials and briefings about cleanup governance documents and the discourse among Federal Facility Agreement signatories, as well as additional materials at the request of the Committee.

Recommendation 5:

By October 1st, 2022, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should collaborate to ensure that funding is available to generate the material specified in R4, in the Fiscal Year 22-23 budget or by October 1st, 2022, and in future budgets.

The Jury suggests that the Committee be empowered to specify to the Department of Public Health what explanatory materials it requires to support its due diligence work. These materials would benefit not only the Committee, but other relevant entities in the City, and interested members of the general public as well.

The Jury expects that, in practice, the briefings and materials would be generated by the environmental consultants who already work with OCII and SFDPH's Shipyard Program and routinely review cleanup governance documents. Recommendation 5 is to provide funding for this work.

Tracking Progress

When the Committee makes a request of the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, what follows may not be a simple, transactional answer, but an extended process of consultation and discussion. The Shipyard Program in the Department of Public Health should represent the City in that process, and must keep the Committee updated frequently on the progress of the talks.

Recommendation 6:

From October 1st, 2022 and going forward, whenever there are outstanding questions and requests to the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, and especially during the lead-up to major cleanup document releases, a member of the management chain overseeing the Hunters Point Shipyard Program in the Department of Public Health should appear before the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee at regular intervals to report on discussions with the Federal Facility Agreement signatories.

Closing the Loop

If the Jury's recommendations are adopted, soon after the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee convenes, a detailed study of the groundwater in the Shipyard under different sea level rise scenarios will fall into its inbox. The Committee should study and evaluate this material, and prepare a statement about what it wants the signatories to consider and respond to. It should share that statement with the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and the Department of Public Health, to ensure that the Federal Facility Agreement signatories receive this analysis with the unified moral authority of the City and County of San Francisco behind it.

Recommendation 7:

By March 1st, 2023, the Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee should prepare a report on its recommended requests for the Federal Facility Agreement signatories based on the groundwater study recommended in R1, and deliver that report to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Department of Public Health.

As noted above, the best venue in the Superfund process to address important new information is the Five-Year Review, and the scheduled date for the next draft Review is April 18th, 2023. If that schedule holds, there will be a short time to move forward with both the groundwater rise study and the Committee, and to socialize the City's concerns about groundwater rise with the signatories ahead of comments on the Review.

The Jury encourages those City departments who are members of the Committee and have experience with groundwater rise to communicate their own knowledge of the issue to other Committee members as soon as possible, so that the Committee as a whole has a shared understanding of groundwater rise, and is prepared to evaluate the study's maps.

The Jury encourages the Department of Public Health to begin communicating with the signatories as soon as the groundwater rise study is commissioned, to create the most receptive atmosphere possible for the results.

CONCLUSION

In the early part of this century, there was little anticipation of how much could go wrong at the Hunters Point Shipyard. No one imagined that the low-lying, more polluted parcels would still be unready for transfer to the City in 2022. No one thought the City would need to be so vigilant in the cleanup process for so long, or that the City would need to put in place a mechanism to ensure such vigilance.

In the course of the Jury's investigation, we did not identify any City department that was failing to perform the tasks expected of it with regard to the cleanup. But thirty years in, it is clear that those expectations are much too low. Plans have gone terribly awry; serious new issues have been overlooked, and far too few people have been paying attention. As the cleanup continues for another decade or more, more things will go wrong, more mistakes will be made, and the situation will keep changing.

The Jury began this investigation by looking at the risks that rising groundwater poses in the Shipyard. Rising groundwater should be the first issue the awakened City successfully takes to the Federal Facility Agreement signatories for action.

It should not be the last. The next time something goes wrong, the next time something is overlooked, the City must be prepared to engage fully—for the sake of those who live in Bayview Hunters Point today, and for all the individuals and families who will live in the Shipyard over the next century.

METHODOLOGY

The Jury's research included extensive reading on the Hunters Point Shipyard. All our sources are cited in the report footnotes. See also Appendix E, for a guide to cleanup documentation, and Appendix F, for an outline of the Superfund legal framework governing the cleanup.

The Jury conducted interviews with current and former representatives of the Federal Facilities Agreement signatories, the Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, and relevant departments in the City and County of San Francisco.

The Jury conducted interviews with representatives of community and non-profit groups; see Appendix D for a list of groups involved in the debate.

The Jury did extensive research on the emerging science of groundwater rise. All our sources are cited in the footnotes. See also Appendix A for additional general-audience reports, Appendix B for additional scientific papers, and Appendix C for municipal and Bay Area regional plans that address groundwater rise.

The Jury interviewed leading scientists and researchers in the field, and attended a two-day regional conference on the science and implications of sea level rise around the Bay, including groundwater rise.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

F1: In the Hunters Point Shipyard, shallow groundwater rising with sea level rise and residual hazardous substances pose serious but poorly understood risks that should concern the City and County of San Francisco, the Navy, future developers, future property owners, and future residents.

F2: The Federal Facility Agreement signatories have neglected to investigate how groundwater rise may lessen the effectiveness of the Navy's cleanup at the Hunters Point Shipyard Superfund site.

F3: The process governing the cleanup at the Shipyard encompasses decisions and value judgments that matter to all San Franciscans, but the extremely technical nature of the process inhibits City leaders and citizens alike from understanding it, or even knowing what is at stake.

F4: Despite the enormous stakes of the process governing the Shipyard cleanup, there is little understanding of the process throughout the City, or even that the City can influence this process.

F5: The City and County of San Francisco is poorly prepared to discover new information pertinent to the Shipyard cleanup, to proactively look for risks and problems overlooked or under-prioritized by the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, or to develop responses to new information or problems..

F6: No proactive mechanism exists for the City and County of San Francisco to articulate its interests and concerns about the cleanup for the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, nor does a mechanism exist for the City to monitor progress towards obtaining satisfactory responses to such interests and concerns from the signatories.

Recommendations

R1: By September 1st, 2022, the Mayor and/or the City Administrator should direct the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, in collaboration with the Department of Public Health, to commission and manage an independent, third-party study of Hunters Point Shipyard to predict the future shallow groundwater surface, groundwater flows, and potential interactions of groundwater with hazardous materials and planned modifications to the site under multiple sea level rise scenarios. (F1)

R2: The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should collaborate to provide funding for the study recommended in R1, in the Fiscal Year 22-23 budget, or by October 1st, 2022. (F1)

R3: By October 1st, 2022, the Board of Supervisors should pass an ordinance to create a permanent Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee that includes the Controller or their designee, relevant technical experts from the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Public Works, and representatives from other relevant City departments, to perform due diligence on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco into the Federal Facility Agreement signatories' decision-making, and to prepare an agenda of questions and requests to be communicated to the signatories by the Department of Public Health in advance of major cleanup document releases. (F4, F5, F6)

R4: By October 1st, 2022, the Mayor should direct the Department of Public Health to support the Cleanup Oversight Committee in its due diligence function by providing explanatory materials and briefings about cleanup governance documents and the discourse among Federal Facility Agreement signatories, as well as additional materials at the request of the Committee. (F3)

R5: By October 1st, 2022, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should collaborate to ensure that funding is available to generate the material specified in R4, in the Fiscal Year 22-23 budget or by October 1st, 2022, and in future budgets. (F3)

R6: From October 1st, 2022 and going forward, whenever there are outstanding questions and requests to the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, and especially during the lead-up to major cleanup document releases, a member of the management chain overseeing the Hunters Point Shipyard Program in the Department of Public Health should appear before the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee at regular intervals to report on discussions with the Federal Facility Agreement signatories. (F6)

R7: By March 1st, 2023, the Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee should prepare a report on its recommended requests for the Federal Facility Agreement signatories based on the groundwater study recommended in R1, and deliver that report to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Department of Public Health. (F2)

REQUIRED AND INVITED RESPONSES

Required Responses

Pursuant to California Penal Code §933 and §933.05, the Jury requests responses to the following Findings and Recommendations from these City institutions.

From the Office of the Mayor within 60 days:

F1, F2, F3, F4, F5
R1, R2, R4, R5, R6, R7

From the San Francisco Board of Supervisors within 90 days:

F4, F5, F6
R2, R3, R7

Invited Responses

The Jury requests responses to the following Recommendations from these City departments within 60 days.

From the Office of the City Administrator: R1

From the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning: R1

From the Department of Public Health: R4, R6

Appendix A: General Audience Media

A selection of additional recent reporting on groundwater rise and its consequences, written for a general audience

Alameda Sun, "City Leading Bay Area in Studying Impacts of Sea Level Rise Locally," December 3, 2020

Hershey, Cole, "The Coming Tide: North Bay Cities Grapple With Sea Level Rise," *Pacific Sun,* March 16, 2021

Hill, Kristina, "Groundwater and Sea Level Rise," PowerPoint presentation, November 2019

Klivens, Laura, "Groundwater Beneath Your Feet Is Rising With the Sea. It Could Bring Long-Buried Toxic Contamination With It;" *KQED,* December 15,2020

Klivens, Laura, "Near Coasts, Rising Seas Could Also Push Up Long-Buried Toxic Contamination," *NPR Morning Edition,* February 8, 2021

Pierre-Louis, Kendra,"How rising groundwater caused by climate change could devastate coastal communities," *MIT Technology Review,* December 13, 2021

Romero, Ezra David, "How Rising Sea Levels Could Push Up a 'Toxic Soup' Into Bay Area Neighborhoods," *KQED,* April 8, 2022

Stock, Stephen, Robert Campos, Mark Villareal, and Michael Horn, "Toxins Long Buried May Surface as Groundwater Rises," *NBC Bay Area,* November 4, 2021

Tada, Grace Mitchell, "The Sea Beneath Us," *Bay Nature Magazine,* Spring 2019

Tada, Grace Mitchell, "The Rising Tide Underfoot," *Hakai Magazine,* November 17, 2020

Wisckol, Martin, "Why Groundwater Flooding is Becoming a Threat to Coastal Cities as Sea Levels Rise," *Orange County Register,* September 16, 2021

Xia, Rosanna, "Some California Cities Think They're Safe from Sea Level Rise. They're Not, New Data Shows,"*Los Angeles Times,* August 17,2020

Appendix B: Scientific Papers

A selection of additional scientific papers on groundwater rise with sea-level rise, and on groundwater rise in contaminated sites

Barnard, Patrick, "USGS Coastal Storm Modeling System (CoSMoS) Groundwater Mapping," Pacific Coastal and Marine Science Center, August 18, 2020

Bjerklie, David, John R. Mullaney, Janet Radway Stone, Brian J. Skinner, and Matthew A. Ramlow, "Preliminary investigation of the effects of sea-level rise on groundwater levels in New Haven, Connecticut," United States Geological Survey, 2012

Carter, Jacob, Casey Kalman, "A Toxic Relationship: Extreme Coastal Flooding and Superfund Sites," *Union of Concerned Scientists*, July 28, 2020

Habel, Shellie, Charles Fletcher, Tiffany Anderson, and Philip Thompson, "Sea-Level Rise Induced Multi-Mechanism Flooding and Contribution to Urban Infrastructure Failure," *Scientific Reports 10,* March 2020

May, Christine, "Coastal Hydrology: Rising Groundwater and Sea-Level Rise," *Nature Climate Change,Vol. 10, October 2020, pp 889-891*

Plane, Ellen, Kristina Hill, and Christine May, "A Rapid Assessment Method to Identify Potential Groundwater Flooding Hotspots as Sea Levels Rise in Coastal Cities" *Water* 11, no. 11, May 2019

Rodriguez, Ozzy, "Adapting Superfund Remedial Plans for Climate Change," Environmental Law Program, Harvard Law School, March 12, 2021

Rotzoll, Kolja, Charles H. Fletcher, "Assessment of groundwater inundation as a consequence of sea-level rise," *Nature Climate Change*, 2012

Appendix C: Municipal and Regional Planning for Groundwater Rise

A selection of city, state and regional reports and planning documents addressing groundwater rise

Adapting to Rising Tides, "Contaminated Lands," *San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission,* 2021

Bay Area Council, "California Resilience Challenge Spotlight: Keeping the Groundwater at Bay," July 31, 2020

California Coastal Commission, "Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Planning Guidance for California's Coastal Zone," August 2021

California Legislative Analyst's Office, "What Threat Does Sea-Level Rise Pose to California," August 2020

City of Alameda, "The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise," September 2020

City of Alameda, "Climate Adaptation and Hazard Mitigation Plan," November 2021

County of San Mateo, US Geological Survey, Silvestrum, and SF Bay Conservation and Development Commission, "Bay Area Groundwater and Sea level Rise Workshop Summary," November 13, 2019

2019-2020 Marin County Civil Grand Jury, "Climate Change: How Will Marin Adapt?", September 11, 2020

SeaChange San Mateo County, Office of Sustainability "Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment," March 2018

SeaChange San Mateo County, "The Shallow Groundwater Layer and Sea Level Rise: Description of Approaches," November 2019

Segura, Martin, "Sea Level Rise and Chemical Contamination," Department of Health Hazard Evaluation and Emergency Response, State of Hawaii, May 20, 2021

Appendix D: Community and Environmental Advocacy Groups

A selection of groups active in the debate over the Hunters Point Shipyard

Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates; archives at UCSF Industry Documents Collection

Committee to Bridge the Gap

Greenaction

Marie Harrison Community Foundation

Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility

Southeast Alliance for Environmental Justice (1995-2001)

Appendix E: Cleanup Documentation

A guide to documents about the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard cleanup

List of Hunters Point Entries in EnviroStor
EnviroStor is the California Department of Toxic Substance Control's online data management system for tracking cleanup, permitting, enforcement, and investigation efforts at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known or suspected contamination issues. For any parcel entry, click "**Site/Facility Docs"** to see the list of documents about that parcel.
The documents below can help illuminate key points in the process for Hunters Point.

Parcel B
US Navy, "Final Amended Record of Decision, Parcel B," January 14, 2009

Parcel C
US Navy, "Final Record of Decision for Parcel C," September 30, 2010

Parcel D-1
US Navy, "Final Record of Decision for Parcels D-1 and UC-1," July 24, 2009

Parcel E
US Navy, "Final Record of Decision for Parcel E," December 2013
ROD for non-landfill areas
US Navy, "Final Record of Decision for Parcel E-2," November 2012
ROD for landfill areas

Parcel G
As described in page 21 of this report, Parcel G's original Record of Decision was modified so that almost all the parcel could be deemed suitable for residential development.

US Navy, "Final Record of Decision for Parcel G," February 18, 2009
Explains "durable cover," and states that ubiquitous metals and contaminants are to be left in place; places restrictions on residential use

Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, "Feasibility Assessment for Evaluating Areas with Residential Land Use Restrictions, Parcel G," Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment,November 30, 2016
Analysis proposing changes to allow residential use in most of Parcel G

US Navy, "Explanation of Significant Differences for the Final Record of Decision for Parcel G,"April 18, 2017

US Navy, "Final Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan, " June, 2019
Radiological retesting plan for Parcel G

US Navy, "Final Fourth Five-Year Review," July 2019

Appendix F: Superfund Legal Framework

Following the environmental disaster at Love Canal in the 1970s,[70] lawmakers in the United States decided that reforms at the federal level were needed to address the most contaminated sites in the country. While existing legislation enabled the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to manage chemical substances, there was an unmet need for accountability and the regulation of waste sites. In 1980, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, (CERCLA) known as the Superfund program, to establish liability at toxic waste sites and create a framework for cleaning up contamination.

CERCLA introduced financial deterrents to polluters through establishing strict liability for contamination—whether it occurred prior to or after the 1980 legislation— in cases where hazardous waste has been or will be released and costs will be incurred. Such costs include cleanup expenses, health screenings, damage to natural resources, and costs related to the investigation and remediation of polluted areas.

In the case of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS,) a site owned and operated by the federal government during and after the release of hazardous waste, liability is outlined by Section 120 of CERCLA. Section 120 states that federal agencies are subject to Superfund liability and must comply with all outlined requirements at their sites, including preliminary assessment, site investigation, remedial investigation, feasibility studies, records of decision, remedial design, remedial actions, community engagement, and long-term operation and maintenance. [71]

HPNS was deactivated as a Naval facility in 1974. Hazardous chemicals, along with radioactive contamination, were identified at HPNS in 1986, and the EPA placed the site on the National Priorities List (making it a Superfund site) in 1989.[72] In 1992, a Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) was signed by the Navy and regulators: EPA, California's Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC,) and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board.)[73]

The Federal Facilities Agreement establishes the Navy's responsibility for the Shipyard's cleanup, and provides a framework in which signatories will certify the Navy's compliance with

[70] Environmental Protection Agency, "Superfund: CERCLA Overview," updated February 4, 2022
[71] Environmental Protection Agency, "Federal Facilities-Military Base Closures; Application of CERCLA Section 120"
[72] US Environmental Protection Agency, "National Priorities List Sites"
[73] US Navy, "Federal Facility Agreement for Naval Station Treasure Island, Hunters Point Annex," January 1992

federal and California law. The FFA, in principle, ensures that past and present contamination at HPNS will be investigated and action will be taken to "protect the public health, welfare and the environment" in each of the Shipyard's parcels. The Navy will undertake and pay for all testing, feasibility studies and remediation actions at HPNS, in accordance with applicable regulations. The FFA requires all work to be performed under the supervision of a qualified professional engineer, a certified engineering geologist, or a registered geologist with hazardous waste cleanup expertise. All the Navy's documents related to the HPNS cleanup are subject to review and comment by the EPA, DTSC and the Water Board.

Appendix G: Hunters Point Shipyard Litigation

A selection of litigation related to the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard

In 2018, two supervisors of the radiation control technicians working for Tetra Tech EC, Inc. at the Shipyard pled guilty to falsifying remediation records, and were sentenced to eight months in prison. Several related cases, and other lawsuits connected to the Shipyard, remain in litigation.

Case: *United States of America v. Tetra Tech EC, Inc.*
Filed: August 19, 2013
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of the United States of America, alleging that Tetra Tech EC, Inc. acted negligently in its oversight of testing specialists, who did not have adequate qualifications and did not meet requirements for radiological testing practices. The suit alleges that Tetra Tech EC, Inc. defrauded the government by certifying that minimum standards and procedures for nuclear remediation services were met as part of its contractual obligations.
These are allegations; the case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: *United States ex rel. Jahr, et al. v. Tetra Tech, EC, Inc., et al., United States ex rel. Smith v. Tetra Tech EC, Inc., et al., and United States ex rel. Wadsworth v. Tetra Tech EC, Inc.*
Filed: October 26, 2018
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

This is a group of consolidated whistleblower cases brought on behalf of the United States of America, under the *qui tam* provisions of the False Claims Act, alleging that Tetra Tech EC, Inc. misrepresented the source of soil samples from Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard and falsified results of radiological surveys conducted at the site.
These are allegations; the case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: *Bayview Hunters Point Residents et al v. Tetra Tech EC, Inc. et al*
Filed: March 18, 2019
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of residents of Bayview Hunters Point, alleging that Tetra Tech EC, Inc. acted negligently in its radiological testing practices and falsified results, putting residents relying on accurate representation in harm's way. The case also names Lennar/Five Point Holdings, the developer at Hunters Point Shipyard.
These are allegations; the case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: *Pennington, et.al v. Tetra Tech, Inc.; Tetra Tech Ec, Inc.; Lennar Corporation; Hps1 Block 50 Llc; Hps1 Block 51 Llc; Hps1 Block 53 Llc; Hps1 Block 54 Llc; Hps1 Block 56/57 Llc; Hps Development Co.; Five Point Holdings, Llc; Bill Dougherty; Andrew Bolt; Emile Haddad; And Does 1-100, Motion for Preliminary Approval of Pennington Plainfiffs' Class Settlement with Homebuilder Defendants*
Filed: August 14, 2020
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

This motion for settlement grew out of an initial lawsuit from 2018 against Lennar, Five Point Holdings, and Tetra Tech EC, Inc., et al. by four homeowners in Parcel A, which grew to include 662 plaintiffs in 347 condominium and townhouse units at the Shipyard.
The $6.3 million settlement agreement between FivePoint Holdings and homeowners was approved in April 2022. Tetra Tech EC, Inc. denied any wrongdoing, and is not part of the settlement.

Case: *Five Point Holdings, LLC et al v. Tetra Tech, Inc. et al*
Filed: February 27, 2020
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of the developers building a mixed-use community at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, on land (Parcel A,) which had been remediated by the Navy and then transferred to the City of San Francisco. The case alleges negligent testing practices and fraud to cover them up by Tetra Tech EC, Inc. resulted in economic damage and delay for the developer's planned use of the site.
These are allegations; the case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: *Abbey v. United States of America, Department of the Navy*
Filed: September 14, 2020
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of officers and employees of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) alleging that the Navy acted negligently in not accurately disclosing the degree of radioactive and hazardous substances present at Building 606 in the Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard site. The suit alleges that the Navy represented Building 606 as safe for use, and that hundreds of SFPD employees worked there from 1997 to the present, incurring harm.
These are allegations; the case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: *Tetra Tech EC, Inc. et al v. United States Environmental Protection Agency et al*
Filed: November 17, 2020
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of Tetra Tech EC, Inc., alleging that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency acted unlawfully in its declaration of the Final Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan for the Former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (June 2019.) The case alleges that no explanation for the change was articulated to Tetra Tech EC, Inc., the declaration relied on unproven allegations, and contrary evidence was not considered at time of declaration.
These are allegations; the case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: *Mothers Against Toxic Housing, Inc. et al v. United States Environmental Protection Agency et al*
Filed: August 3, 2021
Court: Contra Costa County Superior Court

Brought on behalf of a group of community organizations alleging that the City of Richmond violated California environmental standards when approving the Campus Bay Project mixed-use development plan, and ignored scientific data about rising sea levels.
These are allegations; the case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

From:	Gee, Natalie (BOS)
To:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Cc:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislation, (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides; BOS-Operations; BOS-IT; PEARSON, ANNE (CAT); BOS-Budget Analyst; Paulino, Tom (MYR); Rosenfield, Ben (CON); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	Re: Presidential Memo: Special BOS Meeting on Wed 6/22 - Revision #2
Date:	Thursday, June 16, 2022 11:27:11 AM
Attachments:	Presidential Memo - Special Meeting - Wed June 22 2022.pdf

Good morning Madam Clerk,

Please see President Walton's revised memo on the Special Board of Supervirsors Meeting for June 22, 2022 at 10:00am.

General public comment is removed as both items will have an opportunity for the public to comment due to the Special Meeting.

Thank you,
Natalie

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282
Direct: 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670

From: Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 at 7:00 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>, BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>, BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>, BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>, BOS-IT <BOS-IT@sfgov.org>, PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org>, BOS-Budget Analyst <bos-budget_analyst@sfgov.org>, Paulino, Tom (MYR) <tom.paulino@sfgov.org>, Rosenfield, Ben (CON) <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>, Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Presidential Memo: Special BOS Meeting on Wed 6/22 - Revised

Dear Madam Clerk,

Attached is President Walton's revised memo calling for a Special Board of Supervisors Meeting on Wednesday, June 22, 2022, at 10:00am.

The remote Special Board of Supervisors Meeting shall include the following matters:

- **File No. 220696:** Memorandum of Understanding – Service Employees International Union, Local 1021: Staff & Per Diem Nurses
- **General Public Comment**

- **For Adoption Without Committee Reference**
    - **File No. 220738:** Disapproval of Mills Act Historical Property Contract - 714 Steiner Street

Thank you and your staff for going above and beyond to honor our meeting requests.

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282
Direct: 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670

President, Board of Supervisors
District 10

City and County of San Francisco

SHAMANN WALTON

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2022

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: President Shamann Walton

CC: Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors
Board Legislative Aides
Anne Pearson, Office of the City Attorney
Budget Legislative Analyst's Office
Mayor's Office
Controller's Office

SUBJECT: Special Board of Supervisors Meeting – Wednesday, June 22, 2022 *Revision #2

Dear Madam Clerk,

On Monday, June 13, 2022, the Board of Supervisors Rules Committee voted to send File No. 220696 **(**Memorandum of Understanding - Service Employees International Union, Local 1021: Staff & Per Diem Nurses) to the full Board of Supervisors meeting.

On Tuesday, June 14, 2022, Supervisor Peskin introduced an urgent Resolution on the Disapproval of Mills Act Historical Property Contract - 714 Steiner Street, referred for immediate adoption without committee reference.

In conference with my Board colleagues, I am calling for a Special Board of Supervisors' meeting to take place on Wednesday, June 22, 2022, at 10:00am to consider the urgent actions on File No. 220696 and File No. 220738.

The remote Special Board of Supervisors Meeting shall include the following matters:

- **File No. 220696:** Memorandum of Understanding – Service Employees International Union, Local 1021: Staff & Per Diem Nurses
- **File No. 220738:** Disapproval of Mills Act Historical Property Contract - 714 Steiner Street

On behalf of the entire Board, I want to extend my deepest gratitude and appreciation for you and your hard-working staff. We are always appreciative of the Clerk's staff ability to go above and beyond to meet requests during a very demanding time. Thank you.

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

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	FW: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for May 2022
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 4:57:00 PM
Attachments:	CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for May 2022.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached the Investment Report for the month of May 2022, provided by the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector.

Sincerely,

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

From: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 10:37 AM
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for May 2022

All-

Please find the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of May attached for your use.

Regards,

Ichieh Dion
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 140
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-554-5433

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco

Tajel Shah, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Hubert R White, III CFA, CTP, Chief Investment Officer

José Cisneros, Treasurer

Investment Report for the month of May 2022

June 15, 2022

The Honorable London N. Breed
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Franicsco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of May 31, 2022. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of May 2022 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics *

	Current Month		Prior Month	
(in $ million)	Fiscal YTD	May 2022	Fiscal YTD	April 2022
Average Daily Balance	$ 13,518	$ 14,875	$ 13,380	$ 14,723
Net Earnings	70.42	9.85	60.57	8.44
Earned Income Yield	0.57%	0.78%	0.54%	0.70%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

(in $ million) Investment Type	% of Portfolio	Book Value	Market Value	Wtd. Avg. Coupon	Wtd. Avg. YTM	WAM
U.S. Treasuries	32.06%	$ 4,934.8	$ 4,727.9	0.81%	0.72%	826
Federal Agencies	30.49%	4,642.2	4,496.6	0.99%	0.97%	825
Public Time Deposits	0.27%	40.0	40.0	0.48%	0.48%	62
Negotiable CDs	15.64%	2,310.0	2,306.0	0.97%	0.97%	135
Commercial Paper	6.03%	887.8	888.8	0.00%	0.59%	43
Money Market Funds	11.62%	1,714.3	1,714.3	0.64%	0.64%	1
Supranationals	3.89%	596.2	574.1	0.45%	0.80%	704
Totals	100.0%	$ 15,125.3	$ 14,747.7	0.84%	0.82%	568

In the remainder of this report, we provide additional information and analytics at the security-level and portfolio-level, as recommended by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission.

Respectfully,



José Cisneros
Treasurer

cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Aimee Brown, Kevin Kone, Brenda Kwee McNulty, Meghan Wallace
Ben Rosenfield - Controller, Office of the Controller
Mark de la Rosa - Director of Audits, Office of the Controller
Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Francisco Public Library
San Francisco Health Service System

Portfolio Summary
Pooled Fund

As of May 31, 2022

(in $ million) Security Type	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value	Market/Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	$ 4,925.0	$ 4,934.8	$ 4,727.9	95.81	32.06%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	4,639.0	4,642.2	4,496.6	96.86	30.49%	100%	Yes
State & Local Government Agency Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	40.0	40.0	40.0	100.00	0.27%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	2,310.0	2,310.0	2,306.0	99.83	15.64%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	890.0	887.8	888.8	-	6.03%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	-	-	-	-	0.00%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds - Government	1,714.3	1,714.3	1,714.3	100.00	11.62%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	588.5	596.2	574.1	96.30	3.89%	30%	Yes
TOTAL	**$ 15,106.8**	**$ 15,125.3**	**$ 14,747.7**	**97.50**	**100.00%**	**-**	**Yes**

The City and County of San Francisco uses the following methodology to determine compliance: Compliance is pre-trade and calculated on a par value basis of the overall portfolio value. Cash balances are included in the City's compliance calculations.

Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution.
The full Investment Policy can be found at https://sftreasurer.org/banking-investments/investments

Totals may not add due to rounding.

City and County of San Francisco
Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics

For the month ended May 31, 2022

Average Daily Balance	$14,874,689,626
Net Earnings	$9,850,549
Earned Income Yield	0.78%
Weighted Average Maturity	568 days

Investment Type	*($ million)*	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries		$ 4,925.0	$ 4,934.8	$ 4,727.9
Federal Agencies		4,639.0	4,642.2	4,496.6
Public Time Deposits		40.0	40.0	40.0
Negotiable CDs		2,310.0	2,310.0	2,306.0
Commercial Paper		890.0	887.8	888.8
Money Market Funds		1,714.3	1,714.3	1,714.3
Supranationals		588.5	596.2	574.1
Total		**$ 15,106.8**	**$ 15,125.3**	**$ 14,747.7**



Asset Allocation by Market Value

Portfolio Analysis
Pooled Fund





Yield Curves



Source: Bloomberg



	4/29/22	5/31/22	Change
3 Month	0.823	1.039	0.2163
6 Month	1.396	1.555	0.1594
1 Year	2.058	2.050	-0.0080
2 Year	2.715	2.557	-0.1581
3 Year	2.886	2.725	-0.1611
5 Year	2.955	2.817	-0.1376

Source: Bloomberg

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

As of May 31, 2022

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	9128286Y1	US TREASURY	4/8/2021	6/15/2022	1.75	$ 50,000,000	$ 50,990,240	$ 50,032,017	$ 50,019,000
U.S. Treasuries	9128286Y1	US TREASURY	4/28/2021	6/15/2022	1.75	50,000,000	50,937,500	50,031,780	50,019,000
U.S. Treasuries	912796W39	TREASURY BILL	3/1/2022	6/28/2022	0.00	25,000,000	24,960,333	24,991,000	24,986,575
U.S. Treasuries	912828XW5	US TREASURY	8/15/2017	6/30/2022	1.75	25,000,000	24,977,539	24,999,634	25,017,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	3/12/2021	6/30/2022	0.13	50,000,000	50,011,719	50,000,715	49,969,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	3/31/2021	6/30/2022	0.13	50,000,000	50,021,484	50,001,366	49,969,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	4/8/2021	6/30/2022	0.13	50,000,000	50,025,391	50,001,644	49,969,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	4/15/2021	6/30/2022	0.13	50,000,000	50,019,531	50,001,284	49,969,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	4/16/2021	6/30/2022	0.13	50,000,000	50,019,531	50,001,287	49,969,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	4/19/2021	6/30/2022	0.13	50,000,000	50,019,531	50,001,296	49,969,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828YA2	US TREASURY	3/30/2021	8/15/2022	1.50	100,000,000	101,933,594	100,288,309	100,078,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAG6	US TREASURY	3/30/2021	8/31/2022	0.13	50,000,000	50,019,531	50,003,425	49,874,500
U.S. Treasuries	912796U56	TREASURY BILL	3/29/2022	9/22/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,759,821	49,846,665	49,814,950
U.S. Treasuries	912796U64	TREASURY BILL	3/31/2022	9/29/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,734,584	49,825,000	49,785,850
U.S. Treasuries	912796M89	TREASURY BILL	4/7/2022	10/6/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,719,417	49,804,208	49,772,650
U.S. Treasuries	912796V63	TREASURY BILL	4/21/2022	10/20/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,684,028	49,755,209	49,741,350
U.S. Treasuries	912828TY6	US TREASURY	4/8/2021	11/15/2022	1.63	50,000,000	51,201,172	50,342,313	50,025,500
U.S. Treasuries	912796P94	TREASURY BILL	12/13/2021	12/1/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,878,019	49,936,763	49,602,650
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z86	US TREASURY	8/17/2021	2/15/2023	1.38	50,000,000	50,923,828	50,437,425	49,824,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z86	US TREASURY	3/3/2022	2/15/2023	1.38	50,000,000	50,196,402	50,123,204	49,824,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZD5	US TREASURY	3/18/2021	3/15/2023	0.50	50,000,000	50,335,938	50,132,619	49,445,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBU4	US TREASURY	5/4/2021	3/31/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,972,656	49,988,096	49,236,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	US TREASURY	3/12/2021	6/15/2023	0.25	50,000,000	50,066,406	50,030,507	49,027,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	US TREASURY	4/8/2021	6/15/2023	0.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,034,322	49,027,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	US TREASURY	6/24/2021	6/15/2023	0.25	50,000,000	49,998,047	49,998,973	49,027,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828S35	US TREASURY	1/9/2020	6/30/2023	1.38	50,000,000	49,605,469	49,877,409	49,576,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828S35	US TREASURY	6/24/2021	6/30/2023	1.38	50,000,000	51,138,672	50,609,561	49,576,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCK5	US TREASURY	6/30/2021	6/30/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,865,234	49,927,263	48,910,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828S92	US TREASURY	4/1/2021	7/31/2023	1.25	50,000,000	51,220,703	50,609,634	49,445,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828S92	US TREASURY	4/1/2021	7/31/2023	1.25	50,000,000	51,218,750	50,608,659	49,445,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAK7	US TREASURY	8/10/2021	9/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,886,719	49,930,345	48,666,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828WE6	US TREASURY	12/17/2019	11/15/2023	2.75	50,000,000	51,960,938	50,730,034	50,310,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	US TREASURY	3/19/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,767,578	49,869,509	48,334,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	US TREASURY	12/9/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,402,344	49,543,637	48,334,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	US TREASURY	12/15/2021	12/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,443,359	49,571,463	48,334,000
U.S. Treasuries	9128285Z9	US TREASURY	10/4/2021	1/31/2024	2.50	50,000,000	52,511,719	51,801,692	50,060,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	US TREASURY	2/23/2022	1/31/2024	0.88	50,000,000	49,418,422	49,475,093	48,750,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	US TREASURY	4/11/2022	1/31/2024	0.88	50,000,000	48,690,068	48,713,228	48,750,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828B66	US TREASURY	4/11/2022	2/15/2024	2.75	50,000,000	50,458,909	50,231,111	50,267,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBR1	US TREASURY	3/8/2022	3/15/2024	0.25	50,000,000	48,708,984	48,857,679	48,088,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCC3	US TREASURY	7/2/2021	5/15/2024	0.25	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,808,385	47,857,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828XT2	US TREASURY	7/6/2021	5/31/2024	2.00	50,000,000	52,263,672	51,558,944	49,500,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	US TREASURY	8/6/2021	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,998,047	49,998,591	47,761,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	US TREASURY	8/9/2021	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,960,938	49,971,733	47,761,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	US TREASURY	4/12/2022	7/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	47,617,328	47,719,401	47,761,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828Y87	US TREASURY	3/30/2021	7/31/2024	1.75	50,000,000	52,210,938	51,434,661	49,150,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCT6	US TREASURY	8/25/2021	8/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,898,438	49,924,623	47,644,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	912828YM6	US TREASURY	4/15/2021	10/31/2024	1.50	50,000,000	51,746,094	51,190,580	48,678,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	US TREASURY	3/9/2021	11/15/2024	2.25	50,000,000	53,160,156	52,106,771	49,506,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	US TREASURY	3/12/2021	11/15/2024	2.25	50,000,000	53,228,516	52,157,148	49,506,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828YY0	US TREASURY	3/15/2021	12/31/2024	1.75	50,000,000	52,226,563	51,515,411	48,853,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	US TREASURY	3/30/2021	1/31/2025	1.38	50,000,000	51,515,625	51,053,268	48,318,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	US TREASURY	4/15/2021	1/31/2025	1.38	50,000,000	51,507,813	51,059,926	48,318,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	US TREASURY	3/15/2021	2/28/2025	1.13	50,000,000	51,011,719	50,701,766	47,937,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	US TREASURY	3/31/2021	2/28/2025	1.13	50,000,000	50,998,047	50,700,029	47,937,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	US TREASURY	4/15/2021	3/31/2025	0.50	50,000,000	49,779,297	49,842,180	46,996,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	US TREASURY	4/19/2021	3/31/2025	0.50	50,000,000	49,839,844	49,885,158	46,996,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZL7	US TREASURY	5/18/2021	4/30/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,615,234	49,716,292	46,720,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828XB1	US TREASURY	9/2/2021	5/15/2025	2.13	50,000,000	52,849,609	52,275,891	49,164,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	3/8/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,140,625	49,386,161	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	3/9/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,042,969	49,315,972	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	5/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,281,250	49,464,507	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	5/13/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,183,594	49,391,347	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	5/18/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,253,906	49,441,918	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	7/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,310,547	49,464,710	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	8/5/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,500,000	49,605,263	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	8/6/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,406,250	49,530,921	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	12/7/2021	6/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	48,628,906	48,814,389	46,332,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	US TREASURY	8/5/2021	7/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,458,984	49,570,457	46,213,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	US TREASURY	8/6/2021	7/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,363,281	49,494,126	46,213,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	US TREASURY	5/12/2021	9/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,109,375	49,323,414	46,004,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	US TREASURY	7/26/2021	9/30/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,281,250	49,427,165	46,004,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	US TREASURY	2/25/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,298,828	49,487,968	45,908,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	US TREASURY	3/2/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,078,125	49,324,824	45,908,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	US TREASURY	3/4/2021	10/31/2025	0.25	50,000,000	49,048,828	49,302,548	45,908,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	US TREASURY	2/25/2021	12/31/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,455,078	49,597,004	45,894,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	US TREASURY	2/26/2021	12/31/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,271,484	49,460,923	45,894,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	US TREASURY	6/28/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,662,109	49,726,743	46,211,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	US TREASURY	7/2/2021	4/30/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,730,469	49,781,531	46,211,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	US TREASURY	7/23/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	52,203,125	51,810,650	47,799,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	US TREASURY	8/27/2021	5/15/2026	1.63	50,000,000	51,890,625	51,585,402	47,799,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	7/2/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,931,641	49,944,158	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	7/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,070,313	50,057,818	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,345,703	50,285,531	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	7/22/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,328,125	50,271,012	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	8/6/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,406,250	50,338,352	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	8/10/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	50,240,234	50,200,532	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	9/24/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,937,500	49,946,480	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	10/14/2021	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,593,750	49,648,074	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	1/4/2022	6/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,032,178	49,115,227	46,271,500
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	US TREASURY	9/28/2021	8/31/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,524,576	45,869,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	US TREASURY	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,689,453	49,729,766	46,037,100
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	US TREASURY	10/8/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,671,875	49,714,470	46,037,100
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	US TREASURY	10/19/2021	9/30/2026	0.88	50,000,000	49,318,359	49,403,234	46,037,100
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	US TREASURY	12/3/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,072,266	50,065,130	46,693,350
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	US TREASURY	12/7/2021	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	50,117,188	50,105,849	46,693,350

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	US TREASURY	3/29/2022	11/30/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,078,125	47,187,674	46,693,350
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	US TREASURY	3/29/2022	12/31/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,259,356	47,213,938	46,623,000
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	US TREASURY	4/6/2022	3/31/2027	2.50	25,000,000	24,768,058	24,765,264	24,640,625
Subtotals					**0.81**	**$ 4,925,000,000**	**$ 4,934,832,201**	**$ 4,923,411,169**	**$ 4,727,902,500**
Federal Agencies	3133EHLY7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	6/6/2017	6/2/2022	1.88	$ 50,000,000	$ 50,059,250	$ 50,000,033	$ 50,001,500
Federal Agencies	3133EHLY7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	6/9/2017	6/2/2022	1.88	50,000,000	49,997,500	49,999,999	50,001,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMF64	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	7/7/2021	6/9/2022	0.06	58,735,000	58,723,528	58,734,728	58,727,952
Federal Agencies	3133ELDK7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/16/2019	6/15/2022	1.63	20,000,000	19,998,940	19,999,984	20,005,600
Federal Agencies	3133ELDK7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/16/2019	6/15/2022	1.63	25,000,000	24,998,676	24,999,980	25,007,000
Federal Agencies	3133ELDK7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/16/2019	6/15/2022	1.63	25,000,000	24,998,676	24,999,980	25,007,000
Federal Agencies	313385F92	FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT	5/10/2022	9/16/2022	0.00	25,000,000	24,899,667	24,916,778	24,905,000
Federal Agencies	3133EHZP1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/18/2020	9/20/2022	1.85	25,000,000	25,718,750	25,087,097	25,059,750
Federal Agencies	3133ELVL5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/3/2020	10/3/2022	0.70	40,000,000	39,990,000	39,998,642	39,936,400
Federal Agencies	3133EMS45	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	7/14/2021	12/14/2022	0.11	50,000,000	49,992,900	49,997,314	49,432,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMWK4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/18/2021	1/19/2023	0.14	60,000,000	59,987,400	59,995,216	59,449,800
Federal Agencies	3133ELJH8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/25/2020	1/23/2023	1.60	10,140,000	10,384,141	10,195,723	10,116,982
Federal Agencies	3133EMPH9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/3/2022	2/3/2023	0.13	45,500,000	45,101,055	45,204,124	44,964,010
Federal Agencies	3133827H0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3/7/2022	2/6/2023	2.14	44,400,000	44,908,503	44,717,473	44,462,160
Federal Agencies	3133ENDQ0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	11/12/2021	2/10/2023	0.16	50,000,000	49,899,789	49,944,058	49,469,944
Federal Agencies	3133EMUH3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/31/2021	3/23/2023	0.13	65,000,000	64,955,150	64,981,675	64,080,900
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/13/2021	4/13/2023	0.13	20,000,000	19,973,600	19,988,572	19,663,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/13/2021	4/13/2023	0.13	25,000,000	24,967,000	24,985,715	24,578,750
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/13/2021	4/13/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,934,000	49,971,430	49,157,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMXM9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/5/2021	4/27/2023	0.13	44,500,000	44,462,233	44,482,738	43,712,350
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/10/2021	5/10/2023	0.13	12,500,000	12,484,000	12,492,482	12,263,125
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/10/2021	5/10/2023	0.13	25,000,000	24,968,000	24,984,964	24,526,250
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/10/2021	5/10/2023	0.13	75,000,000	74,904,000	74,954,893	73,578,750
Federal Agencies	3130AMRY0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	6/4/2021	6/2/2023	0.13	15,000,000	14,986,200	14,993,062	14,697,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMF31	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	6/2/2021	6/2/2023	0.13	100,000,000	99,938,000	99,968,915	97,996,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMH96	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	6/28/2021	6/14/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,864,850	49,928,650	48,973,000
Federal Agencies	3133EM3S9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/14/2021	6/26/2023	0.20	48,067,000	47,826,184	47,898,989	47,067,687
Federal Agencies	3133EM3S9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	8/26/2021	6/26/2023	0.20	50,000,000	49,979,892	49,988,278	48,960,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMS37	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	7/14/2021	7/14/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,927,791	49,959,642	48,870,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMS37	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	7/14/2021	7/14/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,907,253	49,948,163	48,870,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENEY2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	11/24/2021	7/24/2023	0.45	50,000,000	49,996,500	49,997,590	49,060,600
Federal Agencies	3133EM2E1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	8/10/2021	8/10/2023	0.16	50,000,000	49,970,000	49,982,123	48,810,000
Federal Agencies	3137EAEV7	FREDDIE MAC	12/6/2021	8/24/2023	0.25	40,776,000	40,542,761	40,608,709	39,808,386
Federal Agencies	3130AJXD6	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	12/14/2021	9/8/2023	0.13	20,975,000	20,806,361	20,851,385	20,405,529
Federal Agencies	3135G0U43	FANNIE MAE	12/9/2021	9/12/2023	2.88	29,648,000	30,793,302	30,482,893	29,859,390
Federal Agencies	3133EM6N7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	9/27/2021	9/27/2023	0.17	50,000,000	49,950,000	49,966,918	48,672,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	25,000,000	24,963,750	24,972,713	24,298,503
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	25,000,000	24,963,750	24,972,713	24,298,503
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/3/2021	12/1/2023	0.50	75,000,000	74,891,250	74,918,139	72,895,508
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	12/10/2021	12/8/2023	2.25	10,000,000	10,302,250	10,229,471	9,964,300
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	12/10/2021	12/8/2023	2.25	30,000,000	30,906,750	30,688,413	29,892,900
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	25,000,000	24,987,600	24,990,369	24,328,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	25,000,000	24,988,000	24,990,679	24,328,000

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/20/2021	12/20/2023	0.68	62,000,000	61,970,488	61,977,078	60,333,440
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/3/2022	1/18/2024	0.90	11,856,000	11,752,153	11,754,189	11,595,308
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	2/1/2022	1/18/2024	0.90	50,000,000	49,717,250	49,751,112	48,900,593
Federal Agencies	3130AFW94	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	11/12/2021	2/13/2024	2.50	39,010,000	40,648,810	40,248,566	39,065,004
Federal Agencies	3133ELNE0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/18/2020	2/14/2024	1.43	20,495,000	20,950,604	20,693,768	20,199,872
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	5,000,000	4,998,200	4,998,956	4,816,400
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	5,000,000	4,998,200	4,998,956	4,816,400
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	2/26/2021	2/26/2024	0.25	100,000,000	99,964,000	99,979,123	96,328,000
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3/25/2022	2/28/2024	2.13	11,000,000	10,987,460	10,988,670	10,946,870
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3/25/2022	2/28/2024	2.13	25,000,000	24,971,500	24,974,249	24,879,250
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/18/2021	3/18/2024	0.30	50,000,000	49,939,500	49,963,788	48,237,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/18/2021	3/18/2024	0.30	50,000,000	49,939,450	49,963,758	48,237,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	16,545,000	16,549,633	16,547,953	15,933,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	29,424,000	29,432,239	29,429,252	28,335,606
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/4/2021	4/22/2024	0.35	39,000,000	39,010,920	39,006,961	37,557,390
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/16/2022	5/16/2024	2.63	45,000,000	44,939,250	44,940,580	45,031,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/16/2022	5/16/2024	2.63	50,000,000	49,932,500	49,933,977	50,035,000
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	5/18/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	15,955,000	16,204,674	16,007,462	16,050,092
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	5/18/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	17,980,000	18,264,958	18,042,650	18,087,161
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	5/12/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	25,500,000	25,853,926	25,551,155	25,651,980
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	5/16/2022	6/14/2024	2.88	50,000,000	50,810,944	50,199,705	50,298,000
Federal Agencies	3133EMV25	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	8/6/2021	7/23/2024	0.45	50,000,000	50,092,000	50,066,577	47,784,000
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	25,000,000	24,974,750	24,980,533	23,823,000
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	50,000,000	49,949,500	49,961,065	47,646,000
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	9/23/2021	9/23/2024	0.43	50,000,000	49,949,500	49,961,065	47,646,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	10,000,000	9,988,500	9,990,546	9,570,600
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	10,000,000	9,988,500	9,990,546	9,570,600
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	11/18/2021	11/18/2024	0.88	50,000,000	49,942,500	49,952,730	47,853,000
Federal Agencies	3133ELCP7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/3/2019	12/3/2024	1.63	25,000,000	24,960,000	24,979,945	24,400,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/9/2021	12/9/2024	0.92	50,000,000	49,985,000	49,987,381	47,931,845
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/9/2021	12/9/2024	0.92	50,000,000	49,963,000	49,968,874	47,931,845
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	20,000,000	19,955,000	19,960,816	19,270,800
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,951,020	24,088,500
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	1/11/2022	1/6/2025	1.13	25,000,000	24,943,750	24,951,020	24,088,500
Federal Agencies	3135G0X24	FANNIE MAE	4/21/2021	1/7/2025	1.63	39,060,000	40,632,556	40,162,064	38,012,020
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,997,918	4,838,750
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,997,918	4,838,750
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	5,000,000	4,996,150	4,997,918	4,838,750
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	15,000,000	14,988,450	14,993,754	14,516,250
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	2/14/2020	2/12/2025	1.50	50,000,000	49,961,500	49,979,178	48,387,500
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	4/21/2021	2/12/2025	1.50	53,532,000	55,450,052	54,891,021	51,805,593
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/23/2020	3/3/2025	1.21	16,000,000	15,990,720	15,994,831	15,345,280
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/23/2020	3/3/2025	1.21	24,000,000	23,964,240	23,980,081	23,017,920
Federal Agencies	3133EMWT5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/21/2021	4/21/2025	0.60	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,980,864	47,020,500
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FANNIE MAE	12/8/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	37,938,000	37,367,792	37,448,853	35,694,347
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FANNIE MAE	7/12/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	50,000,000	50,108,000	50,082,643	47,043,000
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FANNIE MAE	12/8/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	50,000,000	49,243,950	49,351,431	47,043,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/23/2022	5/23/2025	2.85	6,000,000	5,991,600	5,991,669	6,014,666
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5/23/2022	5/23/2025	2.85	20,000,000	19,972,000	19,972,230	20,048,887
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FANNIE MAE	12/8/2021	6/17/2025	0.50	4,655,000	4,556,640	4,570,014	4,348,142

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FANNIE MAE	12/8/2021	6/17/2025	0.50	10,000,000	9,789,600	9,818,209	9,340,800
Federal Agencies	3130AN4A5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	7/12/2021	6/30/2025	0.70	17,680,000	17,734,631	17,722,416	16,608,769
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FANNIE MAE	3/4/2021	8/25/2025	0.38	25,000,000	24,684,250	24,771,926	23,143,000
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FANNIE MAE	2/25/2021	8/25/2025	0.38	72,500,000	71,862,000	72,041,122	67,114,700
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	11/2/2021	9/12/2025	1.75	10,295,000	10,575,333	10,533,382	9,961,236
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	FREDDIE MAC	3/4/2021	9/23/2025	0.38	22,600,000	22,295,352	22,378,471	20,883,530
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	11/17/2021	11/17/2025	1.05	39,675,000	39,622,232	39,629,311	37,427,084
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	11/17/2021	11/17/2025	1.05	55,000,000	54,923,000	54,933,330	51,883,796
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/16/2021	12/16/2025	1.17	45,000,000	44,954,100	44,959,347	42,604,650
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12/16/2021	12/16/2025	1.17	50,000,000	49,949,000	49,954,830	47,338,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	8/9/2021	4/6/2026	0.69	15,500,000	15,458,150	15,465,433	14,309,910
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	20,000,000	19,961,200	19,962,634	19,844,501
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/8/2022	4/8/2026	2.64	30,000,000	29,941,800	29,943,951	29,766,751
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,504,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,504,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,504,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	8/19/2021	7/13/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,504,000
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,410,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,410,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,410,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	8/20/2021	7/27/2026	1.07	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,410,250
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,552,760
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,552,760
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,552,760
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	9/13/2021	8/10/2026	1.05	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,552,760
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,344,255
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,344,255
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,344,255
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	10/1/2021	9/3/2026	1.08	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,344,255
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,739,250
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,739,250
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,739,250
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	11/18/2021	10/19/2026	1.43	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,739,250
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,909,210
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,909,210
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,909,210
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	12/16/2021	11/16/2026	1.61	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,909,210
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,887,331
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,887,331
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,887,331
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	1/14/2022	12/14/2026	1.65	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	23,887,331
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,504,250
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,504,250
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,504,250
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3/22/2022	3/8/2027	2.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,504,250
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3/16/2022	3/10/2027	1.68	48,573,000	47,445,621	47,480,292	45,985,516
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	22,500,000	22,393,963	22,395,641	22,207,725
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	24,500,000	24,378,779	24,380,784	24,181,745
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	4/6/2022	4/5/2027	2.60	25,000,000	24,805,806	24,810,014	24,675,250
Subtotals					**0.99**	**$ 4,639,014,000**	**$ 4,642,235,875**	**$ 4,639,198,917**	**$ 4,496,600,622**

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Public Time Deposits	PPES5U4Q0	BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO	12/6/2021	6/6/2022	0.13	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPEJ79PT6	BRIDGE BANK	12/20/2021	6/20/2022	0.15	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPE4E8VT6	BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO	3/21/2022	9/19/2022	0.81	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public Time Deposits	PPEEE5T97	BRIDGE BANK	3/21/2022	9/19/2022	0.81	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotals					**0.48**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**	**$ 40,000,000**
Negotiable CDs	06417MTV7	BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS	12/2/2021	6/15/2022	0.30	$ 100,000,000	$ 100,000,000	$ 100,000,000	$ 99,974,953
Negotiable CDs	78012UT96	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	9/16/2021	6/17/2022	0.15	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,964,553
Negotiable CDs	06417MTY1	BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS	12/6/2021	6/30/2022	0.31	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,950,757
Negotiable CDs	78012UX42	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	10/29/2021	6/30/2022	0.20	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,970,811
Negotiable CDs	89114WMZ5	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	12/13/2021	6/30/2022	0.30	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,974,966
Negotiable CDs	89114WQB4	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	2/1/2022	6/30/2022	0.53	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,984,529
Negotiable CDs	06367CQB6	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	12/17/2021	7/1/2022	0.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,975,419
Negotiable CDs	89114WJ89	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	10/19/2021	7/1/2022	0.21	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,970,264
Negotiable CDs	06417MUM5	BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS	12/13/2021	7/6/2022	0.31	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,940,922
Negotiable CDs	06367CKG1	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	8/25/2021	7/18/2022	0.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,951,974
Negotiable CDs	06367CKN6	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	8/30/2021	7/18/2022	0.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,951,976
Negotiable CDs	06417MSJ5	BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS	11/2/2021	8/1/2022	0.24	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,943,147
Negotiable CDs	06367CTZ0	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	4/11/2022	8/17/2022	1.17	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,029,035
Negotiable CDs	06367CST5	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	3/2/2022	8/29/2022	0.83	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,991,037
Negotiable CDs	78012U3T0	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	2/28/2022	8/29/2022	0.80	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,987,299
Negotiable CDs	06367CSP3	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	2/28/2022	9/12/2022	0.82	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,913,260
Negotiable CDs	78012U3V5	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	3/1/2022	9/12/2022	0.85	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,917,564
Negotiable CDs	78012U4G7	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	3/15/2022	9/22/2022	1.42	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,999,320
Negotiable CDs	78012U4H5	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	3/15/2022	9/26/2022	1.44	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,002,549
Negotiable CDs	78012UW84	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	10/26/2021	9/26/2022	0.28	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,813,642
Negotiable CDs	06367CTT4	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	4/4/2022	9/28/2022	1.42	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,999,471
Negotiable CDs	78012UW68	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	10/25/2021	10/24/2022	0.30	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,773,669
Negotiable CDs	89114WU52	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	4/4/2022	10/24/2022	1.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,015,450
Negotiable CDs	96130ALC0	WESTPAC BANKING CORP NY	10/27/2021	10/24/2022	0.30	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,773,674
Negotiable CDs	78012U2E4	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	12/2/2021	12/2/2022	0.48	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,604,609
Negotiable CDs	89114WM36	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	12/2/2021	12/2/2022	0.48	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,604,609
Negotiable CDs	06367CPS0	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	12/8/2021	12/7/2022	0.52	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,604,420
Negotiable CDs	89114WP58	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	1/6/2022	12/30/2022	0.57	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	59,486,216
Negotiable CDs	89114WWV3	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	5/9/2022	1/4/2023	2.26	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,067,955
Negotiable CDs	06367CTW7	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	4/6/2022	1/13/2023	1.92	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,963,904
Negotiable CDs	89114WU94	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	4/6/2022	1/13/2023	1.92	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,963,904
Negotiable CDs	06367CUZ8	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	5/12/2022	1/18/2023	2.28	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,078,739
Negotiable CDs	89114WWX9	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	5/9/2022	1/24/2023	2.36	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,106,684
Negotiable CDs	78012U5C5	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	4/14/2022	1/27/2023	2.00	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,988,343
Negotiable CDs	06367CSR9	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	3/1/2022	1/30/2023	1.18	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,713,830
Negotiable CDs	89114WQL2	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	2/3/2022	1/30/2023	0.95	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,636,872
Negotiable CDs	06367CSM0	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	2/28/2022	2/13/2023	1.35	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,757,354
Negotiable CDs	89114WRW7	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	2/28/2022	2/13/2023	1.35	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,757,354
Negotiable CDs	89114WUU7	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	4/12/2022	2/27/2023	2.16	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,794,377
Negotiable CDs	06367CV46	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	5/17/2022	3/27/2023	2.60	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,068,424
Negotiable CDs	78012U5Z4	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	5/24/2022	3/27/2023	2.58	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,060,762
Subtotals					**0.97**	**$ 2,310,000,000**	**$ 2,310,000,000**	**$ 2,310,000,000**	**$ 2,306,028,590**

Investment Inventory
Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
Commercial Paper	89233HF82	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	11/10/2021	6/8/2022	0.00	$ 50,000,000	$ 49,941,667	$ 49,998,056	$ 49,990,764
Commercial Paper	89233HFE9	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	10/25/2021	6/14/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,932,333	49,996,208	49,982,847
Commercial Paper	89233HFF6	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	12/21/2021	6/15/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,921,778	49,993,778	49,981,528
Commercial Paper	89233HFF6	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	1/4/2022	6/15/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,932,500	49,994,167	49,981,528
Commercial Paper	89233HFN9	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	12/6/2021	6/22/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,925,750	49,992,125	49,972,292
Commercial Paper	89233HFQ2	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	12/16/2021	6/24/2022	0.00	60,000,000	59,901,833	59,988,117	59,963,584
Commercial Paper	89233HFW9	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	10/19/2021	6/30/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,932,972	49,992,347	49,961,736
Commercial Paper	89233HFW9	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	11/1/2021	6/30/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,919,667	49,990,333	49,961,736
Commercial Paper	62479MG15	MUFG BANK LTD NY	2/23/2022	7/1/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,884,444	49,972,917	49,960,417
Commercial Paper	89233HG16	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	11/19/2021	7/1/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,925,333	49,990,000	49,960,417
Commercial Paper	62479MGL1	MUFG BANK LTD NY	2/28/2022	7/20/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,867,861	49,954,403	49,935,347
Commercial Paper	62479MGN7	MUFG BANK LTD NY	3/1/2022	7/22/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,860,972	49,950,417	49,932,709
Commercial Paper	89233HH15	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	11/4/2021	8/1/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,906,250	49,978,819	49,901,722
Commercial Paper	62479MH30	MUFG BANK LTD NY	3/28/2022	8/3/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,786,667	49,895,000	49,898,500
Commercial Paper	62479MH55	MUFG BANK LTD NY	4/6/2022	8/5/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,808,417	49,897,083	49,895,278
Commercial Paper	62479MHQ9	MUFG BANK LTD NY	4/12/2022	8/24/2022	0.00	50,000,000	49,776,667	49,860,000	49,864,667
Commercial Paper	03785EJ62	APPLE INC	5/10/2022	9/6/2022	0.00	40,000,000	39,841,333	39,870,667	39,845,878
Commercial Paper	62479MJE4	MUFG BANK LTD NY	5/10/2022	9/14/2022	0.00	40,000,000	39,774,222	39,813,333	39,833,167
Subtotals					**0.00**	**$ 890,000,000**	**$ 887,840,667**	**$ 889,127,769**	**$ 888,824,114**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BLACKROCK LIQ INST GOV FUND	5/31/2022	6/1/2022	0.66	$ 61,563,599	$ 61,563,599	$ 61,563,599	$ 61,563,599
Money Market Funds	262006208	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT-I	5/31/2022	6/1/2022	0.63	580,080,177	580,080,177	580,080,177	580,080,177
Money Market Funds	31607A703	FIDELITY INST GOV FUND	5/31/2022	6/1/2022	0.55	14,358,065	14,358,065	14,358,065	14,358,065
Money Market Funds	608919718	FEDERATED GOVERNMENT OBL-PI	5/31/2022	6/1/2022	0.63	11,108,312	11,108,312	11,108,312	11,108,312
Money Market Funds	61747C707	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT FUN	5/31/2022	6/1/2022	0.64	646,864,888	646,864,888	646,864,888	646,864,888
Money Market Funds	85749T517	STATE ST INST US GOV MM-OPP	5/31/2022	6/1/2022	0.65	400,275,774	400,275,774	400,275,774	400,275,774
Subtotals					**0.64**	**$ 1,714,250,815**	**$ 1,714,250,815**	**$ 1,714,250,815**	**$ 1,714,250,815**
Supranationals	459058ES8	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	12/16/2021	10/7/2022	1.88	$ 64,387,000	$ 65,187,330	$ 64,734,262	$ 64,422,413
Supranationals	459058JV6	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	4/20/2021	4/20/2023	0.13	100,000,000	99,793,000	99,908,410	98,172,000
Supranationals	4581X0CC0	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	12/15/2021	10/4/2023	3.00	25,756,000	26,837,752	26,561,560	25,945,822
Supranationals	45906M3B5	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	3/23/2022	6/14/2024	1.98	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	98,775,000
Supranationals	459056HV2	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	11/2/2021	8/28/2024	1.50	50,000,000	50,984,250	50,782,622	48,743,000
Supranationals	4581X0DZ8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	11/4/2021	9/23/2024	0.50	50,000,000	49,595,500	49,675,709	47,553,500
Supranationals	45950VQG4	INTL FINANCE CORP	10/22/2021	9/23/2024	0.44	10,000,000	9,918,700	9,935,615	9,457,000
Supranationals	4581X0CM8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	4/26/2021	1/15/2025	2.13	100,000,000	105,676,000	104,002,415	98,447,000
Supranationals	459058JB0	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	7/23/2021	4/22/2025	0.63	40,000,000	40,086,000	40,066,337	37,618,400
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	11/1/2021	7/15/2025	0.63	28,900,000	28,519,098	28,578,825	27,014,853
Supranationals	45818WDG8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	8/25/2021	2/27/2026	0.82	19,500,000	19,556,907	19,547,233	17,973,345
Subtotals					**1.34**	**$ 588,543,000**	**$ 596,154,538**	**$ 593,792,988**	**$ 574,122,333**
Grand Totals					**0.84**	**$ 15,106,807,815**	**$ 15,125,314,095**	**$ 15,109,781,659**	**$ 14,747,728,973**

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

For month ended May 31, 2022

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM[1]	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	912796H44	TREASURY BILL	0	0	0.055	5/20/21	5/19/22	0	5500.04	0	5500.04
U.S. Treasuries	912828XD7	US TREASURY	0	1.875	0.0798	5/13/21	5/31/22	77266.48	-73739.39	0.00	3527.09
U.S. Treasuries	9128286Y1	US TREASURY	50000000	1.75	0.0801	4/8/21	6/15/22	74519.23	-70894.78	0	3624.45
U.S. Treasuries	9128286Y1	US TREASURY	50000000	1.75	0.0922	4/28/21	6/15/22	74519.23	-70369.25	0	4149.98
U.S. Treasuries	912796W39	TREASURY BILL	25000000	0	0.4808	3/1/22	6/28/22	0.00	10333.33	0.00	10333.33
U.S. Treasuries	912828XW5	US TREASURY	25000000	1.75	1.7692	8/15/17	6/30/22	37465.47	391.17	0.00	37856.64
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.107	3/12/21	6/30/22	5352.21	-764.8	0	4587.41
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.0906	3/31/21	6/30/22	5352.21	-1460.56	0	3891.65
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.0837	4/8/21	6/30/22	5352.21	-1756.94	0	3595.27
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.0927	4/15/21	6/30/22	5352.21	-1372.94	0	3979.27
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.0926	4/16/21	6/30/22	5352.21	-1376.06	0	3976.15
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZX1	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.0924	4/19/21	6/30/22	5352.21	-1385.52	0	3966.69
U.S. Treasuries	912828YA2	US TREASURY	100000000	1.5	0.0988	3/30/21	8/15/22	128453.04	-119167.8	0.00	9285.24
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAG6	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.0974	3/30/21	8/31/22	5264.95	-1166.61	0	4098.34
U.S. Treasuries	912796U56	TREASURY BILL	50000000	0	0.9817	3/29/22	9/22/22	0.00	42065.28	0.00	42065.28
U.S. Treasuries	912796U64	TREASURY BILL	50000000	0	1.0556	3/31/22	9/29/22	0.00	45208.31	0.00	45208.31
U.S. Treasuries	912796M89	TREASURY BILL	50000000	0	1.1163	4/7/22	10/6/22	0	47791.7	0	47791.7
U.S. Treasuries	912796V63	TREASURY BILL	50000000	0	1.2579	4/21/22	10/20/22	0.00	53819.41	0.00	53819.41
U.S. Treasuries	912828TY6	US TREASURY	50000000	1.625	0.1236	4/8/21	11/15/22	68956.62	-63543.22	0.00	5413.4
U.S. Treasuries	912796P94	TREASURY BILL	50000000	0	0.2494	12/13/21	12/1/22	0.00	10712.22	0.00	10712.22
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z86	US TREASURY	50000000	1.375	0.1371	8/17/21	2/15/23	58874.3	-52355.89	0	6518.41
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z86	US TREASURY	50000000	1.375	1.0249	3/3/22	2/15/23	58874.31	-14746.37	0.00	44127.94
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZD5	US TREASURY	50000000	0.5	0.162	3/18/21	3/15/23	21059.78	-14324.71	0.00	6735.07
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBU4	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.1537	5/4/21	3/31/23	5293.71	1217.9	0	6511.61
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.1911	3/12/21	6/15/23	10645.61	-2495.26	0	8150.35
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.1837	4/8/21	6/15/23	10645.61	-2807.31	0.00	7838.3
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.252	6/24/21	6/15/23	10645.61	83.98	0	10729.59
U.S. Treasuries	912828S35	US TREASURY	50000000	1.375	1.6093	1/9/20	6/30/23	58874.31	9645.48	0	68519.79
U.S. Treasuries	912828S35	US TREASURY	50000000	1.375	0.2422	6/24/21	6/30/23	58874.31	-47960.37	0	10913.94
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCK5	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.2602	6/30/21	6/30/23	5352.21	5722.93	0	11075.14
U.S. Treasuries	912828S92	US TREASURY	50000000	1.25	0.2011	4/1/21	7/31/23	53522.1	-44467.44	0	9054.66
U.S. Treasuries	912828S92	US TREASURY	50000000	1.25	0.2027	4/1/21	7/31/23	53522.10	-44396.3	0.00	9125.8
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAK7	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.2333	8/10/21	9/15/23	5264.94	4584.49	0	9849.43
U.S. Treasuries	912828WE6	US TREASURY	50000000	2.75	1.7091	12/17/19	11/15/23	116695.82	-42539.59	0	74156.23
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.2954	3/19/21	12/15/23	5322.80	7197.88	0.00	12520.68
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.7232	12/9/21	12/15/23	5322.80	25173.02	0.00	30495.82
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.125	0.6864	12/15/21	12/15/23	5322.80	23638.16	0.00	28960.96
U.S. Treasuries	9128285Z9	US TREASURY	50000000	2.5	0.3278	10/4/21	1/31/24	107044.20	-91711.75	0.00	15332.45
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	1.5159	2/23/22	1/31/24	37465.47	26719.41	0	64184.88
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	2.4625	4/11/22	1/31/24	37465.47	65500.71	0.00	102966.18
U.S. Treasuries	912828B66	US TREASURY	50000000	2.75	2.4706	4/11/22	2/15/24	117748.62	-11481.48	0	106267.14
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBR1	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	1.5538	3/8/22	3/15/24	10529.90	54229.65	0.00	64759.55
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCC3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.4475	7/2/21	5/15/24	10608.71	8319.42	0	18928.13
U.S. Treasuries	912828XT2	US TREASURY	50000000	2	0.4283	7/6/21	5/31/24	85149.82	-66201.73	0.00	18948.09
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.375	0.3763	8/6/21	7/15/24	16056.63	56.38	0	16113.01
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.375	0.4018	8/9/21	7/15/24	16056.63	1130.67	0.00	17187.3
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.375	2.6013	4/12/22	7/15/24	16056.63	91223.96	0.00	107280.59
U.S. Treasuries	912828Y87	US TREASURY	50000000	1.75	0.4154	3/30/21	7/31/24	74930.94	-56225.64	0	18705.3
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCT6	US TREASURY	50000000	0.375	0.4439	8/25/21	8/15/24	16056.62	2899.11	0.00	18955.73
U.S. Treasuries	912828YM6	US TREASURY	50000000	1.5	0.5038	4/15/21	10/31/24	63179.35	-41798.39	0	21380.96
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	US TREASURY	50000000	2.25	0.5162	3/9/21	11/15/24	95478.4	-72728.17	0	22750.23
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	US TREASURY	50000000	2.25	0.4762	3/12/21	11/15/24	95478.4	-74467.25	0	21011.15
U.S. Treasuries	912828YY0	US TREASURY	50000000	1.75	0.5625	3/15/21	12/31/24	74930.93	-49764.55	0	25166.38

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM[1]	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	US TREASURY	50000000	1.375	0.5756	3/30/21	1/31/25	58874.31	-33488.51	0.00	25385.8
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	US TREASURY	50000000	1.375	0.5707	4/15/21	1/31/25	58874.31	-33700.21	0.00	25174.1
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	US TREASURY	50000000	1.125	0.607	3/15/21	2/28/25	47384.51	-21689.68	0.00	25694.83
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	US TREASURY	50000000	1.125	0.6083	3/31/21	2/28/25	47384.51	-21635.98	0.00	25748.53
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	US TREASURY	50000000	0.5	0.613	4/15/21	3/31/25	21174.87	4731.53	0	25906.4
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	US TREASURY	50000000	0.5	0.5822	4/19/21	3/31/25	21174.87	3443.03	0	24617.9
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZL7	US TREASURY	50000000	0.375	0.5722	5/18/21	4/30/25	15794.84	8265.93	0.00	24060.77
U.S. Treasuries	912828XB1	US TREASURY	50000000	2.125	0.5666	9/2/21	5/15/25	90174.04	-65387.04	0	24787
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.6546	3/8/21	6/30/25	10704.42	16914.68	0	27619.1
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.7014	3/9/21	6/30/25	10704.42	18848.78	0	29553.2
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.6025	5/12/21	6/30/25	10704.42	14755.79	0.00	25460.21
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.6511	5/13/21	6/30/25	10704.42	16771.77	0.00	27476.19
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.6175	5/18/21	6/30/25	10704.42	15378.27	0	26082.69
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.6022	7/12/21	6/30/25	10704.42	14750.2	0.00	25454.62
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.5091	8/5/21	6/30/25	10704.42	10877.2	0	21581.62
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.5583	8/6/21	6/30/25	10704.42	12925.74	0.00	23630.16
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	1.0354	12/7/21	6/30/25	10704.42	32670.18	0	43374.6
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.5246	8/5/21	7/31/25	10704.42	11518.88	0	22223.3
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.5738	8/6/21	7/31/25	10704.42	13565.83	0.00	24270.25
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.6628	5/12/21	9/30/25	10587.43	17234.31	0.00	27821.74
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.5987	7/26/21	9/30/25	10587.43	14591.52	0.00	25178.95
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.5542	2/25/21	10/31/25	10529.90	12718.74	0.00	23248.64
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.6521	3/2/21	10/31/25	10529.90	16771.2	0.00	27301.1
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.25	0.6655	3/4/21	10/31/25	10529.90	17324.52	0.00	27854.42
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	US TREASURY	50000000	0.375	0.6036	2/25/21	12/31/25	16056.63	9543.83	0.00	25600.46
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	US TREASURY	50000000	0.375	0.6814	2/26/21	12/31/25	16056.63	12766.53	0.00	28823.16
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	US TREASURY	50000000	0.75	0.8929	6/28/21	4/30/26	31589.68	5927.9	0.00	37517.58
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	US TREASURY	50000000	0.75	0.8642	7/2/21	4/30/26	31589.68	4739.35	0.00	36329.03
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	US TREASURY	50000000	1.625	0.6924	7/23/21	5/15/26	68956.62	-38871.3	0.00	30085.32
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	US TREASURY	50000000	1.625	0.8064	8/27/21	5/15/26	68956.62	-34035.64	0.00	34920.98
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	0.9031	7/2/21	6/30/26	37465.47	1161.81	0.00	38627.28
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	0.846	7/14/21	6/30/26	37465.47	-1202.92	0.00	36262.55
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	0.7322	7/22/21	6/30/26	37465.47	-5940.57	0.00	31524.9
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	0.7395	7/22/21	6/30/26	37465.47	-5638.52	0	31826.95
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	0.706	8/6/21	6/30/26	37465.47	-7039.55	0.00	30425.92
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	0.7746	8/10/21	6/30/26	37465.47	-4172.14	0	33293.33
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	0.9018	9/24/21	6/30/26	37465.47	1113.51	0	38578.98
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	1.0521	10/14/21	6/30/26	37465.47	7321.95	0	44787.42
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	1.3228	1/4/22	6/30/26	37465.47	18408.02	0	55873.49
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	US TREASURY	50000000	0.75	0.9797	9/28/21	8/31/26	31589.67	9496.23	0	41085.9
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	1.0032	10/8/21	9/30/26	37056.01	5295.36	0	42351.37
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	1.0105	10/8/21	9/30/26	37056.01	5595.09	0	42651.1
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	US TREASURY	50000000	0.875	1.1593	10/19/21	9/30/26	37056.01	11693.89	0.00	48749.9
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	US TREASURY	50000000	1.25	1.2201	12/3/21	11/30/26	53218.64	-1228.87	0	51989.77
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	US TREASURY	50000000	1.25	1.2014	12/7/21	11/30/26	53218.64	-1997.15	0	51221.49
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	US TREASURY	50000000	1.25	2.5854	3/29/22	11/30/26	53218.64	53062.76	0	106281.4
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	US TREASURY	50000000	1.25	2.5489	3/29/22	12/31/26	53522.1	51593.74	0	105115.84
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	US TREASURY	25000000	2.5	2.7091	4/6/22	3/31/27	52937.16	4125.17	0.00	57062.33
Subtotals			**$ 4,925,000,000**					**$ 3,427,526**	**$ (394,430)**	**$ -**	**$ 3,033,095**

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM[1]	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AMEY4	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	$ -	0.06	0.06	5/6/21	5/6/22	$ 83	$ 1	$ -	$ 84
Federal Agencies	3130AMEY4	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	-	0.06	0.06	5/18/21	5/6/22	83	1	-	85
Federal Agencies	313385WL6	FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT	-	0.00	0.06	5/6/21	5/6/22	-	382	-	382
Federal Agencies	3130AMGM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	-	0.06	0.06	5/11/21	5/10/22	750	41	-	791
Federal Agencies	3130AMJ37	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	-	0.06	0.06	5/13/21	5/13/22	900	59	-	959
Federal Agencies	3130AMJ37	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	-	0.06	0.06	5/17/21	5/13/22	600	8	-	608
Federal Agencies	3133EKLR5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	-	2.25	2.32	5/16/19	5/16/22	32,813	972	-	33,785
Federal Agencies	3133EKLR5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	-	2.25	2.32	5/16/19	5/16/22	23,438	695	-	24,132
Federal Agencies	3133EHLY7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	1.88	1.85	6/6/17	6/2/22	78,125	(1,008)	-	77,117
Federal Agencies	3133EHLY7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	1.88	1.88	6/9/17	6/2/22	78,125	43	-	78,168
Federal Agencies	3133EMF64	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	58,735,000	0.06	0.08	7/7/21	6/9/22	2,937	1,055	-	3,992
Federal Agencies	3133ELDK7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	20,000,000	1.63	1.63	12/16/19	6/15/22	27,167	36	-	27,203
Federal Agencies	3133ELDK7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	1.63	1.63	12/16/19	6/15/22	33,958	45	-	34,003
Federal Agencies	3133ELDK7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	1.63	1.63	12/16/19	6/15/22	33,958	45	-	34,003
Federal Agencies	313385F92	FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT	25,000,000	0.00	1.12	5/10/22	9/16/22	-	17,111	-	17,111
Federal Agencies	3133EHZP1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	1.85	0.69	3/18/20	9/20/22	38,542	(24,325)	-	14,217
Federal Agencies	3133ELVL5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	40,000,000	0.70	0.71	4/3/20	10/3/22	23,333	340	-	23,673
Federal Agencies	3133EMS45	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.11	0.12	7/14/21	12/14/22	4,583	425	-	5,008
Federal Agencies	3133EMWK4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	60,000,000	0.14	0.15	5/18/21	1/19/23	7,000	639	-	7,639
Federal Agencies	3133ELJH8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	10,140,000	1.60	0.74	3/25/20	1/23/23	13,520	(7,320)	-	6,201
Federal Agencies	3133EMPH9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	45,500,000	0.13	1.10	3/3/22	2/3/23	4,740	37,134	-	41,874
Federal Agencies	3133827H0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	44,400,000	2.14	1.08	3/7/22	2/6/23	79,180	(39,367)	-	39,813
Federal Agencies	3133ENDQ0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.16	0.32	11/12/21	2/10/23	6,667	6,828	-	13,494
Federal Agencies	3133EMUH3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	65,000,000	0.13	0.16	3/31/21	3/23/23	6,771	1,926	-	8,697
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	20,000,000	0.13	0.19	4/13/21	4/13/23	2,083	1,121	-	3,204
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	0.13	0.19	4/13/21	4/13/23	2,604	1,401	-	4,006
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.13	0.19	4/13/21	4/13/23	5,208	2,803	-	8,011
Federal Agencies	3133EMXM9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	44,500,000	0.13	0.17	5/5/21	4/27/23	4,635	1,622	-	6,257
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	12,500,000	0.13	0.19	5/10/21	5/10/23	1,302	679	-	1,982
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	0.13	0.19	5/10/21	5/10/23	2,604	1,359	-	3,963
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	75,000,000	0.13	0.19	5/10/21	5/10/23	7,813	4,077	-	11,889
Federal Agencies	3130AMRY0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	15,000,000	0.13	0.17	6/4/21	6/2/23	1,563	588	-	2,150
Federal Agencies	3133EMF31	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	100,000,000	0.13	0.16	6/2/21	6/2/23	10,417	2,633	-	13,050
Federal Agencies	3133EMH96	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.13	0.26	6/28/21	6/14/23	5,208	5,851	-	11,060
Federal Agencies	3133EM3S9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	48,067,000	0.20	0.53	12/14/21	6/26/23	8,011	13,355	-	21,366
Federal Agencies	3133EM3S9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.20	0.22	8/26/21	6/26/23	8,333	932	-	9,265
Federal Agencies	3133EMS37	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.13	0.20	7/14/21	7/14/23	5,208	3,066	-	8,275
Federal Agencies	3133EMS37	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.13	0.22	7/14/21	7/14/23	5,208	3,939	-	9,147
Federal Agencies	3133ENEY2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.45	0.45	11/24/21	7/24/23	18,750	179	-	18,929
Federal Agencies	3133EM2E1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.16	0.19	8/10/21	8/10/23	6,667	1,274	-	7,941
Federal Agencies	3137EAEV7	FREDDIE MAC	40,776,000	0.25	0.59	12/6/21	8/24/23	8,495	11,550	-	20,045
Federal Agencies	3130AJXD6	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	20,975,000	0.13	0.59	12/14/21	9/8/23	2,185	8,259	-	10,444
Federal Agencies	3135G0U43	FANNIE MAE	29,648,000	2.88	0.66	12/9/21	9/12/23	71,032	(55,303)	-	15,729
Federal Agencies	3133EM6N7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.17	0.22	9/27/21	9/27/23	7,083	2,123	-	9,207
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	0.50	0.57	12/3/21	12/1/23	10,417	1,544	-	11,960
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	0.50	0.57	12/3/21	12/1/23	10,417	1,544	-	11,960
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	75,000,000	0.50	0.59	12/3/21	12/1/23	31,250	4,631	-	35,881
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	10,000,000	2.25	0.73	12/10/21	12/8/23	18,750	(12,817)	-	5,933
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	30,000,000	2.25	0.73	12/10/21	12/8/23	56,250	(38,452)	-	17,798
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	0.68	0.71	12/20/21	12/20/23	14,167	527	-	14,693
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	0.68	0.70	12/20/21	12/20/23	14,167	510	-	14,676

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM[1]	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	62,000,000	0.68	0.70	12/20/21	12/20/23	35,133	1,253	-	36,387
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	11,856,000	0.90	1.44	3/3/22	1/18/24	8,892	5,296	-	14,188
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.90	1.21	2/1/22	1/18/24	37,500	12,946	-	50,446
Federal Agencies	3130AFW94	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	39,010,000	2.50	0.62	11/12/21	2/13/24	81,271	(61,729)	-	19,542
Federal Agencies	3133ELNE0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	20,495,000	1.43	0.85	3/18/20	2/14/24	24,423	(9,891)	-	14,533
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5,000,000	0.25	0.26	2/26/21	2/26/24	1,042	51	-	1,093
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	5,000,000	0.25	0.26	2/26/21	2/26/24	1,042	51	-	1,093
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	100,000,000	0.25	0.26	2/26/21	2/26/24	20,833	1,019	-	21,853
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	11,000,000	2.13	2.19	3/25/22	2/28/24	19,479	551	-	20,031
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	2.13	2.19	3/25/22	2/28/24	44,271	1,253	-	45,524
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.30	0.34	3/18/21	3/18/24	12,500	1,711	-	14,211
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.30	0.34	3/18/21	3/18/24	12,500	1,713	-	14,213
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	16,545,000	0.35	0.34	5/4/21	4/22/24	4,826	(132)	-	4,693
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	29,424,000	0.35	0.34	5/4/21	4/22/24	8,582	(236)	-	8,346
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	39,000,000	0.35	0.34	5/4/21	4/22/24	11,375	(312)	-	11,063
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	45,000,000	2.63	2.69	5/16/22	5/16/24	49,219	1,330	-	50,548
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	2.63	2.69	5/16/22	5/16/24	54,688	1,477	-	56,165
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	15,955,000	2.88	2.71	5/18/22	6/14/24	16,564	(987)	-	15,577
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	17,980,000	2.88	2.70	5/18/22	6/14/24	18,667	(1,179)	-	17,488
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,500,000	2.88	2.77	5/12/22	6/14/24	38,693	(1,375)	-	37,318
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	50,000,000	2.88	2.67	5/16/22	6/14/24	59,896	(4,295)	-	55,601
Federal Agencies	3133EMV25	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.45	0.39	8/6/21	7/23/24	18,750	(2,636)	-	16,114
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	0.43	0.46	9/23/21	9/23/24	8,958	714	-	9,673
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.43	0.46	9/23/21	9/23/24	17,917	1,428	-	19,345
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.43	0.46	9/23/21	9/23/24	17,917	1,428	-	19,345
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	10,000,000	0.88	0.91	11/18/21	11/18/24	7,292	325	-	7,617
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	10,000,000	0.88	0.91	11/18/21	11/18/24	7,292	325	-	7,617
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.88	0.91	11/18/21	11/18/24	36,458	1,626	-	38,085
Federal Agencies	3133ELCP7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	1.63	1.66	12/3/19	12/3/24	33,854	679	-	34,533
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.92	0.93	12/9/21	12/9/24	38,333	424	-	38,758
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.92	0.95	12/9/21	12/9/24	38,333	1,047	-	39,380
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	20,000,000	1.13	1.20	1/11/22	1/6/25	18,750	1,279	-	20,029
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	1.13	1.20	1/11/22	1/6/25	23,438	1,598	-	25,036
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	1.13	1.20	1/11/22	1/6/25	23,438	1,598	-	25,036
Federal Agencies	3135G0X24	FANNIE MAE	39,060,000	1.63	0.53	4/21/21	1/7/25	52,894	(35,924)	-	16,969
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	5,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	6,250	65	-	6,315
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	5,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	6,250	65	-	6,315
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	5,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	6,250	65	-	6,315
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	15,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	18,750	196	-	18,946
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	50,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	62,500	654	-	63,154
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	FREDDIE MAC	53,532,000	1.50	0.55	4/21/21	2/12/25	66,915	(42,685)	-	24,230
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	16,000,000	1.21	1.22	3/23/20	3/3/25	16,133	159	-	16,293
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	24,000,000	1.21	1.24	3/23/20	3/3/25	24,200	614	-	24,814
Federal Agencies	3133EMWT5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	0.60	0.61	4/21/21	4/21/25	25,000	562	-	25,562
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FANNIE MAE	37,938,000	0.63	1.08	12/8/21	4/22/25	19,759	14,359	-	34,119
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FANNIE MAE	50,000,000	0.63	0.57	7/12/21	4/22/25	26,042	(2,426)	-	23,616
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FANNIE MAE	50,000,000	0.63	1.08	12/8/21	4/22/25	26,042	19,039	-	45,081
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	6,000,000	2.85	2.90	5/23/22	5/23/25	3,800	69	-	3,869
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	20,000,000	2.85	2.90	5/23/22	5/23/25	12,667	230	-	12,897
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FANNIE MAE	4,655,000	0.50	1.11	12/8/21	6/17/25	1,940	2,369	-	4,309
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FANNIE MAE	10,000,000	0.50	1.11	12/8/21	6/17/25	4,167	5,068	-	9,235

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM[1]	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
Federal Agencies	3130AN4A5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	17,680,000	0.70	0.62	7/12/21	6/30/25	10,313	(1,169)	-	9,145
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FANNIE MAE	25,000,000	0.38	0.66	3/4/21	8/25/25	7,813	5,987	-	13,799
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FANNIE MAE	72,500,000	0.38	0.57	2/25/21	8/25/25	22,656	12,045	-	34,701
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	10,295,000	1.75	1.03	11/2/21	9/12/25	15,014	(6,163)	-	8,850
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	FREDDIE MAC	22,600,000	0.38	0.68	3/4/21	9/23/25	7,063	5,676	-	12,738
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	39,675,000	1.05	1.08	11/17/21	11/17/25	34,716	1,120	-	35,835
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	55,000,000	1.05	1.09	11/17/21	11/17/25	48,125	1,634	-	49,759
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	45,000,000	1.17	1.20	12/16/21	12/16/25	43,875	974	-	44,849
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	50,000,000	1.17	1.20	12/16/21	12/16/25	48,750	1,082	-	49,832
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	15,500,000	0.69	0.75	8/9/21	4/6/26	8,913	763	-	9,675
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	20,000,000	2.64	2.69	4/8/22	4/8/26	44,000	823	-	44,823
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	30,000,000	2.64	2.69	4/8/22	4/8/26	66,000	1,235	-	67,235
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	8/19/21	7/13/26	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	8/19/21	7/13/26	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	8/19/21	7/13/26	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	8/19/21	7/13/26	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.07	1.07	8/20/21	7/27/26	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.07	1.07	8/20/21	7/27/26	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.07	1.07	8/20/21	7/27/26	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.07	1.07	8/20/21	7/27/26	22,292	-	-	22,292
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	9/13/21	8/10/26	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	9/13/21	8/10/26	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	9/13/21	8/10/26	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	9/13/21	8/10/26	21,875	-	-	21,875
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.08	1.08	10/1/21	9/3/26	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.08	1.08	10/1/21	9/3/26	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.08	1.08	10/1/21	9/3/26	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.08	1.08	10/1/21	9/3/26	22,396	-	-	22,396
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	11/18/21	10/19/26	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	11/18/21	10/19/26	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	11/18/21	10/19/26	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	11/18/21	10/19/26	29,792	-	-	29,792
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	12/16/21	11/16/26	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	12/16/21	11/16/26	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	12/16/21	11/16/26	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	12/16/21	11/16/26	33,438	-	-	33,438
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.65	1.65	1/14/22	12/14/26	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.65	1.65	1/14/22	12/14/26	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.65	1.65	1/14/22	12/14/26	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	1.65	1.65	1/14/22	12/14/26	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	2.35	2.35	3/22/22	3/8/27	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	2.35	2.35	3/22/22	3/8/27	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	2.35	2.35	3/22/22	3/8/27	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	25,000,000	2.35	2.35	3/22/22	3/8/27	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	48,573,000	1.68	2.18	3/16/22	3/10/27	68,002	19,434	-	87,436
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	22,500,000	2.60	2.70	4/6/22	4/5/27	48,750	1,829	-	50,579
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	24,500,000	2.60	2.71	4/6/22	4/5/27	53,083	2,089	-	55,172
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	25,000,000	2.60	2.77	4/6/22	4/5/27	54,167	3,329	-	57,496
Subtotals			**$ 4,639,014,000**					**$ 3,589,602**	**$ (63,719)**	**$ -**	**$ 3,525,883**

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM[1]	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
Public Time Deposits	PPES5U4Q0	BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO	$ 10,000,000	0.13	0.13	12/6/21	6/6/22	$ 1,119	$ -	$ -	$ 1,119
Public Time Deposits	PPEJ79PT6	BRIDGE BANK	10,000,000	0.15	0.15	12/20/21	6/20/22	1,274	-	-	1,274
Public Time Deposits	PPE4E8VT6	BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO	10,000,000	0.81	0.81	3/21/22	9/19/22	6,975	-	-	6,975
Public Time Deposits	PPEEE5T97	BRIDGE BANK	10,000,000	0.81	0.81	3/21/22	9/19/22	6,879	-	-	6,879
Subtotals			**$ 40,000,000**					**$ 16,248**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 16,248**
Negotiable CDs	06367CHR1	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	$ -	0.17	0.17	7/6/21	5/9/22	$ 3,778	$ -	$ -	$ 3,778
Negotiable CDs	89114WBD6	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	-	0.21	0.21	5/25/21	5/25/22	7,000	-	-	7,000
Negotiable CDs	06417MTV7	BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS	100,000,000	0.30	0.30	12/2/21	6/15/22	25,833	-	-	25,833
Negotiable CDs	78012UT96	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	100,000,000	0.15	0.15	9/16/21	6/17/22	12,917	-	-	12,917
Negotiable CDs	06417MTY1	BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS	100,000,000	0.31	0.31	12/6/21	6/30/22	26,694	-	-	26,694
Negotiable CDs	78012UX42	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	0.20	0.20	10/29/21	6/30/22	8,611	-	-	8,611
Negotiable CDs	89114WMZ5	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	0.30	0.30	12/13/21	6/30/22	12,917	-	-	12,917
Negotiable CDs	89114WQB4	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	0.53	0.53	2/1/22	6/30/22	22,819	-	-	22,819
Negotiable CDs	06367CQB6	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	0.33	0.33	12/17/21	7/1/22	14,208	-	-	14,208
Negotiable CDs	89114WJ89	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	0.21	0.21	10/19/21	7/1/22	9,042	-	-	9,042
Negotiable CDs	06417MUM5	BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS	100,000,000	0.31	0.31	12/13/21	7/6/22	26,694	-	-	26,694
Negotiable CDs	06367CKG1	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	0.18	0.18	8/25/21	7/18/22	7,750	-	-	7,750
Negotiable CDs	06367CKN6	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	0.18	0.18	8/30/21	7/18/22	7,750	-	-	7,750
Negotiable CDs	06417MSJ5	BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS	50,000,000	0.24	0.24	11/2/21	8/1/22	10,333	-	-	10,333
Negotiable CDs	06367CTZ0	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	1.17	1.17	4/11/22	8/17/22	50,375	-	-	50,375
Negotiable CDs	06367CST5	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	0.83	0.83	3/2/22	8/29/22	35,736	-	-	35,736
Negotiable CDs	78012U3T0	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	0.80	0.80	2/28/22	8/29/22	34,444	-	-	34,444
Negotiable CDs	06367CSP3	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	0.82	0.82	2/28/22	9/12/22	35,306	-	-	35,306
Negotiable CDs	78012U3V5	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	0.85	0.85	3/1/22	9/12/22	36,597	-	-	36,597
Negotiable CDs	78012U4G7	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	1.42	1.42	3/15/22	9/22/22	61,139	-	-	61,139
Negotiable CDs	78012U4H5	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	1.44	1.44	3/15/22	9/26/22	62,000	-	-	62,000
Negotiable CDs	78012UW84	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	0.28	0.28	10/26/21	9/26/22	12,056	-	-	12,056
Negotiable CDs	06367CTT4	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	1.42	1.42	4/4/22	9/28/22	61,139	-	-	61,139
Negotiable CDs	78012UW68	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	0.30	0.30	10/25/21	10/24/22	12,917	-	-	12,917
Negotiable CDs	89114WU52	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	1.50	1.50	4/4/22	10/24/22	64,583	-	-	64,583
Negotiable CDs	96130ALC0	WESTPAC BANKING CORP NY	50,000,000	0.30	0.30	10/27/21	10/24/22	12,917	-	-	12,917
Negotiable CDs	78012U2E4	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	0.48	0.48	12/2/21	12/2/22	20,667	-	-	20,667
Negotiable CDs	89114WM36	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	0.48	0.48	12/2/21	12/2/22	20,667	-	-	20,667
Negotiable CDs	06367CPS0	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	0.52	0.52	12/8/21	12/7/22	22,389	-	-	22,389
Negotiable CDs	89114WP58	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	60,000,000	0.57	0.57	1/6/22	12/30/22	29,450	-	-	29,450
Negotiable CDs	89114WWV3	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	2.26	2.26	5/9/22	1/4/23	72,194	-	-	72,194
Negotiable CDs	06367CTW7	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	1.92	1.92	4/6/22	1/13/23	82,667	-	-	82,667
Negotiable CDs	89114WU94	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	1.92	1.92	4/6/22	1/13/23	82,667	-	-	82,667
Negotiable CDs	06367CUZ8	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	2.28	2.28	5/12/22	1/18/23	63,333	-	-	63,333
Negotiable CDs	89114WWX9	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	2.36	2.36	5/9/22	1/24/23	75,389	-	-	75,389
Negotiable CDs	78012U5C5	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	2.00	2.00	4/14/22	1/27/23	86,111	-	-	86,111
Negotiable CDs	06367CSR9	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	1.18	1.18	3/1/22	1/30/23	50,806	-	-	50,806
Negotiable CDs	89114WQL2	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	0.95	0.95	2/3/22	1/30/23	40,903	-	-	40,903
Negotiable CDs	06367CSM0	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	1.35	1.35	2/28/22	2/13/23	58,125	-	-	58,125
Negotiable CDs	89114WRW7	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	50,000,000	1.35	1.35	2/28/22	2/13/23	58,125	-	-	58,125
Negotiable CDs	89114WUU7	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	100,000,000	2.16	2.16	4/12/22	2/27/23	186,000	-	-	186,000
Negotiable CDs	06367CV46	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	50,000,000	2.60	2.60	5/17/22	3/27/23	54,167	-	-	54,167
Negotiable CDs	78012U5Z4	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	50,000,000	2.58	2.58	5/24/22	3/27/23	28,667	-	-	28,667
Subtotals			**$ 2,310,000,000**					**$ 1,707,881**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 1,707,881**

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM[1]	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
Commercial Paper	89233HF82	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	$ 50,000,000	0.00	0.20	11/10/21	6/8/22	$ -	$ 8,611	$ -	$ 8,611
Commercial Paper	89233HFE9	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	50,000,000	0.00	0.21	10/25/21	6/14/22	-	9,042	-	9,042
Commercial Paper	89233HFF6	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	50,000,000	0.00	0.32	12/21/21	6/15/22	-	13,778	-	13,778
Commercial Paper	89233HFF6	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	50,000,000	0.00	0.30	1/4/22	6/15/22	-	12,917	-	12,917
Commercial Paper	89233HFN9	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	50,000,000	0.00	0.27	12/6/21	6/22/22	-	11,625	-	11,625
Commercial Paper	89233HFQ2	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	60,000,000	0.00	0.31	12/16/21	6/24/22	-	16,017	-	16,017
Commercial Paper	89233HFW9	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	50,000,000	0.00	0.19	10/19/21	6/30/22	-	8,181	-	8,181
Commercial Paper	89233HFW9	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	50,000,000	0.00	0.24	11/1/21	6/30/22	-	10,333	-	10,333
Commercial Paper	62479MG15	MUFG BANK LTD NY	50,000,000	0.00	0.65	2/23/22	7/1/22	-	27,986	-	27,986
Commercial Paper	89233HG16	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	50,000,000	0.00	0.24	11/19/21	7/1/22	-	10,333	-	10,333
Commercial Paper	62479MGL1	MUFG BANK LTD NY	50,000,000	0.00	0.67	2/28/22	7/20/22	-	28,847	-	28,847
Commercial Paper	62479MGN7	MUFG BANK LTD NY	50,000,000	0.00	0.70	3/1/22	7/22/22	-	30,139	-	30,139
Commercial Paper	89233HH15	TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP	50,000,000	0.00	0.25	11/4/21	8/1/22	-	10,764	-	10,764
Commercial Paper	62479MH30	MUFG BANK LTD NY	50,000,000	0.00	1.21	3/28/22	8/3/22	-	51,667	-	51,667
Commercial Paper	62479MH55	MUFG BANK LTD NY	50,000,000	0.00	1.14	4/6/22	8/5/22	-	49,083	-	49,083
Commercial Paper	62479MHQ9	MUFG BANK LTD NY	50,000,000	0.00	1.21	4/12/22	8/24/22	-	51,667	-	51,667
Commercial Paper	03785EJ62	APPLE INC	40,000,000	0.00	1.20	5/10/22	9/6/22	-	29,333	-	29,333
Commercial Paper	62479MJE4	MUFG BANK LTD NY	40,000,000	0.00	1.61	5/10/22	9/14/22	-	39,111	-	39,111
Subtotals			**$ 890,000,000**					**$ -**	**$ 419,433**	**$ -**	**$ 419,433**
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BLACKROCK LIQ INST GOV FUND	$ 61,563,599	0.66	0.66	5/31/22	6/1/22	$ 12,792	$ -	$ -	$ 12,792
Money Market Funds	262006208	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT-I	580,080,177	0.63	0.63	5/31/22	6/1/22	239,325	-	-	239,325
Money Market Funds	31607A703	FIDELITY INST GOV FUND	14,358,065	0.55	0.55	5/31/22	6/1/22	6,744	-	-	6,744
Money Market Funds	608919718	FEDERATED GOVERNMENT OBL-PRM	11,108,312	0.63	0.63	5/31/22	6/1/22	5,982	-	-	5,982
Money Market Funds	61747C707	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT FUND	646,864,888	0.64	0.64	5/31/22	6/1/22	319,458	-	-	319,458
Money Market Funds	85749T517	STATE ST INST US GOV MM-OPP	400,275,774	0.65	0.65	5/31/22	6/1/22	175,135	-	-	175,135
Subtotals			**$ 1,714,250,815**					**$ 759,437**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 759,437**
Supranationals	459058ES8	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	$ 64,387,000	1.88	0.33	12/16/21	10/7/22	$ 100,658	$ (84,103)	$ -	$ 16,556
Supranationals	459058JV6	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	100,000,000	0.13	0.26	4/20/21	4/20/23	10,500	8,790	-	19,290
Supranationals	4581X0CC0	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	25,756,000	3.00	0.65	12/15/21	10/4/23	64,390	(50,964)	-	13,426
Supranationals	45906M3B5	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	100,000,000	1.98	1.98	3/23/22	6/14/24	165,000	-	-	165,000
Supranationals	459056HV2	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	50,000,000	1.50	0.79	11/2/21	8/28/24	62,500	(29,623)	-	32,877
Supranationals	4581X0DZ8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	50,000,000	0.50	0.78	11/4/21	9/23/24	20,833	11,897	-	32,730
Supranationals	45950VQG4	INTL FINANCE CORP	10,000,000	0.44	0.72	10/22/21	9/23/24	3,667	2,362	-	6,029
Supranationals	4581X0CM8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	100,000,000	2.13	0.58	4/26/21	1/15/25	177,083	(129,379)	-	47,704
Supranationals	459058JB0	INTL BK RECON & DEVELOP	40,000,000	0.63	0.56	7/23/21	4/22/25	20,867	(1,947)	-	18,919
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	28,900,000	0.63	0.99	11/1/21	7/15/25	15,052	8,734	-	23,786
Supranationals	45818WDG8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK	19,500,000	0.82	0.75	8/25/21	2/27/26	13,325	(1,071)	-	12,254
Subtotals			**$ 588,543,000**					**$ 653,875**	**$ (265,304)**	**$ -**	**$ 388,571**
Grand Totals			**$ 15,106,807,815**					**$ 10,154,569**	**$ (304,020)**	**$ -**	**$ 9,850,549**

[1] Yield to maturity is calculated at purchase

Investment Transactions
Pooled Fund

For month ended May 31, 2022

Transaction	Settle	Maturity	Type of Investment	Issuer Name	CUSIP	Par Value	Coupon	YTM	Price	Interest	Transaction
Purchase	5/2/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	$ 50,000,000	0.64	0.64	$ 100.00	$ -	$ 50,000,000
Purchase	5/3/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	10,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	10,000,000
Purchase	5/6/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	53,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	53,000,000
Purchase	5/9/22	1/4/23	Negotiable CDs	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	89114WWV3	50,000,000	2.26	2.26	100.00	-	50,000,000
Purchase	5/9/22	1/24/23	Negotiable CDs	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	89114WWX9	50,000,000	2.36	2.36	100.00	-	50,000,000
Purchase	5/10/22	9/6/22	Commercial Paper	APPLE INC	03785EJ62	40,000,000	0.00	1.20	99.60	-	39,841,333
Purchase	5/10/22	9/14/22	Commercial Paper	MUFG BANK LTD NY	62479MJE4	40,000,000	0.00	1.61	99.44	-	39,774,222
Purchase	5/10/22	9/16/22	Federal Agencies	FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT	313385F92	25,000,000	0.00	1.12	99.60	-	24,899,667
Purchase	5/12/22	1/18/23	Negotiable CDs	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	06367CUZ8	50,000,000	2.28	2.28	100.00	-	50,000,000
Purchase	5/12/22	6/14/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130A1XJ2	25,500,000	2.88	2.77	100.21	301,396	25,853,926
Purchase	5/13/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	50,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	50,000,000
Purchase	5/16/22	5/16/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENWP1	45,000,000	0.00	0.07	99.87	-	44,939,250
Purchase	5/16/22	5/16/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENWP1	50,000,000	2.63	2.69	99.87	-	49,932,500
Purchase	5/16/22	6/14/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130A1XJ2	50,000,000	2.88	2.67	100.41	606,944	50,810,944
Purchase	5/17/22	3/27/23	Negotiable CDs	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	06367CV46	50,000,000	2.60	2.60	100.00	-	50,000,000
Purchase	5/18/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	13,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	13,000,000
Purchase	5/18/22	6/14/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130A1XJ2	15,955,000	2.88	2.71	100.34	196,224	16,204,674
Purchase	5/18/22	6/14/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130A1XJ2	17,980,000	2.88	2.70	100.36	221,129	18,264,958
Purchase	5/19/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	184,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	184,000,000
Purchase	5/23/22	5/23/25	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENXE5	6,000,000	2.85	2.90	99.86	-	5,991,600
Purchase	5/23/22	5/23/25	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENXE5	20,000,000	2.85	2.90	99.86	-	19,972,000
Purchase	5/24/22	3/27/23	Negotiable CDs	ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY	78012U5Z4	50,000,000	2.58	2.58	100.00	-	50,000,000
Purchase	5/26/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	BLACKROCK LIQ INST GOV F	09248U718	48,000,000	0.66	0.66	100.00	-	48,000,000
Purchase	5/26/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	100,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	100,000,000
Purchase	5/26/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	100,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	100,000,000
Purchase	5/26/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	STATE ST INST US GOV MM-	85749T517	100,000,000	0.65	0.65	100.00	-	100,000,000
Purchase	5/27/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	52,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	52,000,000
Purchase	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	BLACKROCK LIQ INST GOV F	09248U718	12,792	0.66	0.66	100.00	-	12,792
Purchase	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	239,325	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	239,325
Purchase	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	FIDELITY INST GOV FUND	31607A703	6,744	0.55	0.55	100.00	-	6,744
Purchase	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	FEDERATED GOVERNMENT OBL	608919718	5,982	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	5,982
Purchase	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	319,458	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	319,458
Purchase	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	105,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	105,000,000
Purchase	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	STATE ST INST US GOV MM-	85749T517	175,135	0.65	0.65	100.00	-	175,135
Subtotals						**$1,451,194,437**	**1.15**	**1.24**	**$ 99.98**	**$ 1,325,694**	**$1,452,244,511**
Sale	5/2/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	$ 136,000,000	0.63	0.63	$ 100.00	$ -	$ 136,000,000
Sale	5/5/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	10,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	10,000,000
Sale	5/9/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	107,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	107,000,000
Sale	5/10/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	16,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	16,000,000
Sale	5/11/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	30,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	30,000,000
Sale	5/12/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	56,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	56,000,000
Sale	5/16/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	105,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	105,000,000
Sale	5/17/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	67,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	67,000,000
Sale	5/20/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	2,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	2,000,000
Sale	5/23/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	120,000,000	0.64	0.64	100.00	-	120,000,000
Sale	5/24/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	5,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	5,000,000
Sale	5/25/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	22,000,000	0.63	0.63	100.00	-	22,000,000
Subtotals						**$ 676,000,000**	**0.63**	**0.63**	**$ 100.00**	**$ -**	**$ 676,000,000**

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

Transaction	Settle	Maturity	Type of Investment	Issuer Name	CUSIP	Par Value	Coupon	YTM	Price	Interest	Transaction
Maturity	5/6/22	5/6/22	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AMEY4	$ 10,000,000	0.06	0.06	100.00	$ 3,000	$ 10,003,000
Maturity	5/6/22	5/6/22	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AMEY4	10,000,000	0.06	0.06	100.00	3,000	10,003,000
Maturity	5/6/22	5/6/22	Federal Agencies	FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT	313385WL6	50,000,000	0.00	0.06	100.00	-	50,000,000
Maturity	5/9/22	5/9/22	Negotiable CDs	BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO	06367CHR1	100,000,000	0.17	0.17	100.00	144,972	100,144,972
Maturity	5/10/22	5/10/22	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AMGM8	50,000,000	0.06	0.06	100.00	15,000	50,015,000
Maturity	5/13/22	5/13/22	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AMJ37	30,000,000	0.06	0.06	100.00	9,000	30,009,000
Maturity	5/13/22	5/13/22	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AMJ37	45,000,000	0.06	0.06	100.00	13,500	45,013,500
Maturity	5/16/22	5/16/22	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133EKLR5	25,000,000	2.25	2.32	100.00	281,250	25,281,250
Maturity	5/16/22	5/16/22	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133EKLR5	35,000,000	2.25	2.32	100.00	393,750	35,393,750
Maturity	5/19/22	5/19/22	U.S. Treasuries	TREASURY BILL	912796H44	200,000,000	0.00	0.06	100.00	-	200,000,000
Maturity	5/25/22	5/25/22	Negotiable CDs	TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY	89114WBD6	50,000,000	0.21	0.21	100.00	106,458	50,106,458
Maturity	5/31/22	5/31/22	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828XD7	50,000,000	1.88	0.08	100.00	468,750	50,468,750
Subtotals						**$ 655,000,000**	**0.40**	**0.30**	**$ -**	**$ 1,438,681**	**$ 656,438,681**
Interest	5/10/22	5/10/23	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133EMYX4	$ 12,500,000	0.13	0.19	0.00	0.00	$ 7,813
Interest	5/10/22	5/10/23	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133EMYX4	25,000,000	0.13	0.19	0.00	0.00	15,625
Interest	5/10/22	5/10/23	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133EMYX4	75,000,000	0.13	0.19	0.00	0.00	46,875
Interest	5/15/22	5/15/24	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	91282CCC3	50,000,000	0.25	0.45	0.00	0.00	62,500
Interest	5/15/22	5/15/25	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828XB1	50,000,000	2.13	0.57	0.00	0.00	531,250
Interest	5/15/22	5/15/26	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828R36	50,000,000	1.63	0.69	0.00	0.00	406,250
Interest	5/15/22	5/15/26	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828R36	50,000,000	1.63	0.81	0.00	0.00	406,250
Interest	5/15/22	11/15/22	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828TY6	50,000,000	1.63	0.12	0.00	0.00	406,250
Interest	5/15/22	11/15/23	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828WE6	50,000,000	2.75	1.71	0.00	0.00	687,500
Interest	5/15/22	11/15/24	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828G38	50,000,000	2.25	0.52	0.00	0.00	562,500
Interest	5/15/22	11/15/24	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828G38	50,000,000	2.25	0.48	0.00	0.00	562,500
Interest	5/16/22	11/16/26	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AQ7L1	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	0.00	0.00	167,188
Interest	5/16/22	11/16/26	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AQ7L1	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	0.00	0.00	167,188
Interest	5/16/22	11/16/26	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AQ7L1	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	0.00	0.00	167,188
Interest	5/16/22	11/16/26	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130AQ7L1	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	0.00	0.00	167,188
Interest	5/17/22	11/17/25	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENEG1	39,675,000	1.05	1.08	0.00	0.00	208,294
Interest	5/17/22	11/17/25	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENEG1	55,000,000	1.05	1.09	0.00	0.00	288,750
Interest	5/18/22	10/19/26	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130APPR0	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	0.00	0.00	178,750
Interest	5/18/22	10/19/26	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130APPR0	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	0.00	0.00	178,750
Interest	5/18/22	10/19/26	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130APPR0	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	0.00	0.00	178,750
Interest	5/18/22	10/19/26	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	3130APPR0	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	0.00	0.00	178,750
Interest	5/18/22	11/18/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENEJ5	10,000,000	0.88	0.91	0.00	0.00	43,750
Interest	5/18/22	11/18/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENEJ5	10,000,000	0.88	0.91	0.00	0.00	43,750
Interest	5/18/22	11/18/24	Federal Agencies	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3133ENEJ5	50,000,000	0.88	0.91	0.00	0.00	218,750
Interest	5/31/22	5/31/24	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	912828XT2	50,000,000	2.00	0.43	0.00	0.00	500,000
Interest	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	BLACKROCK LIQ INST GOV F	09248U718	61,563,599	0.66	0.66	0.00	0.00	12,792
Interest	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	DREYFUS GOVERN CASH MGMT	262006208	580,080,177	0.63	0.63	0.00	0.00	239,325
Interest	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	FIDELITY INST GOV FUND	31607A703	14,358,065	0.55	0.55	0.00	0.00	6,744
Interest	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	FEDERATED GOVERNMENT OBL	608919718	11,108,312	0.63	0.63	0.00	0.00	5,982
Interest	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT	61747C707	646,864,888	0.64	0.64	0.00	0.00	319,458
Interest	5/31/22	6/1/22	Money Market Funds	STATE ST INST US GOV MM-	85749T517	400,275,774	0.65	0.65	0.00	0.00	175,135
Interest	5/31/22	11/30/26	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	91282CDK4	50,000,000	1.25	1.22	0.00	0.00	312,500
Interest	5/31/22	11/30/26	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	91282CDK4	50,000,000	1.25	1.20	0.00	0.00	312,500
Interest	5/31/22	11/30/26	U.S. Treasuries	US TREASURY	91282CDK4	50,000,000	1.25	2.59	0.00	0.00	312,500
Subtotals						**$2,791,425,815**	**0.93**	**0.76**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 8,079,294**

Grand Totals	**34**	**Purchases**
	(12)	**Sales**
	(12)	**Maturities / Calls**
	10	**Change in number of positions**

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT)
Subject:	FW: SAN FRANCISCO POLICE - Required Reporting Pursuant to Admin Code Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting
Date:	Friday, June 10, 2022 10:36:00 AM
Attachments:	1st QTR 2022 QADR v4.pdf Q1 2022 Victim Demographics.pdf SFPD_ 2022_Q1_CoverLetter.pdf

---

From: Fountain, Christine (POL) <christine.fountain@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2022 9:28 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Cunningham, Jason (POL) <jason.cunningham@sfgov.org>; Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL) <diana.oliva-aroche@sfgov.org>; McGuire, Catherine (POL) <catherine.mcguire@sfgov.org>
Subject: SAN FRANCISCO POLICE - Required Reporting Pursuant to Admin Code Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting

Good morning, Madam Clerk,

On behalf of Chief William Scott, the attached reports for Quarter 1 2022 are being submitted pursuant to Admin Code Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting,

It is respectfully requested these documents be shared with the President of the Board as well as the other Supervisors.

Thank you for your assistance.

Have a wonderful weekend.

Christine Fountain (she/her)
Office of the Chief of Police
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco CA 94158
415.837.7000
christine.fountain@sfgov.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

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

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

WILLIAM SCOTT
CHIEF OF POLICE

June 10, 2022

The Honorable London N. Breed
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

The Honorable Cindy Elias
Vice President, Police Commission
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

Director Sheryl Davis
Executive Director, Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Breed, Supervisor Walton, Commissioner Elias, and Executive Director Davis,

RE: First Quarter 2022 Report per Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements – Stops Data, Use of Force, Crime Victim, and Domestic Violence

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

The 96A quarterly information and comparisons provide an opportunity to analyze the progress of reforms indirectly correlated with policing engagements. In 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to pass local legislation supporting police reforms and specified law enforcement reporting requirements pertaining to stops, searches, arrests, uses of force, and alleged bias-related complaints. The data outlined in this report is an effort to continue meeting a quantitative analysis of the 1st quarter data, utilizing a basic population benchmark against police districts and activities.

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

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

Sincerely,

William Scott

WILLIAM SCOTT
Chief of Police

/cf
Attachemnts

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Quarterly Activity and Data Report
Quarter 1 2022



Safety with Respect

William Scott,
Chief of Police
San Francisco
Police Department

Table of Contents

Quarterly Activity and Data Report 3
Background 4
Collaborative Reform Initiative Status 6
Collaborative Reform Update 6
Remaining CRI Recommendations 7
CRI Sustainability 8
Data Exploration 10
Year-over-Year RIPA/SFPD data comparison 10
Q1 Overview 34
Suspects 35
Stops and Searches 36
Stops and Searches 37
Use of Force 43
Arrests 46
Bias-Related Complaints 49
Q1 Quantitative Analysis Per Capita Population Benchmark 51
Q1 Quantitative Analysis Per Capita Population Benchmark 52
Background 66
Domestic Violence Reporting - Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b 66
SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report 69
Stop Data Quarter 1 2022 70
Calls for Service, Q1 2022 84
Suspects, Q1 2022 85
Use of Force, Q1 2022 86
DHR Investigated Complaints of Bias 106
Use of Force and Arrest Data by Police District 107
Q1 Data By Police District 107
Use of Force Incidents, by District 108
Number of Subjects on Whom Force Was Used, by District 109
Total Uses of Force, by District 110
Total Arrests by District 111

Central District 112
Southern District 117
Bayview District 122
Mission District 127
Northern District 132
Park District 137
Richmond District 142
Ingleside District 147
Taraval District 152
Tenderloin District 157
Airport 162
Outside of SF/Unknown 166
Glossary 167

Quarterly Activity and Data Report
Quarter 1, 2022

Background

The Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (AB953) took effect on January 1, 2016, and requires California law enforcement agencies to collect and report data to the Office of the California Attorney General. The requirements of Assembly Bill 953 include reporting from California cities and police departments on any complaints alleging racial or identity profiling and detailed demographic data for traffic and pedestrian stops.

In 2016, the City and County of San Francisco also passed local legislation to support the police reform efforts of the San Francisco Police Department. The Board of Supervisors voted unanimously on an ordinance that established Administrative Code Sec. 96A (Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements) and specified reporting requirements for the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). The Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR) (previously named the "96A report," short for the Administrative Code Sec. 96A: Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements) serves to meet the quarterly reporting requirements and includes data pertaining to stops, searches, arrests, use of force and alleged bias-related complaints. Additionally, in Quarter Three of 2020, the Department started conducting occasional in- depth analysis with rotating scope and topic. At the same time, the QADR provided references and discussion of academic research on the topic of disparities in policing. In 2021, SFPD outlined its method and approaches to applying academic research in the field of disparities in policing. The primary mechanisms for these efforts center on policy changes to many Department General Orders and training improvements. That work is ongoing and improved continuously through the implementation of additional academic research, audit and other recommendations from the Police Commission, Department of Police Accountability, and community members, and other best practices.

The data presented in this report are analyzed over time and can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of current police reforms undertaken by the San Francisco Police Department. These data inform analysis on disproportionate contact and can be utilized to inform and improve policies, training, and tactics in policing. This report serves to demonstrate that SFPD is:

- committed to delivering on the values encapsulated by "Safety with Respect," the Strategic Framework developed from recommendations of the Collaborative Reform Initiative,
- actively seeking and implementing ways to improve transparency and accountability to San Franciscans,

- conducting data reporting recommended by President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. and
- meeting the requirements of the San Francisco Administrative Code Sections 96A (Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements), and 96A.5 (Victim Demographic Reporting) and 96D (Domestic Violence Reporting).

The data included in this report covers the time period: January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022.

Collaborative Reform Update

Collaborative Reform Initiative Status

The SFPD received its Phase III Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI) report, compiled by an external contractor and validated by the California Department of Justice, was issued in February 2022. The report notes that SFPD has reached substantial compliance on 245 of 272 recommendations originally issued by the Federal Department of Justice.



As of April 6, the 5 focus areas of CRI held the following status:

Focus Area	Status	Total
1 - Use of Force	In Progress	7
	Substantial Compliance	51
2 - Bias	In Progress	7
	Substantial Compliance	47
3 - Community Policing	In Progress	6
	Substantial Compliance	54
4 - Accountability	In Progress	7
	Substantial Compliance	61
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	In Progress	0
	Substantial Compliance	32
Sub Total	**In Progress**	**27**
Sub Total	**Substantial Compliance**	**245**
Grand Total		**272**

SFPD's website provides documentation for all substantially compliant recommendations, including SFPD's submission summary, and narrative summaries detailing compliance as determined by the independent evaluator and validated by the California Department of Justice. The website also includes an interactive dashboard providing specifics for all recommendations, including the wording and statuses of each.[1]

Remaining CRI Recommendations

The remaining 27 recommendations group into 6 major projects, under 4 remaining focus areas, as noted below.

In Progress Recommendations
Project Plans

Use of Force
Arrests Systems, Data & Analysis
20.1
20.2
20.3
20.4
UoF Systems, Data & Analysis
21.1
22.1

Community Policing
Annual Plans/Cmty Forums
26.1
40.2
40.6
48.1
48.2

Bias
Data-informed Professional Development
28.1
28.4
28.5
30.3
30.4
35.3
79.1
79.2
79.3

Accountability
Data-informed Management Tools
68.1
Discipline Review Board; Metrics
69.2
69.3

Understanding the need for a continued fair and impartial evaluation of the Department's progress, the City has renewed, through April 2024, a Memorandum of Understanding with the California Department of Justice. Additionally, SFPD intends to

[1] https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/your-sfpd/police-reform

extend the independent consultants' external review contract in order to continue to bring their professional expertise and knowledge of best practices in other agencies.[2]

These remaining projects are expected to be the lengthiest to complete of the 272 original recommendations, due primarily to requirements around technology procurement, design, and implementation, as well as the need to plan for and hire permanent staff with analytical capacity and to support the ongoing improvements necessary to sustain reform. As noted in the Phase III report, SFPD has begun work on these projects and will continue to report progress to the Police Commission and on the SFPD website.

CRI Sustainability

To make collaborative reform a long term, permanent driver of change in the SFPD, it is necessary not only to complete a recommendation once, but also to re-engage that recommendation routinely to ensure its continued compliance. This process is referred to as 'CRI Sustainability.'

Sustainability Requirements

Types of Review:
- Annual
- Quarterly
- Rolling (Bi-Annual)
- Single Document or Practice

Total Recommendations Requiring Sustainability Efforts:
187

	Use of Force	Bias	Community Policing	Accountability	Recruitment and Retention
Annual	9	12	29	15	8
Quarterly	16	20	16	20	16
Rolling (Bi-Annual)	11	1	15	13	7
Single Document or Practice	5	5	7	0	0
Total Recs for Topic*	37	34	47	42	27

*Some recommendations require multiple types of updates in a single recommendation.

[2] https://sfgov.org/policecommission/sites/default/files/Documents/PoliceCommission/PoliceCommission120121-DOJ_SFPD_MOU_DRAFT_ADDENDUM%20%286%29.pdf

SFPD has reviewed all 245 completed recommendations and identified 187 that require a sustainability effort. These efforts are usually dictated by the compliance measures assigned to each recommendation and can include things like a policy review/update, a data or document audit, or a staff training. The expectation is that the reviews, reports, and analyses will provide opportunities to evaluate and improve upon the processes established and documented for CRI. Further, these sustainability efforts may be an annual, bi-annual, quarterly, or one-time requirement.

An example of sustainability that represents continuous improvement mechanisms is the most recent update of the Department General Order related to Use of Force. In 2016, after the commencement of the implementation phase of the Collaborative Reform partnership, the President of the San Francisco Police Commission and representatives from the Police Department and the Department of Police Accountability worked together to update this policy. In 2020, after an audit performed by the San Francisco Controller's Office, a report from the Center for Policing Equity, and ongoing reviews of community complaints and national concern regarding law enforcement's use of pressure to the head and neck, SFPD proposed an update to this policy. A new policy was adopted by the Commission in January and, after an implementation period, went into effect on April 12, 2022.

An example of a repeated process and reporting effort, CRI recommendation 40.1 required the generation of a Community Policing Strategic Plan. The Community Policing Strategic Plan was developed by an SFPD-led working group of community members and representatives and SFPD personnel. It was developed during 2017 and 2018, with publication in late 2018. The Community Policing Strategic Plan further required unit and station plans be developed and published annually, the first of which have been completed and can be viewed online.

As previously noted, SFPD has identified 187 recommendations with regularly-required reporting or reviews. The remaining 58 recommendations were implemented as a one-time activity to reach substantial compliance. SFPD has begun the first year of validation that the ongoing work is being completed. Also, SFPD will review to ensure that circumstances that established the one-time recommendations as substantially compliant are still in place. These reviews are critical to the success of sustained and ongoing change in SFPD.

Year-over-Year RIPA/SFPD data comparison

The State Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) Board ("The Board") oversees the State's implementation of AB953 of the same name. As part of this oversight, the Board publishes an annual report[3] that considers the previous year's stop data as submitted by law enforcement agencies across California.

The Board's report published early in 2022 provides a helpful data visualization[4] that consolidated statewide data from 2020 across a variety of metrics. This quarter's in-depth analysis replicates those visualizations using SFPD stop data from 2020 and 2021.

Of note, the statewide data includes the stops conducted by the CHP, which accounted for over 1.69 million stops in 2020, or about 55% of the total. This skews statewide metrics because CHP has an outsized contribution to the data. This a significant characteristic of these data and should be given consideration when reviewing these data.

Number of Stops Comparison 2019 to 2020 and 2020 to 2021

Year	Statewide Number of Stops	Statewide % Change	**SFPD Number of Stops**	**SFPD % Change**
2019	3,995,686	N/A	102,459	N/A
2020	2,937,662	-26.5%	38,709	-62.22%
2021	Pending release	TBD	27,548	-28.83%

From 2019 through 2020, during the height of the COVID 19 pandemic, statewide there was a 26.7% reduction in stops, as compared to a 62.2% reduction in stops by the SFPD from 2019 to 2020, with a further reduction of 28.8% in from 2020 to 2021.

[3] https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/board/reports#current
[4] https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-quick-facts-2022.pdf All credit for the original inspiration and methodology for these outstanding visuals go to the RIPA report authorship team at Cal DOJ.

Demographics of Stopped Individuals Comparison 2020 and 2021, State and SFPD





The above chart depicts the by percentage race/ethnicity demographic for all stops conducted by the SFPD in 2020 (left column per race/ethnicity) and 2021 (right column).

As compared to statewide stops, the SFPD conducts stops of Hispanic/Latino(a) individuals at a lower percentage of total stops and at a higher percentage of total stops for Black/African American individuals in 2020. In San Francisco, the percentage of Black/African American individuals stopped by the SFPD declined from 2020 to 2021 from 27% to 24.7%.

Stops with a Perceived Disability

As compared to the State, a higher percentage of all stops include those individuals who were perceived to have a disability. SFPD's rate was 4% in 2020, increasing to 5% in 2021, as compared to the statewide 1.2%.

Perceived Disability, Statewide, 2020







Stops by Perceived Gender

In 2020, stops statewide were 72.7% male, as compared to the SFPD, where stops were 78% and 76.4% male in 2020 and 2021 respectively.

Stops by Perceived Gender, Statewide 2020



Stops by Perceived Gender, SFPD, 2020



Stops by Perceived Gender, SFPD, 2021



Racial/Ethnic Disparities

The Board identified and reviewed points of police contact where disparity may exist, including rates of demographic representation among stops that result in searches, uses of force, and/or no action taken.[5]







SFPD trends broadly mirror the State (Black individuals have the highest disparity across all 3 measures), but SFPD rates are higher across all categories in both 2020 and 2021 as compared to statewide in 2020.

[5] The State quick guide displayed bar charts for these rates outside of normal proportion. For example, the 20.7% rate of search of Black individuals statewide occupies more than 50% of the associated bar. The reasoning for this is unknown but is likely for ease of visual identification. SFPD attempt to match this proportion, but due to a lack of backing data, are our best estimation of proportions. Readers should take care when comparing state to SFPD charts.

Search and Discovery Rates by Perceived Gender

When comparing SFPD 2020 to Statewide 2020 stop data, SFPD's search rates vary from the State's most significantly for the Gender Non-Conforming, Transgender Man/Boy, and Transgender Woman/Girl categories of perceived gender. The 2021 data show shifts, the largest of which is in the Transgender Man/Boy category. SFPD discovery rates in 2020 are consistently higher than the State's reported rates, and, with the exception of Transgender Man/Boy and Transgender Woman/Girl, remained so in 2021. The low number of interactions, and even lower instances of contraband found for Gender Non-conforming, Transgender Man/Boy, and Transgender Woman/Girl can cause such variation in rates when comparing across years.

Search And Discovery Rates by Perceived Gender, Statewide, 2020



Search And Discovery Rates by Perceived Gender, SFPD, 2020



Search And Discovery Rates by Perceived Gender, SFPD, 2021



Reason for Stop by Perceived Gender

As compared to stops Statewide in 2020, SFPD used reasonable suspicion at a higher rate for all perceived genders to conduct stops.







Actions Taken During Stops by Perceived Gender

The types of action taken by SFPD, alongside Statewide data, is shown below. Note that different scales were used for each of these charts.







Search and Discovery Rates by Perceived Disability

In 2020, SFPD had a lower search rate for individuals with perceived mental health disabilities and a higher search rate for individuals without a perceived disability or other disability. In all categories, SFPD's discovery rates are higher than Statewide rates.







Use of Force by Perceived Disability

SFPD Use of Force rates are higher than Statewide rates in 2020. Comparing SFPD data from 2020 to 2021, rates declined across all categories.







Actions Taken During Stops by Perceived Disability

For those individuals with perceived disability, SFPD's rates of actions taken are closer in comparison with Statewide rates than those with no perceived disability. However, the difference between rates of action taken among those with a perceived disability and those without is higher for SFPD than the State. For those with a perceived disability, in 2021, as compared to 2020, SFPD search and handcuffing rates decreased, while curbside/patrol car detention rates increased.






Actions Taken During Stops, SFPD - 2021
Percent of Stops of Disability Group
50%
45%
40%
35%
30%
25%
20%
15%
10%
5%
0%
Searched
Curbside / Patrol Car Detention
Handcuffed
Ordered Vehicle Exit
Disability
No Disability

Persons by race/ethnicity asked for consent to search

In 2020, SFPD's rate of requesting consent to search was the same or lower than the Statewide rates across all race/ethnicity groups. SFPD rates were similar in 2021 data, with the exception of the significant increase for Native American individuals. The low number of interactions, and even lower instances of consent search requests, can cause this type of fluctuation.







Consent given response rate

The SFPD had a consent response rate 1 percentage point lower as compared to the statewide average in 2020. This response rate was one percentage point less in 2021 as compared to 2020.

Consent Given Response Rate, Statewide, 2020







Percent of Consent Only Searches by Race/Ethnicity

Comparing SFPD 2020 data to statewide stops data, in 2020, the SFPD requested consent searches at a higher rate for non-traffic violations across all groups.







Stops Resulting in Supervision Searches: Disparities in Search Rates and Discovery Rates

The Board compared the rates of supervision searches and contraband found (discoveries) for each demographic group with the rates of whites. The below graph represents the value that results when subtracting the rates for a given demographic group from the rate for whites among stops with supervision searches and the resulting discoveries. For example, the Statewide search rate for African Americans stopped in 2020 was 2.3 percentage points higher than the search rate for whites.

SFPD 2020 supervision search rates by percentage, as compared to white individuals, broadly match the statewide 2020 data. SFPD discovery rates in 2020 by percentage, as compared to white individuals, was generally higher in all cases except Native American and Pacific Islander racial/ethnic groups.

Supervision Searches and Discovery Rates by Percentage, Statewide, 2020



Supervision Searches and Discovery Rates by Percentage, SFPD, 2020



Supervision Searches and Discovery Rates by Percentage, SFPD, 2021



Stops Resulting in Supervision Searches: Reasons for Stop

Of stops where SFPD officers conducted a supervision only search, as compared to statewide data in 2020, the SFPD generally tracks statewide trends with some variability in multiracial, Native American and Pacific Islander groups.

Reason for Stop: Supervision Only Searches, Statewide, 2020







Traffic Violation by Type and Race/Ethnicity

The Board grouped types of traffic stops into moving violations, and non-moving and equipment violations, and then sorted by race/ethnicity. Statewide, Black individuals had the highest percentage of traffic stops be for Non-Moving and Equipment violations in 2020.

When comparing moving violations against non-moving and equipment violations by race/ethnicity, in 2020, the SFPD had the same or greater number of Non-Moving/ Equipment violations as compared to statewide data. This trend reduced across most groups when comparing SFPD data from 2020 to 2021.

Traffic Violation Type, Statewide, 2020




Traffic Violation Type, SFPD - 2020
Asian
Black / African American
Hispanic / Latino(a)
Middle Eastern / South Asian
Multiracial
Native American
Pacific Islander
White
81%
19%
52%
48%
65%
35%
64%
36%
58%
42%
48%
52%
73%
27%
76%
24%
0%
10%
20%
30%
40%
50%
60%
70%
80%
90%
100%
Moving
Non-Moving/Equipment


Traffic Violation Type, SFPD - 2021
Asian
Black / African American
Hispanic / Latino(a)
Middle Eastern / South Asian
Multiracial
Native American
Pacific Islander
White
85%
15%
63%
37%
71%
29%
71%
29%
58%
42%
67%
33%
77%
23%
81%
19%
0%
10%
20%
30%
40%
50%
60%
70%
80%
90%
100%
Moving
Non-Moving/Equipment

Select non-moving violations by race

The State's data visualization that inspired this data analysis did a deeper look at two selected non-moving violations. This analysis closely mirrors the state, however, because our top two non-moving violations are different from the State (the State chose bicycle violations and window obstructions, we display license and registration violations), the State charts are omitted.



When comparing no registration stops, against all other non-moving violations, by race/ethnicity, about one in five nonmoving violations are by Black/African American, White and Hispanic/Latino(a) groups.





When comparing license plate citations made by the SFPD in 2020 and 2021 compared to all non-moving violations, by race/ethnicity, Black/African Americans have a higher percentage of license plate citations compared to other racial/ethnic groups.



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

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

Q1 Overview



During the first quarter of 2022, and over the course of 2021, the City and County of San Francisco issued varying directives on changes to shelter in place, vaccination, masking, and business reopening[6]. **Data collected during the pandemic and recovery period reflect the unique circumstances of the time. Users should take care when comparing data trends across pandemic response and non-response timeframes.**

[6] Directives -- COVID-19 Health Directives -- San Francisco Department of Public Health (sfdph.org)

Suspects

SUSPECTS OBSERVED AND REPORTED

The suspect information provided includes descriptions that are generated by members of the public or observed by Department members and documented in police incident reports.

DESCRIPTION	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 2022	% of Total Suspects Q1 2022
Asian/ Pacific Islander	96	127	96	319	4.3%
Black/ African American	939	952	1029	2920	39.2%
Hispanic/ Latino	413	351	480	1244	16.7%
Native American	8	2	8	18	0.2%
White	569	545	532	1646	22.1%
Others	412	408	482	1302	17.5%
Total	**2,437**	**2,385**	**2,627**	**7,449**	**100.00%**

Total suspects observed and reported in Q1 2022 (7,449) increased by 8% from Q1 2021 (6,923). Black/ African Americans accounted for 39.2% of all suspects observed and reported in Q1-2022.



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

STOPS AND SEARCHES

In Q1- 2022, 3,769 stops showed a 57% decrease from Q1 -2021. Of those stops, 1,053 resulted in searches (28%). White subjects accounted for 35% of all stops and 32% of all searches. Black subjects accounted for 23% of stops and 34% of searches.



Compared to Q1-2021, the percentage of total stops decreased by 2% for Hispanic/Latino subjects and decreased by 3% for Black/African American subjects.



Stops and Searches

	STOPS			SEARCHES		
Perceived Race / Ethnicity	**Q1-2021 (n=8,702)**	**Q1-2022 (n=3,769)**	**%Δ from Q1-2021**	**Q1-2021 (n=1,963)**	**Q1-2022 (n=1,053)**	**%Δ from Q1-2021**
Asian	11%	12%	1.0%	4%	8%	4%
Black/ African American	26%	23%	-2.8%	38%	34%	-4%
Hispanic/ Latino	22%	20%	-2.0%	24%	22%	-2%
White	35%	35%	0.4%	29%	32%	3%
Other	6%	10%	3.3%	5%	4%	-1%

Note: “Perceived” identifiers are used to categorize demographic information specific to Stop Data Collection System

SEARCHES BY LEVEL OF DISCRETION

The Department classifies the various types of searches into three categories:

1. Discretionary[7] searches,
2. Administrative searches, and
3. Other searches.

Discretionary Searches	Administrative Searches	Other Searches
*Consent Given	*Incident to Arrest	*Officer Safety/ Safety of Others
	*Search Warrant	*Suspected Weapons
	*Vehicle Inventory	*Visible Contraband
		*Odor of Contraband
		*Canine Detection
		*Evidence of Crime
		*Emergency
		*Suspected Violation of School Policy
		*Condition of Parole/ Probation/ PRCS/ Mandatory Supervision

Discretionary searches require an officer to ask and receive consent to search. In such cases, officers have the most flexibility in determining who to search and include only those occurrences where consent is the only basis provided. Administrative searches include those that occur because of a search warrant, arrest, or vehicle inventory. Other searches have a variable range of discretion and include reasons such as officer safety, suspected weapons, visible contraband, evidence of crime, etc.

[7] In Q3, 2021, the SFPD has renamed search categories from 'Consent Only' and 'Supervision Searches' to 'Discretionary' and 'Administrative' searches to align with terminology being used by the California Department of Justice and the Race and Identity Profiling Act Board.


SFPD Discretionary Searches
July 2018 - March 2022
180
160
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
Consent only searches have decreased 49% overall since Q1-2021.
Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1
2018 2019 2020 2021 2022
Asian
Black/ African American
Hispanic/Latino
White
Other

Stops and Searches

The 1,053 total searches conducted in Q1-2022 were categorized below. Many of these incidents have more than one cause for search and are included in multiple categories.

- **Discretionary Searches: 79 (8%)**
- **Administrative Searches: 673 (64%)**
- **Other Searches: 602 (57%)**



Administrative searches have decreased by 34% overall since Q1-2021

Stops and Searches



Other searches have decreased by 53% overall since Q1-2021.

SEARCH YIELD RATES

The average yield rate for all searches was 42% in Q1-2022. The yield rate was 37% for consent only searches, 48% for supervision searches, and 47% for other searches.



	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	White	Other	TOTAL
Consent Only Searches	43%	50%	29%	30%	0%	37%
Supervision Searches	46%	49%	55%	43%	47%	48%
Other Searches	41%	45%	50%	49%	47%	47%

As noted in the Phase III SFPD Collaborative Reform Initiative report:

> **"The assumption among researchers is that if the rate of discovering contraband during searches of a particular identity group is low, then those people are "objectively less suspicious and may be searched, at least in part, because of their perceived identity."** HTTPS://OAG.CA.GOV/SITES/ALL/FILES/AGWEB/PDFS/RIPA/RIPA-BOARD-REPORT-2021.PDF AT PAGE 48.
>
> **In turn, if the hit/yield rate for a particular identity group increases, that means that officers are using more objective factors – and not a person's perceived identity – to make the decision to search a person. In short, higher hit/yield rates suggest that officers are less likely making a biased decision to search, but are rather using objective factors to inform their decision-making.**[8]"

[8] SFPD Collaborative Reform Initiative Phase III – Final Assessment Report, Hillard Heintze, 2022, p 6, footnote 11.

Use of Force

USE OF FORCE

Since the 1st quarter of 2016, total uses of force have decreased by 66% (952 to 328). More specifically, pointing of a firearm has decreased by 79% (648 to 138).



	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
	2016				2017				2018				2019				2020				2021				2022
UOF by Qtr	952	926	916	953	804	912	706	730	816	601	661	634	515	550	504	420	487	464	305	335	398	309	353	390	328

During Q1-2022, the Department responded to 140,946 total calls for service. Department officers were assaulted 47 times and force was used in 174 incidents which represented 0.12% of all calls for service. Of those 174 incidents, force was used 328 times by 215 officers against 188 subjects. **There was one Officer Involved Shooting - Use of Force incident during Q1-2022 resulting in death.**

Upcoming Methodology Change: The SFPD issued a new Use of Force general order, which went into effect on April 12th, 2022. This new general order added new reportable and documentable uses of force and expanded definitions on current types of uses of force. The Use of Force section and analyses in the Q2, 2022 QADR will account for, and explain, these changes in detail.

Use of Force



Black/African Americans were the subjects of 43% of the total uses of force, 23% against White, and 22% against Hispanic/Latino. While overall uses of force continue to decline, the proportion of those uses of force against all demographic groups has remained relatively constant, with some variability in the last few quarters. For example, from Q1 2021 to Q1 of 2022, uses of force against Asian subjects increased by 8%, to account for 11% of all uses of force in Q1, 2022 with uses of force against Black/African American subjects increasing by 6% as compared to the same quarter last year, increasing to 43% of all uses of force in Q1, 2022. Uses of force against Hispanic/Latino and White subjects decreased by 5% and 3% respectively.

Race/Ethnicity	Uses of Force Q1-2021 (n=398)	Uses of Force Q1-2022 (n=328)	%Δ from 2020
Asian	3%	11%	8%
Black/African American	37%	43%	6%
Hispanic/Latino	27%	22%	-5%
White	26%	23%	-3%
Other	8%	2%	-6%

Use of Force

TYPES OF FORCE USED

Total Uses of Force have decreased by 19% from Q1-2021. Pointing of a firearm, physical control and strike by object/fist were the top three types of force used and accounted for 86% of total Uses of Force in Q1 2022.

Uses of Force	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% Change
Pointing of Firearms	194	138	-29%
Physical Control	112	108	-4%
Strike by Object/Fist	42	37	-12%
OC Spray	12	15	25%
ERIW	14	9	-36%
Impact Weapon	13	6	-54%
Spike Strips	10	5	-50%
Other	5	6	20%
Firearm	0	4	not calc
Vehicle Deflection	**2**	**0**	**-100%**
Grand Total	**404**	**328**	**-19%**

USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

There was one Use of Force incident that resulted in death during Q1-2022.

On the morning of Thursday, January 20, 2022, at approximately 7:26 a.m., San Francisco police officers responded to multiple calls for service regarding reports of a suspicious individual in the International Terminal of San Francisco International Airport (SFO). Arriving on scene, SFPD officers made contact with a male individual, establishing that he appeared to be armed with a handgun. In the course of law enforcement officers' engagement with the subject, an officer-involved shooting occurred involving San Francisco police officers. Responding officers rendered aid to the man and summoned medics to the scene. The individual succumbed to his injuries.

Arrests

ARRESTS

There were 2,777 arrests during the Q1-2022, a 15% decrease from Q1-2021 (3,282). Black/African American subjects accounted for 33% of all arrests, while Hispanic/Latino subjects accounted for 30%.





Percentage of Total Arrests			
Race/ Ethnicity	Q1-2021 (n=3,282)	Q1-2022 (n=2,777)	%Δ from 2021
Asian	5%	7%	1%
Black/ African American	37%	33%	-4%
Hispanic/Latino	28%	30%	2%
White	26%	27%	1%
Unknown	4%	3%	-1%

Overall arrests of Black/African American subjects declined by approximately 4% in Q1 2022 compared to Q1 2021.

*Detailed data regarding age groups and gender can be found later in this report.

Arrests

ARRESTS BY DISTRICT

It is important to note that arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are investigated by and reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

The "Outside SF/Other" category includes arrests made by Department members outside the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco by the SFPD and arrests inside the City and County of San Francisco by agencies other than the SFPD that are captured by our Incident Reporting system.

Overall arrests made by Department members within the City and County of San Francisco jurisdiction declined in Q1-2022 compared to Q1-2021. In addition, Outside SF arrests decreased by 52%.

District	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% change
Co. A - Central	386	331	-14%
Co. B - Southern	424	395	-7%
Co. C - Bayview	390	247	-37%
Co. D - Mission	479	405	-15%
Co. E - Northern	340	319	-6%
Co. F - Park	129	76	-41%
Co. G - Richmond	135	100	-26%
Co. H - Ingleside	253	137	-46%
Co. I - Taraval	148	135	-9%
Co. J - Tenderloin	485	578	19%
Outside SF	113	54	-52%
Total	**3,282**	**2,777**	**-15%**

Bias-Related Complaints

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

The Department is required to obtain information from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) regarding the total number of complaints received during the reporting period that it characterizes as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity. The Department also is required to include in its report the total number of complaints DPA closed during the reporting period that were characterized as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity, as well as the total number of each type of disposition for such complaints.

Cases Received in Q1-2022

Type of Case Received	# of Cases
Racial Bias	1
Gender Bias	0
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
TOTAL	1

DPA received 159 total cases for the quarter.
1 officer was named for allegations of racial or gender bias.
Total cases received in Q1-2022 involved Racial or Gender Bias: 1 Case

During Q1-2022, DPA completed 2 complaint investigation cases in which there was an allegation of racial/ethnic bias. There were no sustained findings indicating bias.
There were no sustained allegations of racial or gender bias in Q1-2022.

Q1-2022 Case Closures and Dispositions

Type of Case	Sustained	Mediated	Unfounded	No Finding	Insufficient Evidence	Improper Conduct	Referral	TOTAL
Racial Bias	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Homophobic Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racial, Homophobic, Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2

*Source: Department of Police Accountability

Bias-Related Complaints

BIAS-RELATED COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY SFPD, AND INVESTIGATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

As part of the Department's commitment to transparency, the Department also reports on all bias-related complaints received internally from members of the Department and forwarded to the Department of Human Resources (DHR) for investigation. Closed cases may include complaints received in previous quarters. Bias-related complaints are referred to as Employment Equal Opportunity (EEO) cases by DHR.

Q1-2022 Bias Cases Received

EEO Cases Received	Q1-2022
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	5
Disability Discrimination	0
Hostile Work Environment	0
Gender Discrimination	0
Race Discrimination	1
Race / Sex Discrimination	0
Retaliation	0
Sexual Harassment	0
Sexual Orientation	0
TOTAL	**6**

Complainants: 5 Department members; 1 Outside Civilian

Respondents (Named): SFPD (named in 5 complaints); 2 Sworn Officers

Total Respondents: 5 SFPD Named; 2 Sworn Officers

Q1-2022 Case Closures and Dispositions

Type of Case	Administrative Closures			Sustained	TOTAL
	Respondent Counseled	Rejected	Insufficient Evidence		
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Gender Discrimination	0	0	1	0	**1**
Gender Identity	1	0	0	0	**1**
Hostile Work Environment	0	0	0	0	**0**
Marital/Parental Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Medical Discrimination	0	0	1	0	**1**
Race Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Race / Sex Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Retaliation	0	0	0	0	**0**
Sexual Harassment	1	0	0	0	**1**
Sexual Orientation	0	0	0	0	**0**
Slurs/Inappropriate Comment	0	0	0	0	**0**
Weight Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Harassment/ Non-EEO	0	0	0	0	**0**
TOTAL	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**4**

Population Benchmark Analysis, Per Capita Race/Ethnicity

The San Francisco Police Department received requests from various key community stakeholders to present a per capita population benchmark analysis. This analysis captures a particular race or ethnicity, as compared to their representation in a similar population of 1000 individuals. We adjust for population in our analysis by the race/ethnic demographic groups in our data. This analysis is compared within this report's quarter and all quarters with data available. A disparity analysis- the contrast between different race/ethnicity groups against each other- is also considered to generate a numerical comparison. This analysis may surface potential racial disparities when comparing policing activities with the various demographic groups. In all cases, a population benchmark analysis that presents per capita results will have challenges, as noted below.

What is a benchmark?

A benchmark is a common frame of reference, created by comparing at least two sets of data to each other, to consider trends and context presented in the data. In this analysis, we compare citywide population demographics against pre and post stop activities by SFPD, and then convert those contact ratios into a Per Capita (or by 1000) number.

Population Benchmark Weaknesses

As noted by the California Department of Justice in their RIPA 2021 report, "An assumption of this type of comparison is that the distribution of who is stopped would be similar to who resides within a comparable geographic region. However, this is not always the case, as people may travel a considerable distance from where they live for several reasons (e.g., to go to work, visit family).[9]" The supposition that the comparison of police data should reflect the residential population makeup makes several assumptions that are not addressed in this analysis, and may result in inaccurate results of the comparative disparities noted in the analysis.

Comparing against residential population does not account for individuals who travel outside their home residential district or zip code in the residential population count, potentially causing over or under representation in the data[10].

[9] 2021 RIPA Board Report - Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory (RIPA) Board (ca.gov)Pp46
[10] https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-board-report-2020.pdf pp26-27

It should be noted that SFPD categorizes residential population demographics differently than other agencies. For instance, the Census American Community Survey (ACS) and Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) have different data standards. When the RIPA board data is used, it is perceived demographic data being compared to self-reported demographics in the residential population data.

Further, "Population counts generally overestimate bias in stop decisions, as differences in poverty, education, and labor market opportunities vary across identity groups in the U.S. Because education and employment affect criminal behavior, disparities along these dimensions will lead to disparities in who commits crime. In this way, pre-existing social disparities will tend to make the fraction of Black or Latinx people in the population smaller than the fraction of Black or Latinx people who are potentially subject to being stopped, overestimating any bias in a stop decision.[11]"

Despite these known limitations in working with population data within a benchmark, it does not mean analysis using a population benchmark is invalid. These limitations should, however, be kept in mind when interpreting results of any population benchmark. Results of population benchmarks can inform future analysis' and provide insight into potential disparities, trends, and differences between geographic areas, such as SFPD districts.

Population Benchmark Strengths

A key benefit in using a population data benchmark is the intuitive ease of understanding as compared to other benchmarks. Other benchmarking techniques can utilize univariate or multivariate statistical analysis that can be hard to explain succinctly and can quickly become overwhelming.

What did SFPD do?

SFPD took a citywide demographic dataset from the 2019 American Community Survey (ACS), administered by the US Census Bureau. Race/Ethnicity groupings are then consolidated to match current Department systems, with Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander groups combined into the Asian group, and two or more races, some other race alone and American Indian/Alaska Native combined into the Other grouping. The percentage demographic representation in various data and generated a per capita (per 1000 residents) count along with a table and graph for each activity. Data

[11] https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/RIPA-in-the-LAPD-Summary-Report.pdf pp12-13

used for comparison to the population benchmark and per capita calculation was gathered during the fourth quarter of 2021 (January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022). All available data was used for the historical per capita analysis, reaching back to either 2016 or the second half of 2018, depending on the dataset. All available prior year data was compared with overall trends per capita against types of SFPD activity, by demographic group. Finally, we conducted a disparity analysis by comparing per capita demographic data for certain groups against each other to determine if disparate treatment may be occurring.

Specific Methodology Notes

In addition to the general challenges of a population benchmark, noted above, the SFPD would like to highlight the additional methodological notes for clarity and context.

- Census[12]/ACS data considers "Hispanic" as an ethnicity, while the suspect, stops, searches, uses of force, and arrest data considers "Hispanic" as a race.
- Suspects per District: Crime Data Warehouse was searched for persons categorized as "Suspects" on police incident reports. Suspect demographic information may be developed from calls for service or it may be developed at a subsequent point during investigation of an incident. All police incident reports (initial or supplemental) having a data value are included. Suspects with unknown race values are not included. While some suspects are subsequently arrested, and also listed as "booked" or "cited" on police incident reports, this category is not intended to include arrestees.
- Stops information provided reflects entries into the Stop Data Collection System (SDCS), a data collection tool provided by the California Department of Justice to assist departments in complying with AB953 and the RIPA Board's data collection requirements.
- Searches information provided reflects entries into the SDCS, with the same caveats as above.
- Uses of Force information provided reflects entries into the Department UoF Database and account for a distinct count of uses of force broken down by District and race of subject force was used against.
- Arrests count persons "booked" and "cited" where an incident report (initial or supplemental) had a date value.

[12] SFPD discovered a calculation error in Q4, 2021 when tabulating census data. The error and corrected tables are included in the Q4, 2021 QADR.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark

Quarter Per Capita Interactions

Using the previously mentioned methodologies, the following trends are noted.



Citywide suspect data shows in Q1 of 2022, 66 of every 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be reported as a suspect to a crime, as compared to 4 of every 1000 White residents.



Citywide stops data shows in Q1 of 2022, 20 of every 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be stopped, as compared to 3 of every 1000 White residents.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide search data shows in Q1 of 2022, roughly 8 of every 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be searched as part of another interaction with the SFPD, as compared to less than 1 of every 1000 White residents.



Citywide Use of Force data shows in Q1 of 2022, 3 of every 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be subject to a use of force, as compared to less than one of every 1000 White residents.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis

Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide arrest data shows in Q1 of 2022, roughly 20 of every 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be stopped, as compared to two of every 1000 White residents.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark

Per Capita Interactions by Race

Analysis was conducted using the above methodology across all quarters from which we have useful data. In this case, starting in Q1, 2016 for Arrests, Uses of Force and Suspect data, and 2018 for Stops and Searches. We found the following trends. Note: Data labels and trend lines for the most impacted group(s) are included for context and clarity.



Citywide suspect data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have been reported as suspects of crimes significantly higher than other demographic categories. On average, however, there has been a slight decline over time, of the per capita inclusion of Black/African American residents within suspect reporting.

Rate of Decrease, Suspects Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-1.281
Asian	-0.024
Hispanic	-0.067
White	-0.026
Other	-1.122

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines are included in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in suspect data goes down 1.281, per 1000 Black/African Americans, per quarter, on average, over time.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis

Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide stops data since 2018 shows that Black/African American individuals have been stopped by the SFPD at significantly higher rates per capita than other demographic categories. There has been a significant decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African American stopped in a vehicle or pedestrian stop since mid-2018.

Rate of Decrease, Stops Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-11.827
Asian	-0.866
Hispanic	-2.894
White	-2.057
Other	-4.995

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in stops data goes down 11.82, per 1000 Black/African Americans, per quarter, on average, over time.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide search data since 2018 shows that Black/African American individuals have been searched in connection with an interaction with the SFPD at rates higher than other demographic categories. There has been a significant decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans searched since mid-2018.

Rate of Decrease , Searches Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-3.232
Asian	-0.076
Hispanic	-0.554
White	-0.262
Other	-0.298

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in search data goes down 3.23, per 1000 Black/African Americans, per quarter, on average, over time.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis

Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide use of force data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have been subject to a use of force at significantly higher rates as compared to other demographic categories. There has been a decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans upon whom use of force has been used since 2016.

Rate of Decrease, UoF Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-0.306
Asian	-0.007
Hispanic	-0.050
White	-0.017
Other	-0.014

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in UoF data goes down .30, per 1000 Black/African Americans, per quarter, on average, over time.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis

Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide arrest data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have arrested at significantly higher rates as compared to other demographic categories. There has been a modest decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans arrested since 2016.

Rate of Decrease , Arrests Per Capita

Race	Slope
Black	-1.393
Asian	-0.031
Hispanic	-0.131
White	-0.138
Other	-0.051

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in Arrest data goes down 1.39, per 1000 Black/African Americans, per quarter, on average, over time.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark

Yearly Per Capita Disparity Analysis

We further conduct a disparity analysis by baselining the 3 most represented demographics against each other to find a numerical representation of the disparity between groups, per SFPD interaction, per year. As with the other per capita analysis, Black/African American residents of San Francisco have higher rates of disparity in the data as compared to the White and Hispanic demographics groups.



Citywide suspect data shows that since 2016, Black/African American residents are between 13 to 19 times more likely to be listed as a suspect, than White residents.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis

Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide vehicle and pedestrian stop data shows that since mid-2018, Black/African American residents are 5 to 6 times more likely to be stopped than White residents.



Citywide search data shows that since mid-2018, Black/African American residents are between about 8 to 12 times more likely to be searched than White residents.

Q1 Quantitative Analysis
Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide search data shows that since mid-2018, Black/African American residents are between 12 to 16 times more likely to have force used upon them than White residents.



Citywide arrest data shows that since 2016, Black/African American residents are between 10 to 11 times more likely to be arrested than White residents.

What did we find?

We found that Black/African American individuals are significantly more often involved in various SFPD interactions than their representation in the population, especially when compared to White residents. These findings provide context around who is involved with the SFPD at various points of engagement but does not answer the question of 'why' this is the case.

It is possible that some or all factors discussed in the benchmark description section above are affecting the data in some way.

The context provided gives us a common frame for conversation, mutual understanding, and a starting point from which additional analysis may occur.

What's next?

The Department looks forward to continuing analysis of data on a quarterly basis. However, it should be noted that SFPD will need to build out analytical capacity in order to carry out some of this work, and timeline expectations will be shared and updated with the publishing of each quarterly report.

The SFPD has also partnered with multiple academic entities to assist in academic level analyses of SFPD data, including:

- The California Policy Lab at UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles,
- Stanford's SPARQ center,
- Palo Alto University, and
- The Center for Policing Equity
- New York University

Domestic Violence Reporting - Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

Background

In November 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved, and Mayor Breed signed, legislation amending the San Francisco Administrative Code to require certain data involving Domestic Violence be reported on a quarterly basis starting in the first quarter of 2022. The report is to be submitted on a quarterly basis to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, Office of Racial Equity, the Human Rights Commission, the Department on the Status of Women, and the PoliceCommission.

Domestic Violence Calls for Service and Investigations

Domestic Violence, also known as Intimate Partner Violence, is abbreviated as DV for brevity in this report. For the purposes of this report, Admin Code 96D defines Domestic Violence as: *"Domestic Violence" means the crime defined in Section 273.5 and the crimes punishable under Section 243 (e){1), of the California Penal Code.*

The SFPD responds to calls for service (CFS) received by the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) whether as a 911 emergency or through the non-emergency line. After gathering information from the caller, DEM staff has the responsibility of determining the appropriate code for the call, based on the information provided, and to dispatch units to the location as either a Priority A (highest), Priority B, or Priority C.

Upon arrival, SFPD officers conduct a thorough investigation into the allegations of domestic violence. Per SFPD policy, calls for service are coded with a final disposition of domestic violence (DV) in cases in which DV is evident during an officer's investigation.

In some cases, a report may be taken without a call to 911 (self-reporting at a police station, forexample.) In these cases, a call for service number is generated during the report writing process.

This report includes data from 1 January 2022 through 31 March 2022.

Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b Reporting Components

1(A) The number of calls for service for Domestic Violence that the Police Department received from the Department of Emergency Management for the period of January 1 to March 31, 2022.

CALLS FOR SERVICE, FINAL CALL CODE INCLUDES "DV" *January 1 to March 31, 2022*				
	January	**February**	**March**	**Total**
DV Calls for Service	**496**	**457**	**552**	**1,505**

1(B) The number of Domestic Violence cases that the Police Department presented to the District Attorney for investigation and/or prosecution in the prior quarter, and of those cases, the number in which a child or children were present and/or a firearm or firearms were present.

DV INCIDENTS SUBMITTED TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE			
	2022		
	Jan	**Feb**	**Mar**
Number of DV Cases Presented to the District Attorney's Office	85	84	62
Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a child was present	20	6	8
Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a firearm was present	2	2	2

Confiscation of Weapons: Pursuant to Penal Code § 18250 and Department policy, officers are mandated to confiscate any firearms or other deadly weapons discovered at the scene of a domestic violence incident. The weapon is booked into the Department's Property Room as evidence. As federal and state laws prohibit individuals convicted of a domestic violence chargefrom owning or acquiring a weapon, the Property Room follows DOJ protocols, including a criminal records' checks, to determine if the individual is eligible for release of the weapon.

Presence of Children: SFPD Department General Order 6.09 also outlines the procedures to follow if children are present during a domestic violence incident. DGO 7.04, Children of Arrested Parents, provides guidance to minimize the negative impact and harmful stressors onchildren when a parent/guardian is arrested whether in their presence or not. This policy is considered a national model, highlighting law enforcement's responsibility to ensure a safe environment for children following a traumatic experience such as the arrest of one's parent.

SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report

Stop Data Quarter I 2022

In Q1-2022, there were a total of 3,769 stops, a 57% decrease from Q1-2021. Of those stops, 1,053 (28%) resulted in searches.

Total Stops Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022				
Type of Stops	**Jan**	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Total**
Dispatched	490	397	518	1,405
Self-Initiated	828	708	828	2,364
Total Stops	1,318	1,105	1,346	3,769

Total Searches Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022				
Type of Stops	**Jan**	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Total**
Dispatched	227	188	253	668
Self- Initiated	118	127	140	385
Total Searches	345	315	393	1,053





The Department utilizes the SDCS program definitions under AB953; a 'stop' is defined as 1) any detention, as defined in regulations, by a peace officer of a person or 2) any peace officer interaction with a person in which the officer conducts a search as defined in regulation.[13] Stops include Traffic Stops and Pedestrian Detentions. Stops may be Self-Initiated or Dispatched.

13 https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I93C41A693CA74BA595E5E5C58A213F79&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)

Stop Data Quarter 1 2022

Stops and Searches by Perceived Race/Ethnicity

White subjects accounted for 35% of all stops and 32% of all searches. Black/African American subjects accounted for 23% of total stops and 34% of total searches.

Total Stops by Perceived Race / Ethnicity Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022					
Perceived Race / Ethnicity	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 Total	% of Stops
Asian	143	132	138	413	11%
Black/African American	301	256	319	876	23%
Hispanic/Latino	264	212	271	747	20%
Middle Eastern or South	102	72	79	253	7%
Native American	4	3	2	9	0%
Pacific Islander	17	13	14	44	1%
White	453	393	480	1,326	35%
Other	34	24	43	101	3%
Total	1,318	1,105	1,346	3,769	100%

Total Searches by Perceived Race / Ethnicity Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022					
Perceived Race / Ethnicity	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 Total	% of Searches
Asian	21	24	24	69	7%
Black/African American	109	101	143	353	34%
Hispanic/Latino	78	59	90	227	22%
Middle Eastern or South	8	10	7	25	2%
Native American	1	1	2	4	0%
Pacific Islander	6	3	4	13	1%
White	111	111	116	338	32%
Other	11	6	7	24	2%
Total	345	315	393	1,053	100%



Stops and Searches by Perceived Age

Subjects within the age group of 30-39 accounted for the most stops (1,274; 31%) and the most searches (366; 35%).

Total Stops by Perceived Age Category Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022					
Perceived Age Category	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 Total	% of Stops
Under 18	14	24	22	60	2%
18 - 29	352	257	303	912	24%
30 - 39	445	362	467	1,274	34%
40 - 49	261	249	283	793	21%
50 - 59	163	140	171	474	13%
60 or over	81	71	99	251	7%
Unknown	2	2	1	5	0%
Total	1,318	1,105	1,346	3,769	100%

Total Searches by Perceived Age Category Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022					
Perceived Age Category	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 Total	% of Searches
Under 18	2	10	11	23	2%
18 - 29	84	79	110	273	26%
30 - 39	128	104	134	366	35%
40 - 49	78	83	81	242	23%
50 - 59	33	26	35	94	9%
60 or over	20	13	22	55	5%
Total	345	315	393	1,053	100%



Stop Data Quarter 1 2022

Stops and Searches by Perceived Gender

Male subjects accounted for 79% of all stops and 82% of all searches.

Total Stops by Perceived Gender Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022					
Perceived Gender	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 Total	% of Stops
Female	240	250	287	777	21%
Male	1,071	847	1,044	2,962	79%
Transgender man/boy	1	1	6	8	0%
Transgender woman/girl	2	2	4	8	0%
Unknown	4	5	5	14	0%
Total	1,318	1,105	1,346	3,769	100%

Total Searches by Perceived Gender Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022					
Perceived Gender	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 Total	% of Searches
Female	55	53	69	177	17%
Male	288	260	320	868	82%
Transgender man/boy	0	0	1	1	0%
Transgender woman/girl	0	0	2	2	0%
Unknown	2	2	1	5	0%
Total	345	315	393	1,053	100%



Stops and Searches by District

Southern Station accounted for the most stops in Q1-2022 (447; 12%) and Central Station conducted the most searches (164; 16%).

Total Stops by District Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022					
District	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total	% Total
Central	149	124	169	442	12%
Southern	148	122	177	447	12%
Bayview	53	46	84	183	5%
Mission	167	104	102	373	10%
Northern	96	107	143	346	9%
Park	95	49	36	180	5%
Richmond	130	95	121	346	9%
Ingleside	75	97	92	264	7%
Taraval	97	98	91	286	8%
Tenderloin	117	80	142	339	9%
Airport	145	135	134	414	11%
Unknown	46	48	55	149	4%
Total	**1,318**	**1,105**	**1,346**	**3,769**	**100%**

Total Searches by District Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2022					
District	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total	% Total
Central	45	63	56	164	16%
Southern	30	41	62	133	13%
Bayview	14	16	42	72	7%
Mission	64	28	41	133	13%
Northern	38	45	52	135	13%
Park	9	12	10	31	3%
Richmond	12	6	3	21	2%
Ingleside	34	18	17	69	7%
Taraval	20	20	17	57	5%
Tenderloin	50	37	54	141	13%
Airport	16	16	22	54	5%
Unknown	13	13	17	43	4%
Total	**345**	**315**	**393**	**1,053**	**100%**

Note: Location information in the Stop Data Collection System is in free text format. "Unknown" indicates stop records that could not be geocoded.

Basis of Searches

Two reasons accounted for 62% of total searches: Incident to arrest (39%) and officer safety/safety of others (23%).

Total Basis of Search	Total	% Total
Consent given	79	5%
Officer safety/safety of others	360	23%
Search warrant	27	2%
Condition of parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision	109	7%
Suspected weapons	116	7%
Visible contraband	62	4%
Odor of contraband	3	0%
Canine Detection	0	0%
Evidence of crime	155	10%
Incident to arrest	605	39%
Exigent circumstances/emergency	13	1%
Vehicle inventory	38	2%
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0%
***Distinct Count of Searches**	**1,053**	**100%**

***There may be more than one basis for search**



Basis of Search by Race, Age, and Gender – 2022 Quarter 1

Basis of Search	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Middle Eastern/ South Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Other	Total
Consent given	6	16	14	3	1	1	37	1	79
Officer safety/safety of others	21	122	75	9	0	4	118	11	360
Search warrant	7	8	8	0	0	2	2	0	27
Condition of parole/probation/ PRCS/mandatory supervision	6	44	21	4	0	1	32	1	109
Suspected weapons	4	41	24	4	0	1	37	5	116
Visible contraband	4	17	16	1	0	0	20	4	62
Odor of contraband	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Canine Detection	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evidence of crime	11	57	35	3	0	1	43	5	155
Incident to arrest	26	207	138	12	4	6	199	13	605
Exigent circumstances/emergency	3	5	0	0	0	0	4	1	13
Vehicle inventory	2	14	10	1	0	1	10	0	38
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Distinct Count of Searches	**69**	**353**	**227**	**25**	**4**	**13**	**338**	**24**	**1,053**
% of Total Searches	**7%**	**34%**	**22%**	**2%**	**0%**	**1%**	**32%**	**2%**	**100%**

Basis of Search	Under 18	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Total
Consent given	0	8	30	25	8	8	79
Officer safety/safety of others	9	93	119	97	25	17	360
Search warrant	2	7	7	1	5	5	27
Condition of parole/probation/ PRCS/mandatory supervision	0	27	53	21	7	1	109
Suspected weapons	6	38	40	20	8	4	116
Visible contraband	0	23	20	13	3	3	62
Odor of contraband	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
Canine Detection	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evidence of crime	7	50	52	31	11	4	155
Incident to arrest	13	155	209	139	59	30	605
Exigent circumstances/emergency	0	4	4	1	1	3	13
Vehicle inventory	0	11	17	8	2	0	38
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Distinct Count of Searches	**23**	**273**	**366**	**242**	**94**	**55**	**1,053**
% of Total Searches	**2%**	**26%**	**35%**	**23%**	**9%**	**5%**	**100%**

Basis of Search	Female	Male	Transgender man/boy	Transgender woman/girl	Unknown	Total
Consent given	9	69	0	0	1	79
Officer safety/safety of others	53	304	0	0	3	360
Search warrant	11	16	0	0	0	27
Condition of parole/probation/ PRCS/mandatory supervision	7	100	0	0	2	109
Suspected weapons	11	104	0	0	1	116
Visible contraband	11	49	0	1	1	62
Odor of contraband	0	3	0	0	0	3
Canine Detection	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evidence of crime	25	128	0	1	1	155
Incident to arrest	104	496	1	2	2	605
Exigent circumstances/emergency	4	9	0	0	0	13
Vehicle inventory	9	29	0	0	0	38
Suspected violation of school policy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Distinct Count of Searches	**177**	**868**	**1**	**2**	**5**	**1,053**
% of Total Searches	**17%**	**82%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**100%**

Results of Searches

There were 1,053 distinct searches in Q1-2022. Total yield rate for all searches was 42%.



	Q3 2018	Q4 2018	Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019	Q4 2019	Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q3 2020	Q4 2020	Q1 2021	Q2 2021	Q3 2021	Q4 2021	Q1 2022
Asian	30%	16%	33%	23%	34%	24%	27%	33%	39%	32%	29%	37%	35%	43%	44%
Black/ African American	35%	22%	33%	31%	32%	33%	36%	33%	37%	39%	41%	37%	35%	49%	42%
Hispanic/ Latino	35%	23%	35%	37%	37%	39%	35%	48%	41%	38%	42%	46%	45%	45%	48%
White	32%	22%	32%	32%	29%	33%	32%	32%	34%	38%	36%	34%	32%	41%	38%
Other	30%	27%	36%	29%	35%	31%	31%	33%	34%	45%	22%	31%	29%	43%	50%

Yield rate was 42% for Black/African Americans, 48% for Hispanics/Latinos, 44% for Asian and 38% for White subjects in Q1-2022.

Stop Data Quarter 1 2022

Results of Searches
2022 QUARTER 1



Results of Searches	Total	% Total
None	606	44%
Firearm(s)	57	4%
Ammunition	45	3%
Weapon(s) other than a firearm	82	6%
Drugs/Narcotics	141	10%
Alcohol	4	0%
Money	54	4%
Drug Paraphernalia	92	7%
Suspected stolen property	127	9%
Cell phone(s) or electronic devices	53	4%
Other Contraband or evidence	122	9%
Unknown	0	0%
Distinct Count of Search	**1,053**	**100%**

***A single search may have multiple results**

Stop Data Quarter 1 2022

Results of Searches
2022 QUARTER 1

Results of Searches	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Middle Eastern/ South Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Other	Total
None	38	206	118	13	3	8	208	12	**606**
Firearm(s)	6	27	15	0	0	1	7	1	**57**
Ammunition	7	19	11	0	0	0	7	1	**45**
Weapon(s) other than a firearm	8	21	18	6	0	1	27	1	**82**
Drugs/Narcotics	7	45	40	1	0	1	41	6	**141**
Alcohol	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	**4**
Money	1	15	31	0	0	0	5	2	**54**
Drug Paraphernalia	3	24	17	1	0	0	42	5	**92**
Suspected stolen property	10	45	26	4	0	0	40	2	**127**
Cell phone(s) or electronic devices	3	23	14	1	0	0	11	1	**53**
Other Contraband or evidence	7	42	32	1	1	2	32	5	**122**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Search	**69**	**353**	**227**	**25**	**4**	**13**	**338**	**24**	**1,053**

Results of Searches	Under 18	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	Total
None	10	141	223	144	57	31		**606**
Firearm(s)	7	26	9	7	2	6		**57**
Ammunition	7	21	6	7	2	2		**45**
Weapon(s) other than a firearm	1	23	26	14	6	12		**82**
Drugs/Narcotics	2	51	44	30	8	6		**141**
Alcohol	0	0	3	1	0	0		**4**
Money	0	39	7	5	3	0		**54**
Drug Paraphernalia	0	24	33	27	8	0		**92**
Suspected stolen property	4	36	44	27	12	4		**127**
Cell phone(s) or electronic devices	4	27	8	8	4	2		**53**
Other Contraband or evidence	2	38	44	23	14	1		**122**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0		**0**
Distinct Count of Search	**23**	**273**	**366**	**242**	**94**	**55**	**0**	**1,053**

Results of Searches	Female	Male	Transgender man/boy	Transgender woman/girl	Unknown	Total
None	113	488	1	1	3	**606**
Firearm(s)	4	53	0	0	0	**57**
Ammunition	5	40	0	0	0	**45**
Weapon(s) other than a firearm	12	69	0	0	1	**82**
Drugs/Narcotics	19	122	0	0	0	**141**
Alcohol	0	4	0	0	0	**4**
Money	3	51	0	0	0	**54**
Drug Paraphernalia	15	77	0	0	0	**92**
Suspected stolen property	22	104	0	1	0	**127**
Cell phone(s) or electronic devices	5	48	0	0	0	**53**
Other Contraband or evidence	18	103	0	0	0	**121**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	1	**1**
Distinct Count of Search	**177**	**868**	**1**	**2**	**5**	**1,053**

Reasons for Stops

In Q1-2022, traffic violations and reasonable suspicion accounted for 95% of reasons for stop. Traffic violations reported 54% and reasonable suspicion was 41%.

Reason for Stops	Total	% Total
Consensual encounter resulting in search	41	1%
Determine if student violated school policy	1	0%
Investigation to determine if person is truant	21	1%
Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person	118	3%
Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision	10	0%
Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity	1,528	41%
Traffic violation	2,040	54%
Unknown	10	0%
Distinct Count of Stops	**3,769**	**100%**



Stop Data Quarter 1 2022

Reasons for Stops by Race, Age, Gender

Reasons for Stops	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Middle Eastern/ South Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Other	Total
Consensual encounter resulting in search	7	8	7	1	0	0	18	0	41
Determine if student violated school policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Investigation to determine if person is truant	4	9	3	0	0	0	5	0	21
Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person	7	42	16	6	0	3	39	5	118
Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision	2	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	10
Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity	100	457	297	39	8	20	571	36	1,528
Traffic violation	292	354	420	207	1	21	690	55	2,040
Unknown	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	10
Distinct Count of Stops	**413**	**876**	**747**	**253**	**9**	**44**	**1,326**	**101**	**3,769**
% of Stops	**11%**	**23%**	**20%**	**7%**	**0%**	**1%**	**35%**	**3%**	**100%**

Reasons for Stops	Under 18	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	Total
Consensual encounter resulting in search	1	7	13	13	2	5	0	41
Determine if student violated school policy	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Investigation to determine if person is truant	8	4	3	1	1	4	0	21
Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person	4	28	34	30	14	8	0	118
Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision	0	2	7	0	1	0	0	10
Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity	32	354	536	341	172	93	0	1,528
Traffic violation	14	515	681	407	283	140	0	2,040
Unknown	0	2	0	1	1	1	5	10
Distinct Count of Stops	**60**	**912**	**1,274**	**793**	**474**	**251**	**5**	**3,769**
% of Stops	**2%**	**24%**	**34%**	**21%**	**13%**	**7%**	**0%**	**100%**

Reasons for Stops	Female	Male	Transgender man/boy	Transgender woman/girl	Unknown	Total
Consensual encounter resulting in search	11	30	0	0	0	41
Determine if student violated school policy	0	1	0	0	0	1
Investigation to determine if person is truant	8	11	1	0	1	21
Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person	14	104	0	0	0	118
Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision	0	9	0	0	1	10
Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity	331	1,178	6	7	6	1,528
Traffic violation	412	1,625	1	1	1	2,040
Unknown	1	4	0	0	5	10
Distinct Count of Stops	**777**	**2,962**	**8**	**8**	**14**	**3,769**
% of Stops	**21%**	**79%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**100%**

Stop Data Quarter 1 2022

Results of Stops

Of the 3,769 stops in Q1-2022: a warning was issued 21% of the time; a citation for infraction was issued 22% of the time, and in-field cite-and-release was issued 15% of the time.

Results of Stops	Total	% Total
No action	473	12%
Warning (verbal or written)	841	21%
Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)	895	22%
In-field cite and release	612	15%
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant	281	7%
Custodial arrest without warrant	538	13%
Field interview card completed	78	2%
Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency)	82	2%
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor	26	1%
Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)	165	4%
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)	1	0%
Referral to school administrator or other support staff	0	0%
Unknown	0	0%
Distinct Count of Stops	**3,769**	**100%**

***A single stop may have multiple results**

*One stop during Q1 resulted in contact with the Department of Homeland Security or its subordinate organizations. The incident occurred at the San Francisco International Airport where an international traveler exited a plane and realized that they had forgotten an item on the plane. The subject pushed through an emergency exit door in an attempt to get back on the plane to retrieve their belongings and set off an alarm. The subject was stopped and detained by CBP and TSA was notified of the incident and responded. A decision was made not to impose any criminal or civil action. There was no violation of DGO 5.15, Enforcement of Immigration Laws.



Stop Data Quarter I 2022

Results of Stops by Race, Age, and Gender

Results of Stops	Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino(a)	Middle Eastern/ South Asian	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Other	Total
No action	37	139	87	21	1	9	157	22	**473**
Warning (verbal or written)	85	228	145	75	0	9	284	15	**841**
Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)	145	84	175	110	1	9	343	28	**895**
In-field cite and release	84	123	138	38	2	4	213	10	**612**
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant	16	96	51	9	1	7	97	4	**281**
Custodial arrest without warrant	25	183	142	5	3	7	155	18	**538**
Field interview card completed	2	26	15	2	1	0	29	3	**78**
Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency)	7	21	12	3	0	0	34	5	**82**
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor	4	10	5	0	0	2	3	2	**26**
Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)	22	32	23	4	1	1	76	6	**165**
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**1**
Referral to school administrator or other support staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Stops	**413**	**876**	**747**	**253**	**9**	**44**	**1,326**	**101**	**3,769**

Results of Stops	Under 18	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	Total
No action	6	114	167	104	49	28	5	**473**
Warning (verbal or written)	4	200	330	172	93	42	0	**841**
Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)	6	208	279	173	154	75	0	**895**
In-field cite and release	8	139	192	139	89	45	0	**612**
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant	5	62	106	75	26	7	0	**281**
Custodial arrest without warrant	14	161	179	106	47	31	0	**538**
Field interview card completed	0	24	31	10	8	5	0	**78**
Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency)	0	13	27	24	11	7	0	**82**
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor	20	4	0	1	1	0	0	**26**
Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)	11	33	48	35	19	19	0	**165**
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	**1**
Referral to school administrator or other support staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Stops	**60**	**912**	**1,274**	**793**	**474**	**251**	**5**	**3,769**

Results of Stops	Female	Male	Transgender man/boy	Transgender woman/girl	Unknown	Total
No action	99	363	3	2	6	**473**
Warning (verbal or written)	178	661	1	0	1	**841**
Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)	173	722	0	0	0	**895**
In-field cite and release	138	469	2	1	2	**612**
Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant	35	243	0	2	1	**281**
Custodial arrest without warrant	93	442	0	1	2	**538**
Field interview card completed	19	59	0	0	0	**78**
Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency)	15	66	1	0	0	**82**
Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor	8	18	0	0	0	**26**
Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)	64	96	1	2	2	**165**
Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)	1	0	0	0	0	**1**
Referral to school administrator or other support staff	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Distinct Count of Stops	**777**	**2,962**	**8**	**8**	**14**	**3,769**

Calls for Service, Q1 2022

Calls for Service

The Department responded to 140,946 total calls for service during Q1-2022. Call volume fluctuated during the Q1-2022, and the month of March accounted for 49,303 calls for service, slightly higher volume of calls compared to the months of January and February.

Calls for Service January 1 - March 31, 2022			
Jan	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Total Q1**
47,360	44,283	49,303	**140,946**



Data Source: San Francisco Police Department CAD

Suspects, Q1 2022

SUSPECTS OBSERVED AND/OR REPORTED TO SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Suspect information/description is either provided by a member of the public, reported directly to the police or through dispatch, or is observed by a Department member during a self-initiated call for service in which there is reasonable suspicion or probable cause for an officer to conduct a stop. The suspect information is documented in a police incident report that is generated from the call for service.

The following table summarizing suspect descriptions gathered from incident reports through the means stated above. Data captured shows that 39.2% of the subjects reported are Black/African American.

SUSPECTS by Race/Ethnicity January 1, 2022 - March 31, 2022					
DESCRIPTION	Jan	Feb	Mar	Q1 2022	% of Total Suspects Q1 2022
Asian/ Pacific Islander	96	127	96	319	4.3%
Black/ African American	939	952	1029	2920	39.2%
Hispanic/ Latino	413	351	480	1244	16.7%
Native American	8	2	8	18	0.2%
White	569	545	532	1646	22.1%
Others	412	408	482	1302	17.5%
Total	2,437	2,385	2,627	7,449	100.00%



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

Use of Force, Q1 2022

Total Use of Force Overview

January 1, 2016, through March 31, 2022



The above chart shows the decrease in Use of Force since the 1st quarter of 2016 by 66%. There were 952 Uses of Force in Q1-2016 compared to 328 Uses of Force in Q1-2022.

Use of Force, Q1 2022

Total Use of Force
Overview by Subject Race/Ethnicity

During Q1-2022, 43% of the total Uses of Force were against Black/African American subjects, 23% were against White subjects and 22% were against Hispanic/Latino subjects.

	COUNT OF FORCE																								
	2016				2017				2018				2019				2020				2021				2022
SUBJECT RACE	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
Asian or Pacific Islander	59	70	60	78	37	61	28	66	32	31	42	36	22	34	20	21	29	23	16	13	10	10	5	23	36
Black	447	379	448	393	333	358	363	308	318	244	270	272	236	242	229	195	179	187	132	127	149	104	141	179	141
Hispanic	232	230	173	226	188	261	128	165	199	135	147	139	104	117	104	100	144	77	68	91	106	79	97	83	72
White	199	225	213	213	211	202	163	166	234	160	172	160	135	142	128	88	115	141	80	92	103	93	95	93	74
Unknown	15	22	22	43	35	29	25	25	33	31	30	28	18	15	23	16	20	36	9	12	30	23	15	12	5
Grand Total	**952**	**926**	**916**	**953**	**804**	**911**	**707**	**730**	**816**	**601**	**661**	**635**	**515**	**550**	**504**	**420**	**487**	**464**	**305**	**335**	**398**	**309**	**353**	**390**	**328**



Use of Force, Q1 2022

Total Use of Force
Overview by Subject Age

During Q1-2022, 44% of the total Uses of Force were against 18-29 years old subjects, and 27% were against 30-39 years old subjects.

	COUNT OF FORCE																								
	2016				2017				2018				2019				2020				2021				2022
SUBJECT AGE	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
Under 18	80	34	41	61	50	102	38	62	32	16	25	31	20	23	4	10	20	137	15	20	26	7	17	9	23
18-29	405	395	357	474	310	396	277	308	321	248	245	258	200	217	190	155	163	152	103	116	147	100	105	125	143
30-39	250	239	220	229	231	191	199	187	236	190	191	179	167	139	173	151	168	55	85	122	107	80	127	122	87
40-49	128	151	141	109	107	87	102	89	139	62	102	96	90	80	84	54	73	30	52	35	42	86	54	56	28
50-59	69	59	102	62	77	84	56	57	44	49	69	51	29	62	30	34	37	9	33	21	29	15	29	32	13
60+	19	34	53	16	21	22	26	17	42	23	11	10	4	12	15	6	6	63	13	9	4	11	8	16	9
Unknown	1	14	2	2	8	29	9	10	2	13	18	10	5	17	9	9	20	18	4	12	43	10	13	30	25
Grand Total	**952**	**926**	**916**	**953**	**804**	**911**	**707**	**730**	**816**	**601**	**661**	**635**	**515**	**550**	**505**	**419**	**487**	**464**	**305**	**335**	**398**	**309**	**353**	**390**	**328**



Total Use of Force
Overview by Subject Gender

89% of the total Uses of Force were against male subjects, and 11% were against female subjects during Q1-2022.

	COUNT OF FORCE																								
	2016				2017				2018				2019				2020				2021				2022
SUBJECT GENDER	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
Female	157	160	131	150	123	134	78	105	148	70	91	93	50	66	41	53	66	66	48	33	38	109	44	62	35
Male	792	764	780	803	681	775	628	625	668	531	570	537	463	479	453	366	416	392	257	301	359	188	305	326	293
Unkown/Nonbinary	3	2	5	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	10	1	5	6	0	1	1	12	4	2	0
Grand Total	**952**	**926**	**916**	**953**	**804**	**911**	**707**	**730**	**816**	**601**	**661**	**635**	**515**	**550**	**504**	**420**	**487**	**464**	**305**	**335**	**398**	**309**	**353**	**390**	**328**



Use of Force, Q1 2022

First Quarter Comparison – Uses of Force – 2021 vs. 2022

January through March showed a decrease in 2022 as compared to 2021. Overall, there were 328 Uses of Force in Q1-2022, a 19% decrease in comparison to the Uses of Force in Q1-2021.

Total Uses of Force

First Quarter Comparison - 2021 vs 2022

	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% Change
Jan	159	119	-25%
Feb	130	96	-26%
Mar	115	113	-2%
Q1 Total	**404**	**328**	**-19%**



Use of Force, Q1 2022

Total Uses of Force-by-Force Type

First Quarter Comparison – 2021 vs. 2022

During Q1-2022, pointing of a firearm, physical control and strike by object/fist were the top three types of force used and accounted for 86% of total Uses of Force.

Uses of Force	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% Change
Pointing of Firearms	194	138	-29%
Physical Control	112	108	-4%
Strike by Object/Fist	42	37	-12%
OC Spray	12	15	25%
ERIW	14	9	-36%
Impact Weapon	13	6	-54%
Spike Strips	10	5	-50%
Other	5	6	20%
Firearm	0	4	not calc
Vehicle Deflection	**2**	**0**	**-100%**
Grand Total	**404**	**328**	**-19%**



A review of all reported uses of force during Q1-2022 found no instances of officers discharging firearms at a moving vehicle, nor any instances where the carotid restraint was employed.

USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

There was one Use of Force incident resulting in death in Q1-2022.

On the morning of Thursday, January 20, 2022, at approximately 7:26 a.m., San Francisco police officers responded to multiple calls for service regarding reports of a suspicious individual in the International Terminal of San Francisco International Airport (SFO). Arriving on scene, SFPD officers made contact with a male individual, establishing that he appeared to be armed with a handgun. In the course of law enforcement officers' engagement with the subject, an officer-involved shooting occurred involving San Francisco police officers. Responding officers rendered aid to the man and summoned medics to the scene. The individual succumbed to his injuries.

Officers Assaulted, Q1 2022

Officers Assaulted by Month
January – March 2022

In Q1-2022, there were a total of 47 officers assaulted: a 4% decrease from Q1-2021.

Officers Assaulted by Month			
	2021	**2022**	**% Change**
January	19	11	-42%
February	15	13	-13%
March	15	23	53%
Total	**49**	**47**	**-4%**



The Central District (9) had the highest number of officers assaulted, followed by Mission (8), Northern (8) Southern (7) and Tenderloin (7).

The Mission District (71) had the highest number of Uses of Force, followed by Bayview (58), Tenderloin (54), and Southern (36).





Types of Force by Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Subject January-March 2022

During Q1-2022, Uses of Force used against Black Male subjects accounted for 35%, 21% against White Male subjects, and 21% against Hispanic Male subjects.

Types of Force by Subject Race & Gender	Pointing of Firearms	Physical Control	Strike by Object/Fist	OC (Pepper Spray)	Impact Weapon	ERIW	Firearm	Spike Strips	Other	Total Uses of Force	%
Asian Female	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**0%**
Asian Male	23	5	1	0	1	1	4	0	0	35	**11%**
Asian Unknown or Nonbinary Gender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Black Female	7	11	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	25	**8%**
Black Male	51	36	18	5	2	2	0	2	0	116	**35%**
Black Unknown or Nonbinary Gender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Hispanic Female	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	**1%**
Hispanic Male	28	21	7	5	2	4	0	1	1	69	**21%**
Hispanic Unknown or Nonbinary Gender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
White Female	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	**2%**
White Male	23	27	5	5	0	1	0	2	5	68	**21%**
White Unknown or Nonbinary Gender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Unknown Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Unknown Male	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	**2%**
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**138**	**108**	**37**	**15**	**6**	**9**	**4**	**5**	**6**	328	**100%**
Percent	**42%**	**33%**	**11%**	**5%**	**2%**	**3%**	**1%**	**2%**	**2%**	**100%**	

Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander.

Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions such as Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Due to rounding, percentage totals may not add up to exactly 100%.

Types of Force by Age of Subject January-March 2022

During Q1-2022, the subjects in the age group of 18-29 accounted for 44% of Uses of Force, and the age group of 30-39 accounted for 27%

Types of Force by Subject Age Group	Pointing of Firearms	Physical Control	Strike by Object/Fist	OC (Pepper Spray)	Impact Weapon	ERIW	Firearm	Spike Strips	Other	Total Uses of Force	%
Under 18	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	23	**7%**
18-29	57	50	21	4	3	2	0	2	4	143	**44%**
30-39	25	36	10	9	1	5	0	0	1	87	**27%**
40-49	14	7	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	28	**9%**
50-59	8	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	**4%**
60+	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	**3%**
Unknown	13	3	1	0	1	2	4	1	0	25	**8%**
Total	138	108	37	15	6	9	4	5	6	328	**100%**
Percent	**42%**	**33%**	**11%**	**5%**	**2%**	**3%**	**1%**	**2%**	**2%**	**100%**	

Unknown indicates information was not documented in report for various reasons (i.e. suspect fled and demographic information was not known).

Due to rounding, percentage totals may not add up to exactly 100%.

Types of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Part I Violent, Part I Property, and Person with a gun incidents were the top three types of calls and accounted for 67% of total Uses of Force during Q1-2022.

Types of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	1	0	3	6	1	33	25	0	13	82	**25%**
Part I Property	1	0	0	4	0	13	48	4	4	74	**23%**
Person with a gun (221)	1	4	1	0	3	14	37	0	3	63	**19%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	2	0	7	10	1	4	24	**7%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	1	0	0	9	4	0	5	19	**6%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	4	0	1	2	0	7	2	0	0	16	**5%**
Vandalism (594/595)	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	5	11	**3%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	8	**2%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	2	8	**2%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	8	**2%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	**2%**
Parking Violation (587)	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	**1%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	**1%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	**1%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	**1%**
Person yelling for help (918)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**0%**
Total	**9**	**4**	**6**	**15**	**6**	**108**	**138**	**5**	**37**	**328**	**100%**

Use of Force, Q1 2022

Uses of Force by Reason
January-March 2022

92% of Total Uses of Force reason in Q1-2022 was to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, or to prevent escape, a 17% decrease from Q1-2021.

Reason for Use of Force	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% Change
The reason for UOF is under investigation	1	9	800%
In defense of others or in self-defense	3	7	133%
To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, or to prevent escape	362	302	-17%
To gain compliance with a lawful order	5	1	-80%
To overcome resistance or to prevent escape	21	7	-67%
To prevent a person from injuring themselves, when the person also pos	2	0	-100%
To prevent the commission of a public offense	10	2	-80%
Grand Total	**404**	**328**	**-19%**

**The reason for UoF in one OIS case is under investigation*



Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age of Officer Q1-2021 vs. 2022

During Q1-2022, White male officers accounted for 165 (50%) of Uses of Force used, and Asian male officers accounted for 60 (18%) of Uses of Force used.

Officer Race & Gender	Officers Using Force			Total Uses of Force			Department Demographic		
	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change
Asian Female *	5	2	-60%	9	2	-78%	47	50	6%
Asian Male *	38	41	8%	76	60	-21%	467	449	-4%
Black Female	5	4	-20%	7	7	0%	40	36	-10%
Black Male	23	13	-43%	32	16	-50%	169	157	-7%
Hispanic Female	9	8	-11%	13	10	-23%	75	75	0%
Hispanic Male	34	27	-21%	51	37	-27%	319	311	-3%
White Female	14	12	-14%	30	16	-47%	156	134	-14%
White Male	119	99	-17%	173	165	-5%	892	836	-6%
Other Female **	1	0	-100%	1	0	-100%	8	7	-13%
Other Male **	7	9	29%	12	15	25%	35	31	-11%
Total	**255**	**215**	-16%	**404**	**328**	-19%	**2,208**	**2,086**	-6%

*Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander
**Other indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions

During Q1-2022, there was 16% decrease in Officers Using Force and 19% decrease in Total Uses of Force compared to Q1-2021.

Officer Age Group	Officers Using Force			Total Uses of Force			Department Demographic		
	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change
21-29	74	37	-50%	127	68	-46%	292	239	-18%
30-39	124	123	-1%	198	187	-6%	742	713	-4%
40-49	44	31	-30%	65	44	-32%	617	623	1%
50-59	13	23	77%	14	28	100%	518	471	-9%
60+	0	1	not cal	0	1	not cal	39	40	3%
Total	**255**	**215**	-16%	**404**	**328**	-19%	**2,208**	**2,086**	-6%

Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age of Subject Q1 – 2021 vs. 2022

During Q1-2022, Black male subjects accounted for 116 (35%) of Uses of Force used against, Hispanic male subjects accounted for 69 (21%) and White male subjects accounted for 68 (21%) of Uses of Force used against.

Subject Race & Gender	Number of Subjects			Total Uses of Force		
	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change
Asian Female	1	1	**0%**	1	1	**0%**
Asian Male	8	10	**25%**	9	35	**289%**
Asian Unknown or Nonbinary Gender	0	0	**not cal**	0	0	**not cal**
Black Female	10	17	**70%**	18	25	**39%**
Black Male	81	64	**-21%**	135	116	**-14%**
Black Unknown or Nonbinary Gender	0	0	**not cal**	0	0	**not cal**
Hispanic Female	7	2	**-71%**	10	3	**-70%**
Hispanic Male	62	45	**-27%**	98	69	**-30%**
Hispanic Unknown or Nonbinary Gender	0	0	**not cal**	0	0	**not cal**
White Female	7	5	**-29%**	9	6	**-33%**
White Male	61	40	**-34%**	94	68	**-28%**
White Unknown or Nonbinary Gender	0	0	**not cal**	0	0	**not cal**
Unknown Female	2	0	**-100%**	4	0	**-100%**
Unknown Male	14	4	**-71%**	25	5	**-80%**
Unknown Race & Gender	1	0	**-100%**	1	0	**-100%**
No Subject	0	0	**not cal**	0	0	**not cal**
Total	**254**	**188**	**-26%**	**404**	**328**	**-19%**

Subjects in the age group of 18-29 accounted for 143 (44%) of Total Use of Force used against, and age group of 30-39 accounted for 87 (27%) of Total Use of Force.

Subject Age Group	Number of Subjects			Total Uses of Force		
	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change	Q1-2021	Q1-2022	% change
Under 18	14	15	**7%**	26	23	**-12%**
18-29	95	78	**-18%**	153	143	**-7%**
30-39	62	49	**-21%**	107	87	**-19%**
40-49	25	21	**-16%**	42	28	**-33%**
50-59	19	10	**-47%**	29	13	**-55%**
60+	4	5	**25%**	4	9	**125%**
Unknown	35	10	**-71%**	43	25	**-42%**
Total	**254**	**188**	**-26%**	**404**	**328**	**-19%**

*Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report.

Use of Force, Q1 2022

Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Officers Involved January-March 2022

Of 174 total Use of Force incidents, most of the incidents involved 1 officer (114, 66%), 3% decrease compared to Q1 of 2021.

Number of Officers Involved	Number of Incidents		
	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% change
1	117	114	-3%
2	54	35	-35%
3	21	12	-43%
4	3	9	200%
5	3	2	-33%
6	3	0	-100%
7	1	1	0%
15	0	1	not cal
Total	**202**	**174**	**-14%**



Use of Force, Q1 2022

Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Subjects Involved January-March 2022

Of 174 total Use of Force incidents, most of the incidents involved 1 subject (157, 90%), 10% decrease compared to Q1 of 2021.

Number of Subjects Involved	Number of Incidents		
	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% change
1	174	157	-10%
2	19	16	-16%
3	6	0	-100%
4	1	0	-100%
5	1	1	0%
18	1	0	-100%
Total	**202**	**174**	**-14%**



Arrests, Q1 2022

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
Q1-2021 vs. Q1-2022

Overall arrests declined in Q1 2022 (2,777) by 15% compared to Q1 2021 (3,282).

Race and Gender	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% change
Asian Female	44	41	-7%
Asian Male	136	146	7%
Asian Unknown	0	2	not cal
Black Female	220	155	-30%
Black Male	977	757	-23%
Black Unknown	3	1	-67%
Hispanic Female	107	92	-14%
Hispanic Male	805	732	-9%
Hispanic Unknown	2	3	50%
White Female	142	152	7%
White Male	717	603	-16%
White Unknown	1	2	100%
Unknown Female	16	11	-31%
Unknown Male	80	65	-19%
Unknown Race & Gender	32	15	-53%
Total	**3,282**	**2,777**	**-15%**



Arrests totals do not include arrests at the Airport.
Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports in which data was not provided.

Arrests Q1, 2022

Arrests by Age

Q1-2021 vs. Q1-2022

The overall arrests of subjects aged 17 and younger increased by 15% in Q1 2022 (97) when compared to arrests in Q1 2021 (84). The arrest of subjects 60 and older increased by 14% in Q1 2022 (150) when compared to Q1 2021 (132).

Age	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% change
Under 18	84	97	15%
18-29	1,139	894	-22%
30-39	1,006	884	-12%
40-49	579	507	-12%
50-59	342	245	-28%
60+	132	150	14%
Unknown	0	0	0%
Total	**3,282**	**2,777**	**-15%**



Arrests totals do not include arrests at the Airport.
Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Department of Police Accountability (DPA)

The Department is required to obtain information from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA), formerly the Office of Citizens Complaints, relating to the total number of complaints for the reporting period received by DPA that it characterizes as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity. The Department also is required to include in its report the total number of complaints DPA closed during the reporting period that were characterized as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity, as well as the total number of each type of disposition for such complaints.

Allegations of Bias based on Race or Ethnicity, Gender, or Gender Identity

Cases Received in Q1-2022

Type of Case Received	# of Cases
Racial Bias	1
Gender Bias	0
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
TOTAL	1

DPA received 159 total cases for the quarter.
1 cases received in Q1-2022 involved Racial or Gender Bias
1 officer were named for allegations of racial or gender bias.
Total Cases Received in 2022 involving Racial or Gender Bias: 1 Case

During Q1-2022, DPA completed 2 complaint investigations in cases in which there was an allegation of racial/ethnic or gender/gender identity bias. There were no sustained findings indicating bias.
There were no sustained allegations of racial or gender bias in 2022.

Case Closures and Dispositions for Q1-2022

Type of Case	Sustained	Mediated	Unfounded	No Finding	Insufficient Evidence	Improper Conduct	Referral	TOTAL
Racial Bias	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Homophobic Bias	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Racial, Homophobic, Gender Bias	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2

*Source: Department of Police Accountability

DHR Investigated Complaints of Bias

BIAS-RELATED COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY SFPD, AND INVESTIGATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

As part of the Department's commitment to transparency, the Department also reports on all bias-related complaints received internally by the Department and forwarded to the Department of Human Resources (DHR) for investigation. Closed cases may include complaints received in previous quarters. Bias-related complaints are referred to as Employment Equal Opportunity (EEO) cases by DHR.

Q1-2022 Bias Cases Received

EEO Cases Received	Q1-2022
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	5
Disability Discrimination	0
Hostile Work Environment	0
Gender Discrimination	0
Race Discrimination	1
Race / Sex Discrimination	0
Retaliation	0
Sexual Harassment	0
Sexual Orientation	0
TOTAL	**6**

Complainants: 5 Department members; 1 Outside Civilian

Respondents (Named): SFPD (named in 5 complaints); 2 Sworn Officers;

Total Respondents: 5 SFPD Named; 2 Sworn Officers

Q1-2022 Case Closures and Dispositions

Type of Case	Administrative Closures			Sustained	TOTAL
	Respondent Counseled	Rejected	Insufficient Evidence		
Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Gender Discrimination	0	0	1	0	**1**
Gender Identity	1	0	0	0	**1**
Hostile Work Environment	0	0	0	0	**0**
Marital/Parental Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Medical Discrimination	0	0	1	0	**1**
Race Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Race / Sex Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Retaliation	0	0	0	0	**0**
Sexual Harassment	1	0	0	0	**1**
Sexual Orientation	0	0	0	0	**0**
Slurs/Inappropriate Comment	0	0	0	0	**0**
Weight Discrimination	0	0	0	0	**0**
Harassment/ Non-EEO	0	0	0	0	**0**
TOTAL	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**4**

Use of Force and Arrest Data by Police District

January-March 2022



Use of Force Q1, 2022

Use of Force Incidents, by District

Q1 – 2021 vs. 2022

During Q1-2022, Tenderloin District accounted for 35 Use of Force incidents comprising 20% of all districts Uses of Force.

Districts	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total
Co. A - Central	4	4	9	17
Co. B - Southern	5	6	12	23
Co. C - Bayview	8	5	8	21
Co. D - Mission	10	13	9	32
Co. E - Northern	7	8	6	21
Co. F - Park	1	1	0	2
Co. G - Richmond	2	1	0	3
Co. H - Ingleside	4	3	4	11
Co. I - Taraval	1	1	2	4
Co. J - Tenderloin	11	12	12	35
Airport	1	2	1	4
Outside SF	0	0	1	1
Total	**54**	**56**	**64**	**174**



Use of Force Q1, 2022

Number of Subjects on Whom Force Was Used, by District
Q1 – 2021 vs. 2022

During the Q1-2022, Mission and Tenderloin districts both accounted for 38% of all districts subjects on whom force was used.

Districts	Number of Subjects		% change
	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	
Co. A - Central	27	18	-33%
Co. B - Southern	25	26	4%
Co. C - Bayview	29	28	-3%
Co. D - Mission	51	36	-29%
Co. E - Northern	40	22	-45%
Co. F - Park	13	2	-85%
Co. G - Richmond	12	4	-67%
Co. H - Ingleside	13	10	-23%
Co. I - Taraval	7	4	-43%
Co. J - Tenderloin	29	35	21%
Airport	2	5	150%
Outside SF	7	1	-86%
Total	**254**	**188**	**-26%**



Use of Force Q1, 2022

Total Uses of Force, by District

During Q1-2022, Mission District (71 uses of force), Bayview District (58 uses of force) and Tenderloin District (54 uses of force) accounted for 42% of all districts Uses of Force.

Districts	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% change
Co. A - Central	40	27	-33%
Co. B - Southern	43	36	-16%
Co. C - Bayview	51	58	14%
Co. D - Mission	81	71	-12%
Co. E - Northern	59	30	-49%
Co. F - Park	19	2	-89%
Co. G - Richmond	17	5	-71%
Co. H - Ingleside	19	15	-21%
Co. I - Taraval	11	4	-64%
Co. J - Tenderloin	49	54	10%
Airport	2	25	1150%
Outside SF	13	1	-92%
Total	**404**	**328**	**-19%**



Arrests, Q1 2022

Total Arrests by District
Q1 – 2021 vs. 2022

In Q1-2022, there was an overall decline in arrest by 15%. However, Tenderloin station arrests (578) increased by 19%.

District	Q1 2021	Q1 2022	% change
Co. A - Central	386	331	-14%
Co. B - Southern	424	395	-7%
Co. C - Bayview	390	247	-37%
Co. D - Mission	479	405	-15%
Co. E - Northern	340	319	-6%
Co. F - Park	129	76	-41%
Co. G - Richmond	135	100	-26%
Co. H - Ingleside	253	137	-46%
Co. I - Taraval	148	135	-9%
Co. J - Tenderloin	485	578	19%
Outside SF	113	54	-52%
Total	**3,282**	**2,777**	**-15%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

By District Data

Central District

(Company A)

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 27 total Uses of Force at Central district. Pointing Firearms (9) accounted for 33% of type of force used. The peak time for incidents (16, 59%) was between 2000-2359hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	0
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	2
OC	3
Other	0
Physical Control	7
Pointing of Firearms	9
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	6
Total	**27**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
A-Central	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**	4%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**	4%
1200-1559	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	**5**	19%
1600-1959	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	**4**	15%
2000-2359	2	0	0	4	5	2	3	**16**	59%
Total	**5**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**7**	**4**	**4**	**27**	100%
Percentage	19%	4%	7%	15%	26%	15%	15%	100%	

By District Data

Central District
(Company A)
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	6	**22%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	1	6	**22%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	6	**22%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**4%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	**4%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**4%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**4%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	5	**19%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**7**	**9**	**0**	**6**	**27**	**100%**

By District Data

Central District
(Company A)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

Black males (32%), and White males (26%) accounted for approximately 58% of arrests made by Central Station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	9	3%
Asian Male	27	8%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	24	7%
Black Male	105	32%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	5	2%
Hispanic Male	46	14%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	26	8%
White Male	85	26%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	3	1%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	0%
Total	**331**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Central District
(Company A)
Arrests by Age
January - March 2022

Subjects aged 18-29 (36%) accounted for the most arrest made by Central station, while subjects under 18 (3%) were the least arrested.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	9	3%
18-29	119	36%
30-39	93	28%
40-49	61	18%
50-59	34	10%
60+	15	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**331**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Central District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









Southern District

(Company B)

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 36 total Uses of Force at Southern district. Pointing of Firearms (14) accounted for 39% of type of force used. The peak times for incidents were between 1600-1959hrs. (11, 31%) and 2000-2359hrs. (11, 31%)

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	1
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	0
OC	3
Other	0
Physical Control	9
Pointing of Firearms	14
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	9
Total	**36**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
B-Southern	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1**	3%
0400-0759	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	**2**	6%
0800-1159	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	**4**	11%
1200-1559	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	**7**	19%
1600-1959	0	4	1	3	0	0	3	**11**	31%
2000-2359	8	0	0	2	0	1	0	**11**	31%
Total	**10**	**7**	**1**	**9**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**36**	100%
Percentage	28%	19%	3%	25%	6%	8%	11%	100%	

By District Data

Southern District
(Company B)
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	2	0	4	8	0	7	21	**58%**
Part I Property	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	5	**14%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	**6%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	4	**11%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	**6%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	**6%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**9**	**14**	**0**	**9**	**36**	**100%**

By District Data

Southern District (Company B)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

Black males (33%) and White males (24%) accounted for approximately 57% of arrests made by Southern station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	9	2%
Asian Male	18	5%
Asian Unknown	1	0%
Black Female	15	4%
Black Male	130	33%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	7	2%
Hispanic Male	86	22%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	16	4%
White Male	96	24%
White Unknown	1	0%
Unknown Female	2	1%
Unknown Male	10	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	4	1%
Total	**395**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Southern District (Company B)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects age 18-29 (31%) and subjects 30-39 (30%) accounted for 61% of arrest made by Southern station in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	22	6%
18-29	123	31%
30-39	118	30%
40-49	64	16%
50-59	47	12%
60+	21	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**395**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Southern District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









By District Data

Bayview District
(Company C)
Use of Force
January-March 2022

There were 58 total Uses of Force at Bayview district. Physical Control (25) accounted for 43% of type of force used. The peak time for incidents (24, 41%) was between 0800-1159hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	1
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	1
OC	0
Other	0
Physical Control	25
Pointing of Firearms	22
Spike Strips	3
Strike by Object/Fist	6
Total	**58**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
C-Bayview	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	**2**	3%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1**	2%
0800-1159	1	0	3	6	5	9	0	**24**	41%
1200-1559	5	4	0	0	3	2	0	**14**	24%
1600-1959	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	**7**	12%
2000-2359	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	**10**	17%
Total	**6**	**6**	**3**	**15**	**14**	**13**	**1**	**58**	100%
Percentage	10%	10%	5%	26%	24%	22%	2%	100%	

By District Data

Bayview District (Company C)
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	7	**12%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	0	17	**29%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	8	**14%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	**9%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	3	8	**14%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**2%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	7	**12%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	**9%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**25**	**22**	**3**	**6**	**58**	**100%**

By District Data

Bayview District (Company C)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

Black males (37%) and Hispanic males (27%) accounted for 64% of arrests made by Bayview Station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	3	1%
Asian Male	17	7%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	28	11%
Black Male	92	37%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	12	5%
Hispanic Male	66	27%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	8	3%
White Male	18	7%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	1	0%
Unknown Male	1	0%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	0%
Total	**247**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Bayview District (Company C)
Arrests by Age
January - March 2022

Subjects ages 18-29 (32%) and subjects ages 30-39 (28%) accounted for 60% of the arrest made by Bayview station in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	13	5%
18-29	79	32%
30-39	70	28%
40-49	53	21%
50-59	15	6%
60+	17	7%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**247**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Bayview District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









By District Data

Mission District
(Company D)
Use of Force
January-March 2022

There were 71 total Uses of Force at Mission district. Pointing of Firearms (44) accounted for 62% of type of force used. The peak time for incidents (18, 25%) was between 1200-1559hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	5
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	1
OC	2
Other	1
Physical Control	15
Pointing of Firearms	44
Spike Strips	2
Strike by Object/Fist	1
Total	**71**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
D-Mission	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	2	0	1	0	4	5	**12**	17%
0400-0759	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	**11**	15%
0800-1159	0	4	2	0	0	1	0	**7**	10%
1200-1559	3	4	3	2	4	2	0	**18**	25%
1600-1959	1	0	0	1	6	5	3	**16**	23%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	**7**	10%
Total	**4**	**10**	**10**	**10**	**13**	**13**	**11**	**71**	100%
Percentage	6%	14%	14%	14%	18%	18%	15%	100%	

By District Data

Mission District (Company D)

Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Strike by Object/Fist	% of Calls
Part I Violent	1	0	0	1	0	7	12	0	0	21	**30%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	1	0	1	17	1	0	20	**28%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	12	**17%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	5	**7%**
Person yelling for help (918)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	**3%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	**3%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	**6%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**1%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	**4%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**5**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**15**	**44**	**2**	**1**	**71**	**100%**

By District Data

Mission District (Company D)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

Hispanic males (34%) and Black males (24%) accounted for 58% of all arrests made by Mission station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	2	0%
Asian Male	17	4%
Asian Unknown	1	0%
Black Female	15	4%
Black Male	98	24%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	18	4%
Hispanic Male	136	34%
Hispanic Unknown	1	0%
White Female	13	3%
White Male	88	22%
White Unknown	1	0%
Unknown Female	2	0%
Unknown Male	11	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	2	0%
Total	405	100%



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Mission District (Company D)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects age 30-39 (36%) and subjects age 18-29 (27%) accounted for 63% of the arrest made by Mission station in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	13	3%
18-29	110	27%
30-39	147	36%
40-49	80	20%
50-59	36	9%
60+	19	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**405**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Mission District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









By District Data

Northern District

(Company E)

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 30 total Uses of Force at Northern district. Physical Control (12) accounted for 40% of type of force used. The peak time for incidents (10, 33%) was between 1200-1559hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	0
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	0
OC	2
Other	1
Physical Control	12
Pointing of Firearms	9
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	6
Total	**30**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
E-Northern	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	3	1	2	0	1	1	**8**	27%
0400-0759	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	**4**	13%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	**2**	7%
1200-1559	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	**10**	33%
1600-1959	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	**3**	10%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	**3**	10%
Total	**6**	**4**	**6**	**6**	**1**	**4**	**3**	**30**	100%
Percentage	20%	13%	20%	20%	3%	13%	10%	100%	

By District Data

Northern District (Company E)
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	5	**17%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	0	3	18	**60%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**3%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	**10%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**3%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	**7%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**12**	**9**	**0**	**6**	**30**	**100%**

By District Data

Northern District (Company E)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

Black males (28%) and White males (25%) accounted for 53% of all arrests made by Northern Station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	3	1%
Asian Male	11	3%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	20	6%
Black Male	90	28%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	9	3%
Hispanic Male	63	20%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	26	8%
White Male	81	25%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	4	1%
Unknown Male	10	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	2	1%
Total	319	100%



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Northern District (Company E)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects aged 30-39 (41%) accounted for the most arrests made by Northern station, while subjects under 18 (4%) were the least arrested in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	12	4%
18-29	92	29%
30-39	132	41%
40-49	48	15%
50-59	17	5%
60+	18	6%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**319**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Northern District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









By District Data

Park District

(Company F)

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 2 total Uses of Force at Park district. Pointing of Firearms (1) and Strike by Object/Fist (1) accounted for 100% of type of force used. The peak times for incidents were between 0000-0359 and 0400-0759hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	0
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	0
OC	0
Other	0
Physical Control	0
Pointing of Firearms	1
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	1
Total	**2**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
F-Park	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1**	50%
0400-0759	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**1**	50%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
Total	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	100%
Percentage	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%	

By District Data

Park District (Company F)
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**50%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	**50%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**100%**

By District Data

Park District (Company F)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

White males (41%) and Hispanic males (17%) accounted for 58% of all arrests made by Park Station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	1	1%
Asian Male	4	5%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	2	3%
Black Male	11	14%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	3	4%
Hispanic Male	13	17%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	9	12%
White Male	31	41%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	2	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	**76**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Park District (Company F)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects age 18-29 (34%) and subjects age 40-49 (25%) accounted for 59% of the arrest made by Park station in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	3	4%
18-29	26	34%
30-39	14	18%
40-49	19	25%
50-59	8	11%
60+	6	8%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**76**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Park District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









Richmond District

(Company G)

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 5 total Uses of Force at Richmond district. Pointing of Firearms (5) accounted for 100% of type of force used. The peak times for incidents were between 1200-1559hrs. (2, 40%) and 1600-1959hrs. (2, 40%)

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	0
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	0
OC	0
Other	0
Physical Control	0
Pointing of Firearms	5
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	0
Total	**5**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
G-Richmond	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0400-0759	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**1**	20%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1200-1559	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**2**	40%
1600-1959	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	**2**	40%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
Total	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**5**	100%
Percentage	0%	0%	60%	0%	40%	0%	0%	100%	

By District Data

Richmond District (Company G)

Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**20%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	**40%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	**40%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**100%**

By District Data

Richmond District (Company G)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

White males (26%) and Hispanic males (20%) accounted for 46% of all arrests made by Richmond station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	3	3%
Asian Male	7	7%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	3	3%
Black Male	19	19%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	2	2%
Hispanic Male	20	20%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	12	12%
White Male	26	26%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	8	8%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	100	100%



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Richmond District (Company G)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects age 18-29 (26%) and subjects age 30-39 (25%) accounted for 51% of the arrest made by Richmond station in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	2	2%
18-29	26	26%
30-39	25	25%
40-49	23	23%
50-59	13	13%
60+	11	11%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**100**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Richmond District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









Ingleside District

(Company H)

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 15 total Uses of Force at Ingleside district. Pointing of Firearms (5) accounted for 33% of type of force used. The peak time for incidents was (6, 40%) between 2000-2359hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	1
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	1
OC	3
Other	1
Physical Control	3
Pointing of Firearms	5
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	1
Total	**15**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
H-Ingleside	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0400-0759	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**1**	7%
0800-1159	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**1**	7%
1200-1559	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	**2**	13%
1600-1959	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	**5**	33%
2000-2359	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	**6**	40%
Total	**2**	**2**	**5**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**15**	100%
Percentage	13%	13%	33%	13%	7%	7%	13%	100%	

By District Data

Ingleside District (Company H)
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	6	**40%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	**13%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**7%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**7%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	5	**33%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**1**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**3**	**5**	**0**	**1**	**15**	**100%**

Ingleside District (Company H)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

Hispanic males (36%) and Black males (26%) accounted for approximately 62% of all arrests made by Ingleside station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	2	1%
Asian Male	12	9%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	7	5%
Black Male	35	26%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	4	3%
Hispanic Male	49	36%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	3	2%
White Male	21	15%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	4	3%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	137	100%



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Ingleside District (Company H)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects age 18-29 (29%) and subjects age 30-39 (29%) accounted 58% of arrests made by the Ingleside station in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	5	4%
18-29	40	29%
30-39	40	29%
40-49	26	19%
50-59	19	14%
60+	7	5%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**137**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Ingleside District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









Taraval District

(Company I)

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 4 total Uses of Force at Taraval district. Pointing of Firearms (2) accounted for 50% of type of force used. The peak time for incidents (2, 50%) was between 0800-1159hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	0
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	0
OC	1
Other	0
Physical Control	1
Pointing of Firearms	2
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	0
Total	**4**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
I-Taraval	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	**1**	25%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0800-1159	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**2**	50%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**	25%
1600-1959	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
Total	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**4**	100%
Percentage	0%	0%	25%	0%	25%	25%	25%	100%	

By District Data

Taraval District (Company I)
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**25%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**25%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	**25%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**25%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**100%**

By District Data

Taraval District (Company I)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

White males (33%) and Hispanic males (19%) accounted for 52% of all arrests made by Taraval station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	5	4%
Asian Male	21	16%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	4	3%
Black Male	20	15%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	4	3%
Hispanic Male	26	19%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	9	7%
White Male	44	33%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	2	1%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0%
Total	135	100%



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Taraval District (Company I)
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects age 18-29 (27%) and subjects age 30-39 (26%) accounted for approximately 53% of arrests made by Taraval station in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	2	1%
18-29	37	27%
30-39	35	26%
40-49	32	24%
50-59	17	13%
60+	12	9%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**135**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Taraval District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









By District Data

Tenderloin District

(Company J)

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 54 total Uses of Force at Tenderloin district. Physical Control (30) accounted for 56% of type of force used. The peak time for incidents (28, 52%) was between 1200-1559hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	0
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	0
OC	1
Other	0
Physical Control	30
Pointing of Firearms	18
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	5
Total	**54**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
J-Tenderloin	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	**3**	6%
0400-0759	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	**5**	9%
0800-1159	2	1	0	2	4	0	1	**10**	19%
1200-1559	10	0	5	2	1	5	5	**28**	52%
1600-1959	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	**4**	7%
2000-2359	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	**4**	7%
Total	**15**	**1**	**8**	**10**	**6**	**7**	**7**	**54**	100%
Percentage	28%	2%	15%	19%	11%	13%	13%	100%	

By District Data

Tenderloin District (Company J)
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	1	12	**24%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	**6%**
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	15	**29%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**2%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4	**8%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6	**12%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	**6%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**2%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	**4%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	**8%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**29**	**17**	**0**	**5**	**51**	**100%**

By District Data

Tenderloin District (Company J)
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

Hispanic males (35%) and Black males (25%) accounted for approximately 60% of all arrests made by Tenderloin station in Q1-2022.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	4	1%
Asian Male	12	2%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	36	6%
Black Male	144	25%
Black Unknown	1	0%
Hispanic Female	25	4%
Hispanic Male	200	35%
Hispanic Unknown	2	0%
White Female	28	5%
White Male	110	19%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	2	0%
Unknown Male	10	2%
Unknown Race & Gender	4	1%
Total	**578**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

Tenderloin District (Company J)
Arrests Age
January – March 2022

Subjects age 18-29 (36%) and subjects age 30-39 (34%) accounted for 70% of arrests made by Tenderloin station in Q1-2022.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	14	2%
18-29	206	36%
30-39	199	34%
40-49	98	17%
50-59	39	7%
60+	22	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**578**	**100%**



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

Tenderloin District
Shootings, Firearm Seizures, Homicides, and Part 1 Violent Crimes
January 1, 2022 – March 31, 2022









Airport

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There were 25 total Uses of Force at the Airport. Pointing of Firearms (9) accounted for 36% of type of force used. The peak time for incidents (18, 72%) was between 1200-1559hrs.

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	1
Firearm	4
Impact Weapon	1
OC	0
Other	3
Physical Control	6
Pointing of Firearms	9
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	1
Total	**25**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
K-Airport	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0400-0759	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	**1**	4%
0800-1159	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	**3**	12%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	**18**	72%
1600-1959	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	**3**	12%
Total	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**18**	**4**	**0**	**25**	100%
Percentage	0%	0%	12%	0%	72%	16%	0%	100%	

By District Data

Airport
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERIW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	**12%**
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Person with a gun (221)	1	4	1	0	3	0	9	0	0	18	**72%**
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	**12%**
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**4%**
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
Total	**1**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**6**	**9**	**0**	**1**	**25**	**100%**

Airport
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

There were 64 total arrests in Q1-2022. Black males accounted for 31%, White males accounted for 30% and Hispanic males accounted for 9%.

Race & Gender	Q1-2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	1	2%
Asian Male	3	5%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	4	6%
Black Male	20	31%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	0	0%
Hispanic Male	6	9%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	4	6%
White Male	19	30%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	1	2%
Unknown Male	6	9%
Total	**64**	**100%**



Airport arrest data obtained from the San Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau. Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Airport
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects ages 30-39 accounted for 32% of all Airport arrests and subjects age 50 and over accounted for 6%.

Age Group	Q1-2022 Arrests	% of Total
18-29	16	25%
30-39	26	41%
40-49	9	14%
50-59	7	11%
60+	6	9%
Total	**64**	**100%**



Airport arrest data is obtained from the San Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau.

Outside of SF/Unknown

Use of Force

January-March 2022

There was 1 total Use of Force Outside of SF/Unknown. Strike by Object/Fist (1) accounted for 100% of type of force used. The peak time for incident was between 0400-0759hrs

Use of Force	Total
ERIW	0
Firearm	0
Impact Weapon	0
OC	0
Other	0
Physical Control	0
Pointing of Firearms	0
Spike Strips	0
Strike by Object/Fist	1
Total	**1**

Time of Day/Day of Week									
L-Outside SF	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	**Total**	
0000-0359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
0400-0759	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**1**	100%
0800-1159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1200-1559	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
1600-1959	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
2000-2359	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0%
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	100%
Percentage	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	

By District Data

Outside of SF/Unknown
Use of Force by Call Type
January-March 2022

Type of Call	ERW	Firearm	Impact Weapon	OC	Other	Physical Control	Pointing of Firearms	Spike Strips	Strike by Object/Fist	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Part I Property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Person with a gun (221)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Person with a knife (219)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	100%
Aided Case (520)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Restraining Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Terrorist Threats (650)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Traffic-Related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Vandalism (594/595)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Weapon, Carrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Panic Alarm (100P)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Demonstration (400)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
RAT Activation (200)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Interview with a Citizen (909)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Meet with Officer (905)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Escape from Jail (1000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**100%**

Outside SF/Unknown
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender
January – March 2022

Hispanic males (50%) and Black males (24%) accounted for 74% of all Outside SF arrests.

Race and Gender	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Asian Female	0	0%
Asian Male	0	0%
Asian Unknown	0	0%
Black Female	1	2%
Black Male	13	24%
Black Unknown	0	0%
Hispanic Female	3	6%
Hispanic Male	27	50%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0%
White Female	2	4%
White Male	3	6%
White Unknown	0	0%
Unknown Female	0	0%
Unknown Male	4	7%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	2%
Total	54	100%



Arrest totals do not include arrests at Airport.
Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

By District Data

Outside SF/Unknown
Arrests by Age
January – March 2022

Subjects age 18-29 (67%) and age 30-39 (20%) accounted for 87% of all Outside SF arrests.

Age	Q1 2022 Arrests	% of Total
Under 18	2	4%
18-29	36	67%
30-39	11	20%
40-49	3	6%
50-59	0	0%
60+	2	4%
Unknown Age	0	0%
Total	**54**	**100%**



Note: Arrests totals do not include arrests at Airport.
Note: Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

By District Data

Outside SF/Unknown

Arrests by City
January – March 2022

Oakland (23) and Daly City (5) accounted for 52% of arrests outside of the city limits.

Location	Q1 2022 Arrests
Alameda County Sheriff's Office	1
Brentwood, CA	1
CA Highway Patrol	1
Colma PD	1
Confidential	3
Daly City, CA	5
Dublin, CA	2
Fairfield PD	1
Manteca, CA	1
Marin County Sheriff's Office	1
Merced, CA	1
Newark, CA	1
Oakland, CA	23
Richmond, CA	2
Rohnert Park, CA	2
San Bruno, CA	1
San Joaquin County	1
San Leandro, CA	1
SF International Airport	1
SFSU PD	2
Stockton, CA	1
Suisun City, CA	1
Grand Total	**54**



Glossary

AB 953	Assembly Bill 953, also known as the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) of 2015; requires CA law enforcement agencies to collect and report demographic data to the California Department of Justice
Administrative Code Chapter 96a	A San Francisco ordinance passed in 2016 that placed specified reporting requirements on the San Francisco Police Department
Bias by proxy	When a civilian racially profiles an individual and calls the police as a result
Cal DOJ	California Department of Justice
CBP	U.S. Customs and Border Protection
CDW	Crime Data Warehouse
City	City and County of San Francisco
CMCR	Critical Mindset Coordinated Response
Department	San Francisco Police Department
DGO	Department General Order
DGO 5.01	SFPD's Department General Order that provides guidelines for the application and reporting of Use of Force
DHR	San Francisco Department of Human Resources
DHS	U.S. Department of Homeland Security
DOJ	U.S. Department of Justice
DPA	Department of Police Accountability
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity

EIS	Early Intervention System – a system that works to identify officers who could benefit from non-disciplinary intervention and designed to improve the performance of officers through coaching, training, and professional development
ERIW	Extended Range Impact Weapons
ICE	U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
K-9	Police Dog (Canine)
OC	Oleoresin Capsicum spray or pepper spray
OIS	Officer Involved Shooting
PRCS	Post Release Community Supervision; used to classify probation and parole searches
RIPA Board	California's Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board; produces an annual report on the past and current status of racial identity profiling and provides recommendations to law enforcement agencies
SDCS	Stop Data Collection System, the tool used to collect stops and search data in compliance with AB953.
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
Spike Strips	Device used to impede or stop the movement of wheeled vehicles by puncturing their tires
TSA	Transportation Security Administration



Safety with Respect

Prepared by San Francisco Police Department

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit

May 2022

Data Sources: San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Early Intervention Systems Administrative Investigative Management Database, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau, San Francisco Police Department Human Resources; San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs; San Francisco Department of Emergency Management; San Francisco Department of Public Accountability; California Department of Justice Stop Data Collection System

Q1 2021 and Q1 2022 Use of Force data was queried on April 21, 2022
Q1 2022 Arrest Data was queried on April 14, 2022

Safety with Respect

APPENDIX A
SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report
2022 Quarter 1 Report
Crime Victim Data Reporting

WILLIAM SCOTT
Chief of Police

On April 12, 2020, Ordinance 40-20 went into effect, amending San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 96 to include section 96A.5, "Quarterly Crime Victim Data Reporting." The ordinance mandated that the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provide quarterly reports regarding victim demographics across a host of data points, further specifying that the quarterly reports would be due on the first Tuesday in February, May, August and November.

As part of our commitment to the community we serve, SFPD's Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit worked diligently and in close coordination with relevant SFPD bureaus to compile the crime victim information required for this report. It bears mentioning here, however, that as noted by the Board of Supervisors' Budget and Legislative Analyst, SFPD…

> …would need to modify the current UCR [Uniform Crime Reports] system if the proposed ordinance required tracking and reporting of the additional crime data at an earlier date than the estimated NIBRS [National Incident-Based Reporting System] implementation date of March 2022. Based on a minimum of two full-time equivalent (FTE) consultants, the Department estimates the minimum cost would be approximately $960,000. The estimated cost could be higher, based on the actual scope of work needed to modify the current UCR system. (Source: Budget and Legislative Analyst Memo for the February 6, 2020 Government Audit and Oversight Committee Meeting, Feb. 3, 2020, https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8048232&GUID=24920980-EBBA-4951-95B0-79C2FB993568)

As no additional funding was allocated to allow for the extraction of this data from our primary records management system, Crime Data Warehouse (CDW), staff worked within the constraints of the current resources to aggregate the needed data from CDW as it stands. As a result, readers must be aware that SFPD data is not structured for this reporting method.

As background, all law enforcement agencies must report the most severe crime under the Uniform Crime Reporting requirements, as stated by the FBI Summary Reporting System manual:

"*In cases where more than one offense occurs in an incident, only the highest ranking Part I offense is counted.*"

This “hierarchy rule” has led to the development of a system (born many decades ago), and migrated to the current state, structured for the purpose of counting the “highest ranking” offense. As such, the number of victims of certain crimes is not mandated for reporting by UCR nor is the age, ethnicity, gender or location for any crime. Therefore, detailed demographic and location information for victims is not prepared for capture in this type of report.

For example:

1. An individual can be a victim of multiple crime types in a single reported incident – that person may be counted in each crime type.
2. In a single incident with multiple crimes *and* multiple victims, SFPD summary reporting cannot provide how many people were victim to any individual crime. All victims in the incident show up in each crime.

Prepared by: San Francisco Police Department Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit
Data Sources: San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse (CDW); San Francisco Police Department Homicide Unit; San Francisco Police Department Special Investigations Division

APPENDIX A – SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report - Victim Demographic Summary Findings

Aggravated Assault
The number of victims associated with Aggravated Assault incident reports is up .9 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Aggravated Assault in Q1 2022 are Hispanic, males, ages 30-39.

Battery/Other Assault
The number of victims associated with Battery/Other Assault incident reports is up 17.5 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Battery/Other Assault in Q1 2022 are White, males, ages 30-39.

Robbery
The number of victims associated with Robbery incident reports is down 15.2 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Robbery in Q1 2022 are Hispanic, males, ages 18-29.

Burglary
The number of victims associated with Burglary incident reports is down 30 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Burglary in Q1 2022 are others/unknown, followed by White, males, ages 30-39.

Larceny Theft
The number of victims associated with Larceny incident reports is up 41.5 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. Larceny victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Larceny in Q1 2022 are other, followed by White, males, aged 18-29.

Motor Vehicle Theft
The number of victims associated with Motor Vehicle Theft incident reports is up 5.2 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. Motor Vehicle Theft victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Motor Vehicle Theft in Q1 2022 are others, followed by white, male, ages 30-39.

Sexual Assault
The number of victims associated with Sexual Assault incident reports is up 31.8 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Sexual Assault in Q1 2022 are White, female, ages 18-29.

Vandalism
The number of victims associated with Vandalism incident reports is up 4.6 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. Vandalism victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Vandalism in Q1 2022 are other and unknown, followed by white, male, ages 30-39.

VICTIM DEMOGRAPHIC DATA REPORT
Q1 2022

Domestic Violence
The number of victims associated with Domestic Violence incident reports is up 21.7 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Domestic Violence in Q1 2022 are Black, female, ages 30-39.

Homicide
The number of Homicide victims is the same in Q1 2021 and Q1 2022 (nine). The most common victim demographic characteristics for Homicide in Q1 2021 are Black, male, ages 30-39.

Elder Abuse
The number of victims associated with Elder Abuse incident reports is down six percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Elder Abuse in Q1 2022 are Asian or Pacific Islander, female.

Child Abuse
The number of victims associated with Child Abuse incident reports is up 62.6 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Child Abuse in Q1 2022 are Hispanic and female.

Hate Crime
The number of victims associated with Hate Crime incident reports is down 63 percent from Q1 2021 to Q1 2022. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Hate Crime in Q1 2022 are Asian and White, male and female, ages 30-39. The most prevalent bias motivation during Q1 2022 was anti-Asian.

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	1	12	10	27	10	4	23	**87**
B	Southern	2	20	23	28	18	10	25	**126**
C	Bayview		8	60	28	8	8	24	**136**
D	Mission	3	5	22	72	15	6	30	**153**
E	Northern	1	15	54	31	10	14	39	**164**
F	Park		2	4	1	4	1	5	**17**
G	Richmond		3	4	5	2	2	9	**25**
H	Ingleside		18	10	46	4		17	**95**
I	Taraval		5	8	2	5	1	12	**33**
J	Tenderloin	1	10	40	28	5	5	43	**132**
X	Out of SF		3		2				**5**
Grand Total		**8**	**101**	**235**	**270**	**81**	**51**	**227**	**973**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.1%	1.2%	1.0%	2.8%	1.0%	0.4%	2.4%	**8.9%**
B	Southern	0.2%	2.1%	2.4%	2.9%	1.8%	1.0%	2.6%	**12.9%**
C	Bayview		0.8%	6.2%	2.9%	0.8%	0.8%	2.5%	**14.0%**
D	Mission	0.3%	0.5%	2.3%	7.4%	1.5%	0.6%	3.1%	**15.7%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.5%	5.5%	3.2%	1.0%	1.4%	4.0%	**16.9%**
F	Park		0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	**1.7%**
G	Richmond		0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.9%	**2.6%**
H	Ingleside		1.8%	1.0%	4.7%	0.4%		1.7%	**9.8%**
I	Taraval		0.5%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	1.2%	**3.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	1.0%	4.1%	2.9%	0.5%	0.5%	4.4%	**13.6%**
X	Out of SF		0.3%		0.2%				**0.5%**
Grand Total		**0.8%**	**10.4%**	**24.2%**	**27.7%**	**8.3%**	**5.2%**	**23.3%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	3	14	20	23	9	8	10	**87**
B	Southern	5	25	25	25	17	13	16	**126**
C	Bayview	17	27	37	17	16	8	14	**136**
D	Mission	8	27	30	30	20	19	19	**153**
E	Northern	17	34	42	26	23	9	13	**164**
F	Park		4	1	2	3	3	4	**17**
G	Richmond		8	4	3	3	4	3	**25**
H	Ingleside	12	14	27	15	8	14	5	**95**
I	Taraval	1	4	8	5	5	5	5	**33**
J	Tenderloin	1	20	33	24	29	16	9	**132**
X	Out of SF	2	1	1	1				**5**
Grand Total		**66**	**178**	**228**	**171**	**133**	**99**	**98**	**973**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.3%	1.4%	2.1%	2.4%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	**8.9%**
B	Southern	0.5%	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%	1.7%	1.3%	1.6%	**12.9%**
C	Bayview	1.7%	2.8%	3.8%	1.7%	1.6%	0.8%	1.4%	**14.0%**
D	Mission	0.8%	2.8%	3.1%	3.1%	2.1%	2.0%	2.0%	**15.7%**
E	Northern	1.7%	3.5%	4.3%	2.7%	2.4%	0.9%	1.3%	**16.9%**
F	Park		0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	**1.7%**
G	Richmond		0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	**2.6%**
H	Ingleside	1.2%	1.4%	2.8%	1.5%	0.8%	1.4%	0.5%	**9.8%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	**3.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	2.1%	3.4%	2.5%	3.0%	1.6%	0.9%	**13.6%**
X	Out of SF	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%				**0.5%**
Grand Total		**6.8%**	**18.3%**	**23.4%**	**17.6%**	**13.7%**	**10.2%**	**10.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	31	46		10		**87**
B	Southern	28	81		17		**126**
C	Bayview	61	65		9	1	**136**
D	Mission	29	109		14	1	**153**
E	Northern	62	95		7		**164**
F	Park	3	12		2		**17**
G	Richmond	6	15		3	1	**25**
H	Ingleside	38	53	1	2	1	**95**
I	Taraval	8	21		4		**33**
J	Tenderloin	38	90		3	1	**132**
X	Out of SF	1	4				**5**
Grand Total		**305**	**591**	**1**	**71**	**5**	**973**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	3.2%	4.7%		1.0%		**8.9%**
B	Southern	2.9%	8.3%		1.7%		**12.9%**
C	Bayview	6.3%	6.7%		0.9%	0.1%	**14.0%**
D	Mission	3.0%	11.2%		1.4%	0.1%	**15.7%**
E	Northern	6.4%	9.8%		0.7%		**16.9%**
F	Park	0.3%	1.2%		0.2%		**1.7%**
G	Richmond	0.6%	1.5%		0.3%	0.1%	**2.6%**
H	Ingleside	3.9%	5.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	**9.8%**
I	Taraval	0.8%	2.2%		0.4%		**3.4%**
J	Tenderloin	3.9%	9.2%		0.3%	0.1%	**13.6%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%	0.4%				**0.5%**
Grand Total		**31.3%**	**60.7%**	**0.1%**	**7.3%**	**0.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	**4**	**134**	**226**	**228**	**89**	**50**	**233**	**964**
Q1 2022	**8**	**101**	**235**	**270**	**81**	**51**	**227**	**973**
Difference	**4**	**-33**	**9**	**42**	**-8**	**1**	**-6**	**9**
% Change	**100.0%**	**-24.6%**	**4.0%**	**18.4%**	**-9.0%**	**2.0%**	**-2.6%**	**0.9%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	**39**	**210**	**224**	**167**	**122**	**83**	**119**	**964**
Q1 2022	**66**	**178**	**228**	**171**	**133**	**99**	**98**	**973**
Difference	**27**	**-32**	**4**	**4**	**11**	**16**	**-21**	**9**
% Change	**69.2%**	**-15.2%**	**1.8%**	**2.4%**	**9.0%**	**19.3%**	**-17.6%**	**0.9%**

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	**289**	**583**	**1**	**86**	**5**	**964**
Q1 2022	**305**	**591**	**1**	**71**	**5**	**973**
Difference	**16**	**8**	**0**	**-15**	**0**	**9**
% Change	**5.5%**	**1.4%**	**0.0%**	**-17.4%**	**0.0%**	**0.9%**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	1	31	25	24	9	13	64	**167**
B	Southern		24	29	32	8	10	67	**170**
C	Bayview		7	43	43	6	3	16	**118**
D	Mission	3	27	23	90	12	4	57	**216**
E	Northern	1	38	49	35	17	16	73	**229**
F	Park		6	4	5	1	4	16	**36**
G	Richmond		8	7	10	2	2	19	**48**
H	Ingleside		14	15	44	2		15	**90**
I	Taraval	1	30	19	15	2	4	17	**88**
J	Tenderloin	2	30	55	51	7	18	72	**235**
X	Out of SF		1	1	1				**3**
Grand Total		**8**	**216**	**270**	**350**	**66**	**74**	**416**	**1400**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.1%	2.2%	1.8%	1.7%	0.6%	0.9%	4.6%	**11.9%**
B	Southern		1.7%	2.1%	2.3%	0.6%	0.7%	4.8%	**12.1%**
C	Bayview		0.5%	3.1%	3.1%	0.4%	0.2%	1.1%	**8.4%**
D	Mission	0.2%	1.9%	1.6%	6.4%	0.9%	0.3%	4.1%	**15.4%**
E	Northern	0.1%	2.7%	3.5%	2.5%	1.2%	1.1%	5.2%	**16.4%**
F	Park		0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	1.1%	**2.6%**
G	Richmond		0.6%	0.5%	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	1.4%	**3.4%**
H	Ingleside		1.0%	1.1%	3.1%	0.1%		1.1%	**6.4%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	2.1%	1.4%	1.1%	0.1%	0.3%	1.2%	**6.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	2.1%	3.9%	3.6%	0.5%	1.3%	5.1%	**16.8%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.1%	0.1%				**0.2%**
Grand Total		**0.6%**	**15.4%**	**19.3%**	**25.0%**	**4.7%**	**5.3%**	**29.7%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	15	34	35	33	21	12	17	**167**
B	Southern	9	31	49	26	25	21	9	**170**
C	Bayview	14	23	30	18	16	12	5	**118**
D	Mission	17	42	41	56	27	22	11	**216**
E	Northern	7	51	55	37	26	29	24	**229**
F	Park	1	8	10	5	4	6	2	**36**
G	Richmond	5	9	13	8	5	6	2	**48**
H	Ingleside	13	25	18	16	7	7	4	**90**
I	Taraval	3	20	25	16	10	8	6	**88**
J	Tenderloin	8	46	55	46	38	24	18	**235**
X	Out of SF	2	1						**3**
Grand Total		**94**	**290**	**331**	**261**	**179**	**147**	**98**	**1400**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	1.1%	2.4%	2.5%	2.4%	1.5%	0.9%	1.2%	**11.9%**
B	Southern	0.6%	2.2%	3.5%	1.9%	1.8%	1.5%	0.6%	**12.1%**
C	Bayview	1.0%	1.6%	2.1%	1.3%	1.1%	0.9%	0.4%	**8.4%**
D	Mission	1.2%	3.0%	2.9%	4.0%	1.9%	1.6%	0.8%	**15.4%**
E	Northern	0.5%	3.6%	3.9%	2.6%	1.9%	2.1%	1.7%	**16.4%**
F	Park	0.1%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	**2.6%**
G	Richmond	0.4%	0.6%	0.9%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	**3.4%**
H	Ingleside	0.9%	1.8%	1.3%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	**6.4%**
I	Taraval	0.2%	1.4%	1.8%	1.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	**6.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.6%	3.3%	3.9%	3.3%	2.7%	1.7%	1.3%	**16.8%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%	0.1%						**0.2%**
Grand Total		**6.7%**	**20.7%**	**23.6%**	**18.6%**	**12.8%**	**10.5%**	**7.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	73	81		8	5	**167**
B	Southern	61	101		8		**170**
C	Bayview	66	46		6		**118**
D	Mission	92	116		8		**216**
E	Northern	89	119		15	6	**229**
F	Park	16	19		1		**36**
G	Richmond	20	25	1	2		**48**
H	Ingleside	40	48		2		**90**
I	Taraval	55	31		2		**88**
J	Tenderloin	96	132		7		**235**
X	Out of SF	3					**3**
Grand Total		**611**	**718**	**1**	**59**	**11**	**1400**

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	5.2%	5.8%		0.6%	0.4%	**11.9%**
B	Southern	4.4%	7.2%		0.6%		**12.1%**
C	Bayview	4.7%	3.3%		0.4%		**8.4%**
D	Mission	6.6%	8.3%		0.6%		**15.4%**
E	Northern	6.4%	8.5%		1.1%	0.4%	**16.4%**
F	Park	1.1%	1.4%		0.1%		**2.6%**
G	Richmond	1.4%	1.8%	0.1%	0.1%		**3.4%**
H	Ingleside	2.9%	3.4%		0.1%		**6.4%**
I	Taraval	3.9%	2.2%		0.1%		**6.3%**
J	Tenderloin	6.9%	9.4%		0.5%		**16.8%**
X	Out of SF	0.2%					**0.2%**
Grand Total		**43.6%**	**51.3%**	**0.1%**	**4.2%**	**0.8%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	11	175	225	285	70	72	353	1191
Q1 2022	8	216	270	350	66	74	416	1400
Difference	-3	41	45	65	-4	2	63	209
% Change	-27.3%	23.4%	20.0%	22.8%	-5.7%	2.8%	17.8%	17.5%

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	50	237	272	218	167	159	88	1191
Q1 2022	94	290	331	261	179	147	98	1400
Difference	44	53	59	43	12	-12	10	209
% Change	88.0%	22.4%	21.7%	19.7%	7.2%	-7.5%	11.4%	17.5%

BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	519	604	4	62	2	1191
Q1 2022	611	718	1	59	11	1400
Difference	92	114	-3	-3	9	209
% Change	17.7%	18.9%	-75.0%	-4.8%	450.0%	17.5%

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	1	29	13	32	35	7	28	**145**
B	Southern	1	11	11	14	8	11	20	**76**
C	Bayview		13	10	27	7		15	**72**
D	Mission	2	10	8	70	29	9	29	**157**
E	Northern	1	20	20	14	22	9	29	**115**
F	Park		5	2	2	7	1	7	**24**
G	Richmond		7	1	1	5	7	5	**26**
H	Ingleside	1	11	5	29	15	3	10	**74**
I	Taraval	2	19	4	6	12	1	12	**56**
J	Tenderloin	1	10	15	35	22	8	37	**128**
X	Out of SF			1					**1**
Grand Total		**9**	**135**	**90**	**230**	**162**	**56**	**192**	**874**

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	3.3%	1.5%	3.7%	4.0%	0.8%	3.2%	**16.6%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.3%	1.3%	1.6%	0.9%	1.3%	2.3%	**8.7%**
C	Bayview		1.5%	1.1%	3.1%	0.8%		1.7%	**8.2%**
D	Mission	0.2%	1.1%	0.9%	8.0%	3.3%	1.0%	3.3%	**18.0%**
E	Northern	0.1%	2.3%	2.3%	1.6%	2.5%	1.0%	3.3%	**13.2%**
F	Park		0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.8%	**2.7%**
G	Richmond		0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	**3.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	1.3%	0.6%	3.3%	1.7%	0.3%	1.1%	**8.5%**
I	Taraval	0.2%	2.2%	0.5%	0.7%	1.4%	0.1%	1.4%	**6.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	1.1%	1.7%	4.0%	2.5%	0.9%	4.2%	**14.6%**
X	Out of SF			0.1%					**0.1%**
Grand Total		**1.0%**	**15.4%**	**10.3%**	**26.3%**	**18.5%**	**6.4%**	**22.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	3	35	26	21	14	13	33	**145**
B	Southern	3	22	18	12	5	7	9	**76**
C	Bayview	5	15	22	13	5	7	5	**72**
D	Mission	3	38	28	30	19	15	24	**157**
E	Northern	4	36	14	17	9	9	26	**115**
F	Park		5	1	7	2	4	5	**24**
G	Richmond		4	6	3	3	4	6	**26**
H	Ingleside	4	15	13	15	4	8	15	**74**
I	Taraval	3	13	6	9	5	7	13	**56**
J	Tenderloin		26	36	16	17	10	23	**128**
X	Out of SF		1						**1**
Grand Total		**25**	**210**	**170**	**143**	**83**	**84**	**159**	**874**

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.3%	4.0%	3.0%	2.4%	1.6%	1.5%	3.8%	**16.6%**
B	Southern	0.3%	2.5%	2.1%	1.4%	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	**8.7%**
C	Bayview	0.6%	1.7%	2.5%	1.5%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%	**8.2%**
D	Mission	0.3%	4.3%	3.2%	3.4%	2.2%	1.7%	2.7%	**18.0%**
E	Northern	0.5%	4.1%	1.6%	1.9%	1.0%	1.0%	3.0%	**13.2%**
F	Park		0.6%	0.1%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	**2.7%**
G	Richmond		0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%	**3.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.5%	1.7%	1.5%	1.7%	0.5%	0.9%	1.7%	**8.5%**
I	Taraval	0.3%	1.5%	0.7%	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%	1.5%	**6.4%**
J	Tenderloin		3.0%	4.1%	1.8%	1.9%	1.1%	2.6%	**14.6%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%						**0.1%**
Grand Total		**2.9%**	**24.0%**	**19.5%**	**16.4%**	**9.5%**	**9.6%**	**18.2%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	40	69	1	35		**145**
B	Southern	14	53		9		**76**
C	Bayview	28	37		7		**72**
D	Mission	24	103		29	1	**157**
E	Northern	33	54		21	7	**115**
F	Park	4	12		7	1	**24**
G	Richmond	10	10		5	1	**26**
H	Ingleside	21	38		15		**74**
I	Taraval	17	27		12		**56**
J	Tenderloin	35	73		20		**128**
X	Out of SF	1					**1**
Grand Total		**227**	**476**	**1**	**160**	**10**	**874**

ROBBERY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	4.6%	7.9%	0.1%	4.0%		**16.6%**
B	Southern	1.6%	6.1%		1.0%		**8.7%**
C	Bayview	3.2%	4.2%		0.8%		**8.2%**
D	Mission	2.7%	11.8%		3.3%	0.1%	**18.0%**
E	Northern	3.8%	6.2%		2.4%	0.8%	**13.2%**
F	Park	0.5%	1.4%		0.8%	0.1%	**2.7%**
G	Richmond	1.1%	1.1%		0.6%	0.1%	**3.0%**
H	Ingleside	2.4%	4.3%		1.7%		**8.5%**
I	Taraval	1.9%	3.1%		1.4%		**6.4%**
J	Tenderloin	4.0%	8.4%		2.3%		**14.6%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%					**0.1%**
Grand Total		**26.0%**	**54.5%**	**0.1%**	**18.3%**	**1.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	**8**	**231**	**119**	**218**	**230**	**34**	**191**	**1031**
Q1 2022	**9**	**135**	**90**	**230**	**162**	**56**	**192**	**874**
Difference	**1**	**-96**	**-29**	**12**	**-68**	**22**	**1**	**-157**
% Change	12.5%	-41.6%	-24.4%	5.5%	-29.6%	64.7%	0.5%	-15.2%

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	**29**	**255**	**212**	**125**	**106**	**83**	**221**	**1031**
Q1 2022	**25**	**210**	**170**	**143**	**83**	**84**	**159**	**874**
Difference	**-4**	**-45**	**-42**	**18**	**-23**	**1**	**-62**	**-157**
% Change	-13.8%	-17.6%	-19.8%	14.4%	-21.7%	1.2%	-28.1%	-15.2%

ROBBERY	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	**344**	**457**	**0**	**228**	**2**	**1031**
Q1 2022	**227**	**476**	**1**	**160**	**10**	**874**
Difference	**-117**	**19**	**1**	**-68**	**8**	**-157**
% Change	-34.0%	4.2%	not calc	-29.8%	400.0%	-15.2%

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	1	39	11	12	124	13	69	**269**
B	Southern	2	33	12	16	140	18	70	**291**
C	Bayview		33	15	22	87	13	59	**229**
D	Mission	1	29	8	29	80	18	128	**293**
E	Northern	2	25	20	17	124	43	142	**373**
F	Park	2	12	2	7	27	7	92	**149**
G	Richmond	1	33	2	4	42	10	78	**170**
H	Ingleside	1	37	9	38	29	8	69	**191**
I	Taraval	1	69	4	7	38	4	65	**188**
J	Tenderloin	2	6	8	8	37	18	16	**95**
Grand Total		**13**	**316**	**91**	**160**	**728**	**152**	**788**	**2248**

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.0%	1.7%	0.5%	0.5%	5.5%	0.6%	3.1%	**12.0%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.5%	0.5%	0.7%	6.2%	0.8%	3.1%	**12.9%**
C	Bayview		1.5%	0.7%	1.0%	3.9%	0.6%	2.6%	**10.2%**
D	Mission	0.0%	1.3%	0.4%	1.3%	3.6%	0.8%	5.7%	**13.0%**
E	Northern	0.1%	1.1%	0.9%	0.8%	5.5%	1.9%	6.3%	**16.6%**
F	Park	0.1%	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	1.2%	0.3%	4.1%	**6.6%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	1.5%	0.1%	0.2%	1.9%	0.4%	3.5%	**7.6%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	1.6%	0.4%	1.7%	1.3%	0.4%	3.1%	**8.5%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	3.1%	0.2%	0.3%	1.7%	0.2%	2.9%	**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	1.6%	0.8%	0.7%	**4.2%**
Grand Total		**0.6%**	**14.1%**	**4.0%**	**7.1%**	**32.4%**	**6.8%**	**35.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	3	24	38	30	29	36	109	**269**
B	Southern		34	53	23	20	20	141	**291**
C	Bayview	8	7	40	33	27	28	86	**229**
D	Mission	4	22	50	53	40	44	80	**293**
E	Northern	5	36	59	54	37	45	137	**373**
F	Park		15	40	28	20	29	17	**149**
G	Richmond		6	32	24	30	36	42	**170**
H	Ingleside	6	14	47	29	22	44	29	**191**
I	Taraval	12	12	33	22	30	46	33	**188**
J	Tenderloin	1	3	13	15	10	2	51	**95**
Grand Total		**39**	**173**	**405**	**311**	**265**	**330**	**725**	**2248**

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.1%	1.1%	1.7%	1.3%	1.3%	1.6%	4.8%	**12.0%**
B	Southern		1.5%	2.4%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	6.3%	**12.9%**
C	Bayview	0.4%	0.3%	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	3.8%	**10.2%**
D	Mission	0.2%	1.0%	2.2%	2.4%	1.8%	2.0%	3.6%	**13.0%**
E	Northern	0.2%	1.6%	2.6%	2.4%	1.6%	2.0%	6.1%	**16.6%**
F	Park		0.7%	1.8%	1.2%	0.9%	1.3%	0.8%	**6.6%**
G	Richmond		0.3%	1.4%	1.1%	1.3%	1.6%	1.9%	**7.6%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	0.6%	2.1%	1.3%	1.0%	2.0%	1.3%	**8.5%**
I	Taraval	0.5%	0.5%	1.5%	1.0%	1.3%	2.0%	1.5%	**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.1%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	0.1%	2.3%	**4.2%**
Grand Total		**1.7%**	**7.7%**	**18.0%**	**13.8%**	**11.8%**	**14.7%**	**32.3%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	72	90		105	2	**269**
B	Southern	58	101		130	2	**291**
C	Bayview	50	97		81	1	**229**
D	Mission	58	155		78	2	**293**
E	Northern	88	154		110	21	**373**
F	Park	40	93		16		**149**
G	Richmond	58	69	1	42		**170**
H	Ingleside	72	93		26		**191**
I	Taraval	57	100		31		**188**
J	Tenderloin	16	27		35	17	**95**
Grand Total		**569**	**979**	**1**	**654**	**45**	**2248**

BURGLARY		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	3.2%	4.0%		4.7%	0.1%	**12.0%**
B	Southern	2.6%	4.5%		5.8%	0.1%	**12.9%**
C	Bayview	2.2%	4.3%		3.6%	0.0%	**10.2%**
D	Mission	2.6%	6.9%		3.5%	0.1%	**13.0%**
E	Northern	3.9%	6.9%		4.9%	0.9%	**16.6%**
F	Park	1.8%	4.1%		0.7%		**6.6%**
G	Richmond	2.6%	3.1%	0.0%	1.9%		**7.6%**
H	Ingleside	3.2%	4.1%		1.2%		**8.5%**
I	Taraval	2.5%	4.4%		1.4%		**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.7%	1.2%		1.6%	0.8%	**4.2%**
Grand Total		**25.3%**	**43.5%**	**0.0%**	**29.1%**	**2.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	18	445	85	183	970	198	1313	3212
Q1 2022	13	316	91	160	728	152	788	2248
Difference	-5	-129	6	-23	-242	-46	-525	-964
% Change	-27.8%	-29.0%	7.1%	-12.6%	-24.9%	-23.2%	-40.0%	-30.0%

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	36	328	564	494	415	441	934	3212
Q1 2022	39	173	405	311	265	330	725	2248
Difference	3	-155	-159	-183	-150	-111	-209	-964
% Change	8.3%	-47.3%	-28.2%	-37.0%	-36.1%	-25.2%	-22.4%	-30.0%

BURGLARY	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	826	1482		871	33	3212
Q1 2022	569	979	1	654	45	2248
Difference	-257	-503	1	-217	12	-964
% Change	-31.1%	-33.9%	not calc	-24.9%	36.4%	-30.0%

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	9	373	89	242	1288	113	817	**2931**
B	Southern	2	173	56	81	702	43	260	**1317**
C	Bayview		50	47	53	156	22	65	**393**
D	Mission	3	100	31	130	509	30	275	**1078**
E	Northern	5	299	64	131	861	76	534	**1970**
F	Park	2	50	8	26	220	24	168	**498**
G	Richmond	7	153	17	84	555	58	303	**1177**
H	Ingleside	5	59	26	73	186	14	107	**470**
I	Taraval	3	150	31	74	388	16	174	**836**
J	Tenderloin	3	45	35	34	185	12	78	**392**
X	Out of SF		10	5	3	33	5	35	**91**
Grand Total		**39**	**1462**	**409**	**931**	**5083**	**413**	**2816**	**11153**

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.1%	3.3%	0.8%	2.2%	11.5%	1.0%	7.3%	**26.3%**
B	Southern	0.0%	1.6%	0.5%	0.7%	6.3%	0.4%	2.3%	**11.8%**
C	Bayview		0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	1.4%	0.2%	0.6%	**3.5%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.9%	0.3%	1.2%	4.6%	0.3%	2.5%	**9.7%**
E	Northern	0.0%	2.7%	0.6%	1.2%	7.7%	0.7%	4.8%	**17.7%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	2.0%	0.2%	1.5%	**4.5%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	1.4%	0.2%	0.8%	5.0%	0.5%	2.7%	**10.6%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.7%	1.7%	0.1%	1.0%	**4.2%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	1.3%	0.3%	0.7%	3.5%	0.1%	1.6%	**7.5%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	1.7%	0.1%	0.7%	**3.5%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	**0.8%**
Grand Total		**0.3%**	**13.1%**	**3.7%**	**8.3%**	**45.6%**	**3.7%**	**25.2%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	72	624	585	433	267	193	757	**2931**
B	Southern	7	273	246	142	143	63	443	**1317**
C	Bayview	8	65	106	62	42	45	65	**393**
D	Mission	6	237	276	151	76	96	236	**1078**
E	Northern	27	539	435	256	195	144	374	**1970**
F	Park	9	108	108	88	52	41	92	**498**
G	Richmond	19	230	201	177	135	132	283	**1177**
H	Ingleside	10	59	96	79	61	74	91	**470**
I	Taraval	7	142	143	109	101	113	221	**836**
J	Tenderloin	1	70	74	40	29	40	138	**392**
X	Out of SF		24	25	9	12	17	4	**91**
Grand Total		**166**	**2371**	**2295**	**1546**	**1113**	**958**	**2704**	**11153**

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.6%	5.6%	5.2%	3.9%	2.4%	1.7%	6.8%	**26.3%**
B	Southern	0.1%	2.4%	2.2%	1.3%	1.3%	0.6%	4.0%	**11.8%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	0.6%	1.0%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	**3.5%**
D	Mission	0.1%	2.1%	2.5%	1.4%	0.7%	0.9%	2.1%	**9.7%**
E	Northern	0.2%	4.8%	3.9%	2.3%	1.7%	1.3%	3.4%	**17.7%**
F	Park	0.1%	1.0%	1.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.4%	0.8%	**4.5%**
G	Richmond	0.2%	2.1%	1.8%	1.6%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	**10.6%**
H	Ingleside	0.1%	0.5%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	0.8%	**4.2%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	1.3%	1.3%	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%	2.0%	**7.5%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	1.2%	**3.5%**
X	Out of SF		0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	**0.8%**
Grand Total		**1.5%**	**21.3%**	**20.6%**	**13.9%**	**10.0%**	**8.6%**	**24.2%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	883	1292	2	739	15	**2931**
B	Southern	344	536		437		**1317**
C	Bayview	131	197	1	64		**393**
D	Mission	355	484		233	6	**1078**
E	Northern	738	874	1	351	6	**1970**
F	Park	172	235		88	3	**498**
G	Richmond	382	513		267	15	**1177**
H	Ingleside	153	221		93	3	**470**
I	Taraval	251	366		218	1	**836**
J	Tenderloin	97	159		136		**392**
X	Out of SF	38	49		4		**91**
Grand Total		**3544**	**4926**	**4**	**2630**	**49**	**11153**

LARCENY THEFT		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	7.9%	11.6%	0.0%	6.6%	0.1%	**26.3%**
B	Southern	3.1%	4.8%		3.9%		**11.8%**
C	Bayview	1.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.6%		**3.5%**
D	Mission	3.2%	4.3%		2.1%	0.1%	**9.7%**
E	Northern	6.6%	7.8%	0.0%	3.1%	0.1%	**17.7%**
F	Park	1.5%	2.1%		0.8%	0.0%	**4.5%**
G	Richmond	3.4%	4.6%		2.4%	0.1%	**10.6%**
H	Ingleside	1.4%	2.0%		0.8%	0.0%	**4.2%**
I	Taraval	2.3%	3.3%		2.0%	0.0%	**7.5%**
J	Tenderloin	0.9%	1.4%		1.2%		**3.5%**
X	Out of SF	0.3%	0.4%		0.0%		**0.8%**
Grand Total		**31.8%**	**44.2%**	**0.0%**	**23.6%**	**0.4%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	26	969	414	857	3243	404	1968	7881
Q1 2022	39	1462	409	931	5083	413	2816	11153
Difference	13	493	-5	74	1840	9	848	3272
% Change	50.0%	50.9%	-1.2%	8.6%	56.7%	2.2%	43.1%	41.5%

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	130	1748	1922	1077	774	641	1589	7881
Q1 2022	166	2371	2295	1546	1113	958	2704	11153
Difference	36	623	373	469	339	317	1115	3272
% Change	27.7%	35.6%	19.4%	43.5%	43.8%	49.5%	70.2%	41.5%

LARCENY THEFT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	2584	3713	2	1552	30	7881
Q1 2022	3544	4926	4	2630	49	11153
Difference	960	1213	2	1078	19	3272
% Change	37.2%	32.7%	100.0%	69.5%	63.3%	41.5%

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		1	3		148		3	**155**
B	Southern		2	3	3	166	1	8	**183**
C	Bayview		2		3	238	4	3	**250**
D	Mission		2		3	263		8	**276**
E	Northern		2	5	2	193	10	11	**223**
F	Park	1	1		3	89		4	**98**
G	Richmond				1	103		1	**105**
H	Ingleside			3	1	243	3	8	**258**
I	Taraval		1	1	1	167	2	7	**179**
J	Tenderloin			1		51			**52**
X	Out of SF		2	1	1	15	1		**20**
Grand Total		**1**	**13**	**17**	**18**	**1676**	**21**	**53**	**1799**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		0.1%	0.2%		8.2%		0.2%	**8.6%**
B	Southern		0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	9.2%	0.1%	0.4%	**10.2%**
C	Bayview		0.1%		0.2%	13.2%	0.2%	0.2%	**13.9%**
D	Mission		0.1%		0.2%	14.6%		0.4%	**15.3%**
E	Northern		0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	10.7%	0.6%	0.6%	**12.4%**
F	Park	0.1%	0.1%		0.2%	4.9%		0.2%	**5.4%**
G	Richmond				0.1%	5.7%		0.1%	**5.8%**
H	Ingleside			0.2%	0.1%	13.5%	0.2%	0.4%	**14.3%**
I	Taraval		0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	9.3%	0.1%	0.4%	**9.9%**
J	Tenderloin			0.1%		2.8%			**2.9%**
X	Out of SF		0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%		**1.1%**
Grand Total		**0.1%**	**0.7%**	**0.9%**	**1.0%**	**93.2%**	**1.2%**	**2.9%**	**100.0%**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		45	29	23	27	26	5	**155**
B	Southern		31	47	36	24	31	14	**183**
C	Bayview	1	40	55	47	55	43	9	**250**
D	Mission		42	62	69	46	47	10	**276**
E	Northern	2	55	51	40	28	30	17	**223**
F	Park		25	24	14	12	21	2	**98**
G	Richmond		24	25	14	19	22	1	**105**
H	Ingleside		34	60	44	65	48	7	**258**
I	Taraval		32	39	38	29	37	4	**179**
J	Tenderloin		7	12	19	7	7		**52**
X	Out of SF		4	3	2	5	3	3	**20**
Grand Total		**3**	**339**	**407**	**346**	**317**	**315**	**72**	**1799**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central		2.5%	1.6%	1.3%	1.5%	1.4%	0.3%	**8.6%**
B	Southern		1.7%	2.6%	2.0%	1.3%	1.7%	0.8%	**10.2%**
C	Bayview	0.1%	2.2%	3.1%	2.6%	3.1%	2.4%	0.5%	**13.9%**
D	Mission		2.3%	3.4%	3.8%	2.6%	2.6%	0.6%	**15.3%**
E	Northern	0.1%	3.1%	2.8%	2.2%	1.6%	1.7%	0.9%	**12.4%**
F	Park		1.4%	1.3%	0.8%	0.7%	1.2%	0.1%	**5.4%**
G	Richmond		1.3%	1.4%	0.8%	1.1%	1.2%	0.1%	**5.8%**
H	Ingleside		1.9%	3.3%	2.4%	3.6%	2.7%	0.4%	**14.3%**
I	Taraval		1.8%	2.2%	2.1%	1.6%	2.1%	0.2%	**9.9%**
J	Tenderloin		0.4%	0.7%	1.1%	0.4%	0.4%		**2.9%**
X	Out of SF		0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	**1.1%**
Grand Total		**0.2%**	**18.8%**	**22.6%**	**19.2%**	**17.6%**	**17.5%**	**4.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	2	5	148		**155**
B	Southern	7	10	166		**183**
C	Bayview	5	7	238		**250**
D	Mission	3	10	263		**276**
E	Northern	7	15	192	9	**223**
F	Park	4	5	89		**98**
G	Richmond		2	103		**105**
H	Ingleside	5	8	243	2	**258**
I	Taraval	1	11	167		**179**
J	Tenderloin	1	1	50		**52**
X	Out of SF	2	3	15		**20**
Grand Total		**37**	**77**	**1674**	**11**	**1799**

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.1%	0.3%	8.2%		**8.6%**
B	Southern	0.4%	0.6%	9.2%		**10.2%**
C	Bayview	0.3%	0.4%	13.2%		**13.9%**
D	Mission	0.2%	0.6%	14.6%		**15.3%**
E	Northern	0.4%	0.8%	10.7%	0.5%	**12.4%**
F	Park	0.2%	0.3%	4.9%		**5.4%**
G	Richmond		0.1%	5.7%		**5.8%**
H	Ingleside	0.3%	0.4%	13.5%	0.1%	**14.3%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	0.6%	9.3%		**9.9%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.1%	2.8%		**2.9%**
X	Out of SF	0.1%	0.2%	0.8%		**1.1%**
Grand Total		**2.1%**	**4.3%**	**93.1%**	**0.6%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	0	26	20	25	1570	10	59	1710
Q1 2022	1	13	17	18	1676	21	53	1799
Difference	1	-13	-3	-7	106	11	-6	89
% Change	not calc	-50.0%	-15.0%	-28.0%	6.8%	110.0%	-10.2%	5.2%

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	6	259	415	352	288	323	67	1710
Q1 2022	3	339	407	346	317	315	72	1799
Difference	-3	80	-8	-6	29	-8	5	89
% Change	-50.0%	30.9%	-1.9%	-1.7%	10.1%	-2.5%	7.5%	5.2%

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	44	99	0	1567	0	1710
Q1 2022	37	77	0	1674	11	1799
Difference	-7	-22	0	107	11	89
% Change	-15.9%	-22.2%	not calc	6.8%	not calc	5.2%

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central			3	6	1		11	**21**
B	Southern		3	6	5	2		2	**18**
C	Bayview		1	5	12	2	1	3	**24**
D	Mission	1	8	3	15	6	3	21	**57**
E	Northern	1		4	2			15	**22**
F	Park		2	1	2		2	7	**14**
G	Richmond				1		2	4	**7**
H	Ingleside			2	9	1		2	**14**
I	Taraval		4		5		1	4	**14**
J	Tenderloin		2	3	2			11	**18**
X	Out of SF		2	5	13	1	1	1	**23**
Grand Total		**2**	**22**	**32**	**72**	**13**	**10**	**81**	**232**

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central			1.3%	2.6%	0.4%		4.7%	**9.1%**
B	Southern		1.3%	2.6%	2.2%	0.9%		0.9%	**7.8%**
C	Bayview		0.4%	2.2%	5.2%	0.9%	0.4%	1.3%	**10.3%**
D	Mission	0.4%	3.4%	1.3%	6.5%	2.6%	1.3%	9.1%	**24.6%**
E	Northern	0.4%		1.7%	0.9%			6.5%	**9.5%**
F	Park		0.9%	0.4%	0.9%		0.9%	3.0%	**6.0%**
G	Richmond				0.4%		0.9%	1.7%	**3.0%**
H	Ingleside			0.9%	3.9%	0.4%		0.9%	**6.0%**
I	Taraval		1.7%		2.2%		0.4%	1.7%	**6.0%**
J	Tenderloin		0.9%	1.3%	0.9%			4.7%	**7.8%**
X	Out of SF		0.9%	2.2%	5.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	**9.9%**
Grand Total		**0.9%**	**9.5%**	**13.8%**	**31.0%**	**5.6%**	**4.3%**	**34.9%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	1	9	8	2		1		**21**
B	Southern	5	7	3	1		2		**18**
C	Bayview	10	6	2	1	2	1	2	**24**
D	Mission	15	18	15	4	2	3		**57**
E	Northern	6	4	7	1	4			**22**
F	Park	3	5	3	2		1		**14**
G	Richmond		3	1	3				**7**
H	Ingleside	4	6	2	1		1		**14**
I	Taraval	10	2		1		1		**14**
J	Tenderloin		5	5	3	2	2	1	**18**
X	Out of SF	12	5	5				1	**23**
Grand Total		**66**	**70**	**51**	**19**	**10**	**12**	**4**	**232**

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	0.4%	3.9%	3.4%	0.9%		0.4%		**9.1%**
B	Southern	2.2%	3.0%	1.3%	0.4%		0.9%		**7.8%**
C	Bayview	4.3%	2.6%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	**10.3%**
D	Mission	6.5%	7.8%	6.5%	1.7%	0.9%	1.3%		**24.6%**
E	Northern	2.6%	1.7%	3.0%	0.4%	1.7%			**9.5%**
F	Park	1.3%	2.2%	1.3%	0.9%		0.4%		**6.0%**
G	Richmond		1.3%	0.4%	1.3%				**3.0%**
H	Ingleside	1.7%	2.6%	0.9%	0.4%		0.4%		**6.0%**
I	Taraval	4.3%	0.9%		0.4%		0.4%		**6.0%**
J	Tenderloin		2.2%	2.2%	1.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.4%	**7.8%**
X	Out of SF	5.2%	2.2%	2.2%				0.4%	**9.9%**
Grand Total		**28.4%**	**30.2%**	**22.0%**	**8.2%**	**4.3%**	**5.2%**	**1.7%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	19	2			**21**
B	Southern	12	4	2		**18**
C	Bayview	20	3	1		**24**
D	Mission	49	8			**57**
E	Northern	19	3			**22**
F	Park	14				**14**
G	Richmond	6	1			**7**
H	Ingleside	13		1		**14**
I	Taraval	10	3		1	**14**
J	Tenderloin	17	1			**18**
X	Out of SF	18	4	1		**23**
Grand Total		**197**	**29**	**5**	**1**	**232**

SEXUAL ASSAULT		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	8.2%	0.9%			**9.1%**
B	Southern	5.2%	1.7%	0.9%		**7.8%**
C	Bayview	8.6%	1.3%	0.4%		**10.3%**
D	Mission	21.1%	3.4%			**24.6%**
E	Northern	8.2%	1.3%			**9.5%**
F	Park	6.0%				**6.0%**
G	Richmond	2.6%	0.4%			**3.0%**
H	Ingleside	5.6%		0.4%		**6.0%**
I	Taraval	4.3%	1.3%		0.4%	**6.0%**
J	Tenderloin	7.3%	0.4%			**7.8%**
X	Out of SF	7.8%	1.7%	0.4%		**9.9%**
Grand Total		**84.9%**	**12.5%**	**2.2%**	**0.4%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	2	23	27	53	8	8	55	176
Q1 2022	2	22	32	72	13	10	81	232
Difference	0	-1	5	19	5	2	26	56
% Change	0.0%	-4.3%	18.5%	35.8%	62.5%	25.0%	47.3%	31.8%

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	54	52	35	13	8	8	6	176
Q1 2022	66	70	51	19	10	12	4	232
Difference	12	18	16	6	2	4	-2	56
% Change	22.2%	34.6%	45.7%	46.2%	25.0%	50.0%	-33.3%	31.8%

SEXUAL ASSAULT	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	139	31	0	6	0	176
Q1 2022	197	29	0	5	1	232
Difference	58	-2	0	-1	1	56
% Change	41.7%	-6.5%	not calc	-16.7%	not calc	31.8%

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	2	38	8	17	232	14	62	**373**
B	Southern	2	37	20	21	189	19	60	**348**
C	Bayview	1	22	59	49	61	4	27	**223**
D	Mission	1	28	17	59	124	17	81	**327**
E	Northern	5	40	23	22	156	29	89	**364**
F	Park	1	11	6	12	75	2	34	**141**
G	Richmond	3	21	8	7	66	4	46	**155**
H	Ingleside	1	44	19	33	64	6	22	**189**
I	Taraval	3	51	16	18	64	10	42	**204**
J	Tenderloin	1	6	17	19	69	3	15	**130**
X	Out of SF					1			**1**
Grand Total		**20**	**298**	**193**	**257**	**1101**	**108**	**478**	**2455**

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.1%	1.5%	0.3%	0.7%	9.5%	0.6%	2.5%	**15.2%**
B	Southern	0.1%	1.5%	0.8%	0.9%	7.7%	0.8%	2.4%	**14.2%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.9%	2.4%	2.0%	2.5%	0.2%	1.1%	**9.1%**
D	Mission	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	2.4%	5.1%	0.7%	3.3%	**13.3%**
E	Northern	0.2%	1.6%	0.9%	0.9%	6.4%	1.2%	3.6%	**14.8%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	3.1%	0.1%	1.4%	**5.7%**
G	Richmond	0.1%	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%	2.7%	0.2%	1.9%	**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	1.8%	0.8%	1.3%	2.6%	0.2%	0.9%	**7.7%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	2.1%	0.7%	0.7%	2.6%	0.4%	1.7%	**8.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.2%	0.7%	0.8%	2.8%	0.1%	0.6%	**5.3%**
X	Out of SF					0.0%			**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.8%**	**12.1%**	**7.9%**	**10.5%**	**44.8%**	**4.4%**	**19.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central		47	63	53	38	20	152	**373**
B	Southern	2	57	70	46	35	21	117	**348**
C	Bayview	1	21	46	43	32	28	52	**223**
D	Mission	2	41	55	55	40	46	88	**327**
E	Northern	5	57	53	45	55	37	112	**364**
F	Park	2	24	22	18	20	19	36	**141**
G	Richmond	1	17	26	9	24	34	44	**155**
H	Ingleside	4	29	38	32	20	25	41	**189**
I	Taraval	4	26	31	29	31	39	44	**204**
J	Tenderloin	2	13	16	11	12	9	67	**130**
X	Out of SF		1						**1**
Grand Total		**23**	**333**	**420**	**341**	**307**	**278**	**753**	**2455**

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central		1.9%	2.6%	2.2%	1.5%	0.8%	6.2%	**15.2%**
B	Southern	0.1%	2.3%	2.9%	1.9%	1.4%	0.9%	4.8%	**14.2%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.9%	1.9%	1.8%	1.3%	1.1%	2.1%	**9.1%**
D	Mission	0.1%	1.7%	2.2%	2.2%	1.6%	1.9%	3.6%	**13.3%**
E	Northern	0.2%	2.3%	2.2%	1.8%	2.2%	1.5%	4.6%	**14.8%**
F	Park	0.1%	1.0%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%	**5.7%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.7%	1.1%	0.4%	1.0%	1.4%	1.8%	**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	0.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.3%	0.8%	1.0%	1.7%	**7.7%**
I	Taraval	0.2%	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	1.3%	1.6%	1.8%	**8.3%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	2.7%	**5.3%**
X	Out of SF		0.0%						**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.9%**	**13.6%**	**17.1%**	**13.9%**	**12.5%**	**11.3%**	**30.7%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	75	141		154	3	**373**
B	Southern	87	144	1	113	3	**348**
C	Bayview	68	104		51		**223**
D	Mission	94	142		87	4	**327**
E	Northern	90	159		108	7	**364**
F	Park	38	61		41	1	**141**
G	Richmond	49	57		48	1	**155**
H	Ingleside	61	86		39	3	**189**
I	Taraval	68	92		44		**204**
J	Tenderloin	25	41		64		**130**
X	Out of SF		1				**1**
Grand Total		**655**	**1028**	**1**	**749**	**22**	**2455**

VANDALISM		PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT DESCRIPTION	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	3.1%	5.7%		6.3%	0.1%	**15.2%**
B	Southern	3.5%	5.9%	0.0%	4.6%	0.1%	**14.2%**
C	Bayview	2.8%	4.2%		2.1%		**9.1%**
D	Mission	3.8%	5.8%		3.5%	0.2%	**13.3%**
E	Northern	3.7%	6.5%		4.4%	0.3%	**14.8%**
F	Park	1.5%	2.5%		1.7%	0.0%	**5.7%**
G	Richmond	2.0%	2.3%		2.0%	0.0%	**6.3%**
H	Ingleside	2.5%	3.5%		1.6%	0.1%	**7.7%**
I	Taraval	2.8%	3.7%		1.8%		**8.3%**
J	Tenderloin	1.0%	1.7%		2.6%		**5.3%**
X	Out of SF		0.0%				**0.0%**
Grand Total		**26.7%**	**41.9%**	**0.0%**	**30.5%**	**0.9%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	12	256	188	252	1033	133	474	2348
Q1 2022	20	298	193	257	1101	108	478	2455
Difference	8	42	5	5	68	-25	4	107
% Change	66.7%	16.4%	2.7%	2.0%	6.6%	-18.8%	0.8%	4.6%

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	16	274	422	313	304	273	746	2348
Q1 2022	23	333	420	341	307	278	753	2455
Difference	7	59	-2	28	3	5	7	107
% Change	43.8%	21.5%	-0.5%	8.9%	1.0%	1.8%	0.9%	4.6%

VANDALISM	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	593	957	0	774	24	2348
Q1 2022	655	1028	1	749	22	2455
Difference	62	71	1	-25	-2	107
% Change	10.5%	7.4%	not calc	-3.2%	-8.3%	4.6%

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		22	28	22		5	38	**115**
B	Southern	2	18	50	29	3	6	25	**133**
C	Bayview		4	80	45	3	4	17	**153**
D	Mission		7	24	66	3	2	34	**136**
E	Northern		10	31	12	6	5	42	**106**
F	Park		2	4	2			11	**19**
G	Richmond		16	4	4		1	23	**48**
H	Ingleside		11	36	37	4	1	13	**102**
I	Taraval	1	16	15	27		3	24	**86**
J	Tenderloin	1	4	37	27	2	2	42	**115**
X	Out of SF		7	2	4		1		**14**
Grand Total		**4**	**117**	**311**	**275**	**21**	**30**	**269**	**1027**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		2.1%	2.7%	2.1%		0.5%	3.7%	**11.2%**
B	Southern	0.2%	1.8%	4.9%	2.8%	0.3%	0.6%	2.4%	**13.0%**
C	Bayview		0.4%	7.8%	4.4%	0.3%	0.4%	1.7%	**14.9%**
D	Mission		0.7%	2.3%	6.4%	0.3%	0.2%	3.3%	**13.2%**
E	Northern		1.0%	3.0%	1.2%	0.6%	0.5%	4.1%	**10.3%**
F	Park		0.2%	0.4%	0.2%			1.1%	**1.9%**
G	Richmond		1.6%	0.4%	0.4%		0.1%	2.2%	**4.7%**
H	Ingleside		1.1%	3.5%	3.6%	0.4%	0.1%	1.3%	**9.9%**
I	Taraval	0.1%	1.6%	1.5%	2.6%		0.3%	2.3%	**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin	0.1%	0.4%	3.6%	2.6%	0.2%	0.2%	4.1%	**11.2%**
X	Out of SF		0.7%	0.2%	0.4%		0.1%		**1.4%**
Grand Total		**0.4%**	**11.4%**	**30.3%**	**26.8%**	**2.0%**	**2.9%**	**26.2%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	15	28	23	24	12	8	5	**115**
B	Southern	18	35	41	28	7	2	2	**133**
C	Bayview	18	27	52	22	16	14	4	**153**
D	Mission	26	38	32	25	13	2		**136**
E	Northern	9	27	30	22	9	8	1	**106**
F	Park		5	4	2	4	2	2	**19**
G	Richmond	3	15	10	7	6	3	4	**48**
H	Ingleside	16	26	26	20	7	3	4	**102**
I	Taraval	12	26	19	12	11	4	2	**86**
J	Tenderloin	12	24	29	29	15	2	4	**115**
X	Out of SF	3	4	5	2				**14**
Grand Total		**132**	**255**	**271**	**193**	**100**	**48**	**28**	**1027**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	**18-29**	**30-39**	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60+**	**Unknown**	
A	Central	1.5%	2.7%	2.2%	2.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.5%	**11.2%**
B	Southern	1.8%	3.4%	4.0%	2.7%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	**13.0%**
C	Bayview	1.8%	2.6%	5.1%	2.1%	1.6%	1.4%	0.4%	**14.9%**
D	Mission	2.5%	3.7%	3.1%	2.4%	1.3%	0.2%		**13.2%**
E	Northern	0.9%	2.6%	2.9%	2.1%	0.9%	0.8%	0.1%	**10.3%**
F	Park		0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	**1.9%**
G	Richmond	0.3%	1.5%	1.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	**4.7%**
H	Ingleside	1.6%	2.5%	2.5%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.4%	**9.9%**
I	Taraval	1.2%	2.5%	1.9%	1.2%	1.1%	0.4%	0.2%	**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin	1.2%	2.3%	2.8%	2.8%	1.5%	0.2%	0.4%	**11.2%**
X	Out of SF	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%				**1.4%**
Grand Total		**12.9%**	**24.8%**	**26.4%**	**18.8%**	**9.7%**	**4.7%**	**2.7%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	75	40			**115**
B	Southern	98	32		3	**133**
C	Bayview	108	41		4	**153**
D	Mission	96	40			**136**
E	Northern	78	26		2	**106**
F	Park	9	10			**19**
G	Richmond	30	18			**48**
H	Ingleside	77	21		4	**102**
I	Taraval	66	20			**86**
J	Tenderloin	84	28	1	2	**115**
X	Out of SF	10	4			**14**
Grand Total		**731**	**280**	**1**	**15**	**1027**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		PERSON COUNT				PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**Nonbinary**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	7.3%	3.9%			**11.2%**
B	Southern	9.5%	3.1%		0.3%	**13.0%**
C	Bayview	10.5%	4.0%		0.4%	**14.9%**
D	Mission	9.3%	3.9%			**13.2%**
E	Northern	7.6%	2.5%		0.2%	**10.3%**
F	Park	0.9%	1.0%			**1.9%**
G	Richmond	2.9%	1.8%			**4.7%**
H	Ingleside	7.5%	2.0%		0.4%	**9.9%**
I	Taraval	6.4%	1.9%			**8.4%**
J	Tenderloin	8.2%	2.7%	0.1%	0.2%	**11.2%**
X	Out of SF	1.0%	0.4%			**1.4%**
Grand Total		**71.2%**	**27.3%**	**0.1%**	**1.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	6	93	241	213	27	26	238	844
Q1 2022	4	117	311	275	21	30	269	1027
Difference	-2	24	70	62	-6	4	31	183
% Change	-33.3%	25.8%	29.0%	29.1%	-22.2%	15.4%	13.0%	21.7%

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	79	216	245	156	59	63	26	844
Q1 2022	132	255	271	193	100	48	28	1027
Difference	53	39	26	37	41	-15	2	183
% Change	67.1%	18.1%	10.6%	23.7%	69.5%	-23.8%	7.7%	21.7%

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	612	205	4	23	0	844
Q1 2022	731	280	1	15	0	1027
Difference	119	75	-3	-8	0	183
% Change	19.4%	36.6%	-75.0%	-34.8%	not calc	21.7%

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	1	4	1				4	**10**
B	Southern		4	3	1		1	7	**16**
C	Bayview		4	6		1		1	**12**
D	Mission		2	1	11			7	**21**
E	Northern		6	7			2	3	**18**
F	Park		1	2		1		1	**5**
G	Richmond		1					2	**3**
H	Ingleside	1	4		1		1	4	**11**
I	Taraval		6		1		1	3	**11**
J	Tenderloin		9		2	1		4	**16**
X	Out of SF							2	**2**
Grand Total		**2**	**41**	**20**	**16**	**3**	**5**	**38**	**125**

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central	0.8%	3.2%	0.8%				3.2%	**8.0%**
B	Southern		3.2%	2.4%	0.8%		0.8%	5.6%	**12.8%**
C	Bayview		3.2%	4.8%		0.8%		0.8%	**9.6%**
D	Mission		1.6%	0.8%	8.8%			5.6%	**16.8%**
E	Northern		4.8%	5.6%			1.6%	2.4%	**14.4%**
F	Park		0.8%	1.6%		0.8%		0.8%	**4.0%**
G	Richmond		0.8%					1.6%	**2.4%**
H	Ingleside	0.8%	3.2%		0.8%		0.8%	3.2%	**8.8%**
I	Taraval		4.8%		0.8%		0.8%	2.4%	**8.8%**
J	Tenderloin		7.2%		1.6%	0.8%		3.2%	**12.8%**
X	Out of SF							1.6%	**1.6%**
Grand Total		**1.6%**	**32.8%**	**16.0%**	**12.8%**	**2.4%**	**4.0%**	**30.4%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**65+**	
A	Central	10	**10**
B	Southern	16	**16**
C	Bayview	12	**12**
D	Mission	21	**21**
E	Northern	18	**18**
F	Park	5	**5**
G	Richmond	3	**3**
H	Ingleside	11	**11**
I	Taraval	11	**11**
J	Tenderloin	16	**16**
X	Out of SF	2	**2**
Grand Total		**125**	**125**

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**65+**	
A	Central	8.0%	**8.0%**
B	Southern	12.8%	**12.8%**
C	Bayview	9.6%	**9.6%**
D	Mission	16.8%	**16.8%**
E	Northern	14.4%	**14.4%**
F	Park	4.0%	**4.0%**
G	Richmond	2.4%	**2.4%**
H	Ingleside	8.8%	**8.8%**
I	Taraval	8.8%	**8.8%**
J	Tenderloin	12.8%	**12.8%**
X	Out of SF	1.6%	**1.6%**
Grand Total		**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	5	5		**10**
B	Southern	7	9		**16**
C	Bayview	6	5	1	**12**
D	Mission	10	11		**21**
E	Northern	12	6		**18**
F	Park	4		1	**5**
G	Richmond	2	1		**3**
H	Ingleside	6	5		**11**
I	Taraval	7	4		**11**
J	Tenderloin	7	8	1	**16**
X	Out of SF		2		**2**
Grand Total		**66**	**56**	**3**	**125**

ELDER ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	4.0%	4.0%		**8.0%**
B	Southern	5.6%	7.2%		**12.8%**
C	Bayview	4.8%	4.0%	0.8%	**9.6%**
D	Mission	8.0%	8.8%		**16.8%**
E	Northern	9.6%	4.8%		**14.4%**
F	Park	3.2%		0.8%	**4.0%**
G	Richmond	1.6%	0.8%		**2.4%**
H	Ingleside	4.8%	4.0%		**8.8%**
I	Taraval	5.6%	3.2%		**8.8%**
J	Tenderloin	5.6%	6.4%	0.8%	**12.8%**
X	Out of SF		1.6%		**1.6%**
Grand Total		**52.8%**	**44.8%**	**2.4%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	1	41	13	22	3	6	47	133
Q1 2022	2	41	20	16	3	5	38	125
Difference	1	0	7	-6	0	-1	-9	-8
% Change	100.0%	0.0%	53.8%	-27.3%	0.0%	-16.7%	-19.1%	-6.0%

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
	65+	
Q1 2021	133	133
Q1 2022	125	125
Difference	-8	-8
% Change	-6.0%	-6.0%

ELDER ABUSE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	47	85	0	1	0	133
Q1 2022	66	56	0	3	0	125
Difference	19	-29	0	2	0	-8
% Change	40.4%	-34.1%	not calc	200.0%	not calc	-6.0%

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		7	2	5	1		2	**17**
B	Southern		2	5	8	2	2		**19**
C	Bayview			17	15	2		1	**35**
D	Mission		1	7	25	4	2		**39**
E	Northern	1		6	8	1		3	**19**
F	Park				1		1	2	**4**
G	Richmond		1	1			1	1	**4**
H	Ingleside		1	9	8			3	**21**
I	Taraval		1	1	12		1	2	**17**
J	Tenderloin		1	7	2	1	1		**12**
X	Out of SF			4	6	1	1	1	**13**
Grand Total		**1**	**14**	**59**	**90**	**12**	**9**	**15**	**200**

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Black**	**Hispanic or Latin**	**OTHERS**	**Unknown**	**White**	
A	Central		3.5%	1.0%	2.5%	0.5%		1.0%	**8.5%**
B	Southern		1.0%	2.5%	4.0%	1.0%	1.0%		**9.5%**
C	Bayview			8.5%	7.5%	1.0%		0.5%	**17.5%**
D	Mission		0.5%	3.5%	12.5%	2.0%	1.0%		**19.5%**
E	Northern	0.5%		3.0%	4.0%	0.5%		1.5%	**9.5%**
F	Park				0.5%		0.5%	1.0%	**2.0%**
G	Richmond		0.5%	0.5%			0.5%	0.5%	**2.0%**
H	Ingleside		0.5%	4.5%	4.0%			1.5%	**10.5%**
I	Taraval		0.5%	0.5%	6.0%		0.5%	1.0%	**8.5%**
J	Tenderloin		0.5%	3.5%	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%		**6.0%**
X	Out of SF			2.0%	3.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	**6.5%**
Grand Total		**0.5%**	**7.0%**	**29.5%**	**45.0%**	**6.0%**	**4.5%**	**7.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	
A	Central	17	**17**
B	Southern	19	**19**
C	Bayview	35	**35**
D	Mission	39	**39**
E	Northern	19	**19**
F	Park	4	**4**
G	Richmond	4	**4**
H	Ingleside	21	**21**
I	Taraval	17	**17**
J	Tenderloin	12	**12**
X	Out of SF	13	**13**
Grand Total		**200**	**200**

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**0-17**	
A	Central	8.5%	**8.5%**
B	Southern	9.5%	**9.5%**
C	Bayview	17.5%	**17.5%**
D	Mission	19.5%	**19.5%**
E	Northern	9.5%	**9.5%**
F	Park	2.0%	**2.0%**
G	Richmond	2.0%	**2.0%**
H	Ingleside	10.5%	**10.5%**
I	Taraval	8.5%	**8.5%**
J	Tenderloin	6.0%	**6.0%**
X	Out of SF	6.5%	**6.5%**
Grand Total		**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	9	8		**17**
B	Southern	7	11	1	**19**
C	Bayview	22	12	1	**35**
D	Mission	27	12		**39**
E	Northern	11	7	1	**19**
F	Park	3	1		**4**
G	Richmond	2	2		**4**
H	Ingleside	11	10		**21**
I	Taraval	10	7		**17**
J	Tenderloin	5	6	1	**12**
X	Out of SF	7	5	1	**13**
Grand Total		**114**	**81**	**5**	**200**

CHILD ABUSE		PERSON COUNT			PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**	**Female**	**Male**	**OTHERS**	
A	Central	4.5%	4.0%		**8.5%**
B	Southern	3.5%	5.5%	0.5%	**9.5%**
C	Bayview	11.0%	6.0%	0.5%	**17.5%**
D	Mission	13.5%	6.0%		**19.5%**
E	Northern	5.5%	3.5%	0.5%	**9.5%**
F	Park	1.5%	0.5%		**2.0%**
G	Richmond	1.0%	1.0%		**2.0%**
H	Ingleside	5.5%	5.0%		**10.5%**
I	Taraval	5.0%	3.5%		**8.5%**
J	Tenderloin	2.5%	3.0%	0.5%	**6.0%**
X	Out of SF	3.5%	2.5%	0.5%	**6.5%**
Grand Total		**57.0%**	**40.5%**	**2.5%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021	0	17	33	31	14	8	20	123
Q1 2022	1	14	59	90	12	9	15	200
Difference	1	-3	26	59	-2	1	-5	77
% Change	not calc	-17.6%	78.8%	190.3%	-14.3%	12.5%	-25.0%	62.6%

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT	PERSON COUNT
	0-17	
Q1 2021	123	123
Q1 2022	200	200
Difference	77	77
% Change	62.6%	62.6%

CHILD ABUSE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	71	42	0	10	0	123
Q1 2022	114	81	0	5	0	200
Difference	43	39	0	-5	0	77
% Change	60.6%	92.9%	not calc	-50.0%	not calc	62.6%

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central								
B	Southern			1					**1**
C	Bayview								
D	Mission				2	1		1	**4**
E	Northern								
F	Park								
G	Richmond								
H	Ingleside		1						**1**
I	Taraval			1					**1**
J	Tenderloin			2					**2**
X	Out of SF								
Grand Total			**1**	**4**	**2**	**1**		**1**	**9**

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**11.1%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	**44.4%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**11.1%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**11.1%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**22.2%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**11.1%**	**44.4%**	**22.2%**	**11.1%**	**0.0%**	**11.1%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central								
B	Southern			1					**1**
C	Bayview								
D	Mission		1	1	1			1	**4**
E	Northern								
F	Park								
G	Richmond								
H	Ingleside						1		**1**
I	Taraval				1				**1**
J	Tenderloin			1				1	**2**
X	Out of SF								
Grand Total			**1**	**3**	**2**		**1**	**2**	**9**

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**11.1%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	**44.4%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	**11.1%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**11.1%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	**22.2%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**11.1%**	**33.3%**	**22.2%**	**0.0%**	**11.1%**	**22.2%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT				**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central					
B	Southern		1			**1**
C	Bayview					
D	Mission		4			**4**
E	Northern					
F	Park					
G	Richmond					
H	Ingleside		1			**1**
I	Taraval		1			**1**
J	Tenderloin		2			**2**
X	Out of SF					
Grand Total			**9**			**9**

HOMICIDE		PERSON COUNT				**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**11.1%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	44.4%	0.0%	0.0%	**44.4%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**11.1%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	**11.1%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	**22.2%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**100.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic or Latin	OTHERS	Unknown	White	
Q1 2021		1	3	2			3	9
Q1 2022		1	4	2	1		1	9
Difference	0	0	1	0	1	0	-2	0
% Change	not calc	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	not calc	not calc	-66.7%	0.0%

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021	1	2	2	1	1	2		9
Q1 2022		1	3	2		1	2	9
Difference	-1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	2	0
% Change	-100.0%	-50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	-100.0%	-50.0%	not calc	0.0%

HOMICIDE	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021		9				9
Q1 2022		9				9
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Change	not calc	0.0%	not calc	not calc	not calc	0.0%

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Native American	White	Unknown	
A	Central		3						**3**
B	Southern						1		**1**
C	Bayview								
D	Mission		1	1					**2**
E	Northern				1		2		**3**
F	Park								
G	Richmond								
H	Ingleside								
I	Taraval								
J	Tenderloin						1		**1**
X	Out of SF								
Grand Total			**4**	**1**	**1**		**4**		**10**

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Native American	White	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**30.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	**10.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	**30.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	**10.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**40.0%**	**10.0%**	**10.0%**	**0.0%**	**40.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central			1	1		1		**3**
B	Southern			1					**1**
C	Bayview								
D	Mission			1		1			**2**
E	Northern			1	1	1			**3**
F	Park								
G	Richmond								
H	Ingleside								
I	Taraval								
J	Tenderloin				1				**1**
X	Out of SF								
Grand Total				**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**		**10**

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
A	Central	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	**30.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**10.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**30.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**10.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**40.0%**	**30.0%**	**20.0%**	**10.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT					**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	3					**3**
B	Southern		1				**1**
C	Bayview						
D	Mission		2				**2**
E	Northern	1	2				**3**
F	Park						
G	Richmond						
H	Ingleside						
I	Taraval						
J	Tenderloin	1					**1**
X	Out of SF						
Grand Total		**5**	**5**				**10**

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT					**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
A	Central	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**30.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**10.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
E	Northern	10.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**30.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**10.0%**
Grand Total		**50.0%**	**50.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION								**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	
A	Central		3							**3**
B	Southern								1	**1**
C	Bayview									
D	Mission		1	1						**2**
E	Northern				1		1		1	**3**
F	Park									
G	Richmond									
H	Ingleside									
I	Taraval									
J	Tenderloin	1								**1**
X	Out of SF									
Grand Total		**1**	**4**	**1**	**1**		**1**		**2**	**10**

HATE CRIME		PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION								**PERSON COUNT**
DISTRICT	DISTRICT	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Jewish	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	
A	Central	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**30.0%**
B	Southern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	**10.0%**
C	Bayview	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
D	Mission	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**20.0%**
E	Northern	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	**30.0%**
F	Park	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
G	Richmond	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
H	Ingleside	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
I	Taraval	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
J	Tenderloin	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**10.0%**
X	Out of SF	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
Grand Total		**10.0%**	**40.0%**	**10.0%**	**10.0%**	**0.0%**	**10.0%**	**0.0%**	**20.0%**	**100.0%**

Victim Demographic Data Report
Q1 2022

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian	Black	Hispanic or Latin	Native American	White	Unknown	
Q1 2021		15	4	4		4		27
Q1 2022		4	1	1		4		10
Difference	0	-11	-3	-3	0	0	0	-17
% Change	not calc	-73.3%	-75.0%	-75.0%	not calc	0.0%	not calc	-63.0%

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT							PERSON COUNT
	0-17	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Unknown	
Q1 2021		3	8	4	7	3	2	27
Q1 2022			4	3	2	1		10
Difference	0	-3	-4	-1	-5	-2	-2	-17
% Change	not calc	-100.0%	-50.0%	-25.0%	-71.4%	-66.7%	-100.0%	-63.0%

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT					PERSON COUNT
	Female	Male	Nonbinary	OTHERS	Unknown	
Q1 2021	11	16				27
Q1 2022	5	5				10
Difference	-6	-11	0	0	0	-17
% Change	-54.5%	-68.8%	not calc	not calc	not calc	-63.0%

HATE CRIME	PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION								PERSON COUNT
	Anti-Transgender	Anti-Asian	Anti-Black	Anti-Hispanic	Anti-Other Races	Anti-Female	Anti-White	Sexual Orientation	
Q1 2021		14	4	2	1		1	5	27
Q1 2022	1	4	1	1		1		2	10
Difference	1	-10	-3	-1	-1	1	-1	-3	-17
% Change	not calc	-71.4%	-75.0%	-50.0%	-100.0%	not calc	-100.0%	-60.0%	-63.0%

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: OCME Accidental Overdose Report - June 2022
Date:	Thursday, June 16, 2022 9:07:00 AM
Attachments:	2022 06_OCME Overdose Report.pdf

From: Rodda, Luke (ADM) <luke.rodda@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 10:50 AM
To: Colfax, Grant (DPH) <grant.colfax@sfdph.org>; Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Po, Vivian (ADM) <vivian.po@sfgov.org>; Serrano Sewell, David (ADM) <david.serranosewell@sfgov.org>; Bukowski, Kenneth (ADM) <kenneth.bukowski@sfgov.org>; Pojman, Natalie (DPH) <natalie.pojman@sfdph.org>; Liverman, Christopher (ADM) <christopher.liverman@sfgov.org>; Cretan, Jeff (MYR) <jeff.cretan@sfgov.org>
Subject: OCME Accidental Overdose Report - June 2022

Dear Mayor Breed, President Walton, and Director Colfax:

Please find attached the OCME Accidental Overdose Report for June 2022.

Sincerely,

****

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

Office of the Chief Medical Examiner
City and County of San Francisco
1 Newhall Street
San Francisco, California 94124

Assistant Adjunct Professor
Laboratory Medicine
University of California, San Francisco

Tel: (415) 641-3688

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

Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator
Christopher Liverman, Chief Medical Examiner
Office of the Chief Medical Examiner

June 15, 2022

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

The Honorable Shamann Walton, President
Board of Supervisors

Grant Colfax, M.D., Director
Department of Public Health

Subject: Report on Accidental Overdose Deaths

Dear Mayor Breed, President Walton, and Director Colfax:

The enclosed report includes preliminary data of accidental overdose deaths in the City and County of San Francisco from the recent four months of February 1, 2022, to May 31, 2022. This report satisfies the ordinance's reporting criteria. For your reference, reports of preliminary data of accidental overdose deaths from January 1, 2021, to May 31, 2022, are enclosed. The preliminary number of accidental overdose deaths in May 2022 is 45.

The reports are published by the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME), Forensic Laboratory Division, to comply with local and state reporting guidelines and further OCME's mission to provide neutral data to inform policymakers. Please note, these results are preliminary as of testing to June 8, 2022, and are subject to change as the OCME finalizes the manner and cause of each death. These reports are not intended to replace other death statistics within the City that rely on finalized death certificates.

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

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

Sincerely,

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

cc: Office of the City Administrator
enclosures: Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Reports for January 2022 through May 2022
Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Reports for January 2021 through December 2021

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Reports for January 2022 through May 2022

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER — CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

JAN-MAY 2022



31.09% Acc. Overdoses Open
68.91% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



21% Female
79% Male

Race



4% Asian
30% Black
12% Latinx
0% Native American
50% White
5% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
3% 15-24
11% 25-34
18% 35-44
26% 45-54
26% 55-64
14% >=65

Fixed Address



74% Yes (see residence)
21% No
5% Unknown

Residence



22% Tenderloin (94102)
17% SOMA (94103)
7% Inner Mission (94110)
13% Nob Hill (94109)
40% Others

Location of Death



21% Tenderloin (94102)
16% SOMA (94103)
18% Nob Hill (94109)
11% Inner Mission (94110)
34% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

JANUARY 2022



0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00 Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



20% Female
80% Male

Race



2% Asian
29% Black
18% Latinx
0% Native American
45% White
6% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
4% 15-24
4% 25-34
14% 35-44
35% 45-54
22% 55-64
20% >=65

Fixed Address



82% Yes (see residence)
18% No
0% Unknown

Residence



30% Tenderloin (94102)
15% SOMA (94103)
10% Inner Mission (94110)
10% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
35% Others

Location of Death



20% Tenderloin (94102)
18% SOMA (94103)
20% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
8% Inner Mission (94110)
33% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

FEBRUARY 2022



0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00 Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



16% Female
84% Male

Race



6% Asian
34% Black
14% Latinx
0% Native American
42% White
4% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
12% 25-34
10% 45-54
14% >=65
0% 15-24
28% 35-44
36% 55-64

Fixed Address



82% Yes (see residence)
16% No
2% Unknown

Residence



15% Tenderloin (94102)
27% SOMA (94103)
7% Inner Mission (94110)
15% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
37% Others

Location of Death



16% Tenderloin (94102)
22% SOMA (94103)
24% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
6% Inner Mission (94110)
32% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER — CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

MARCH 2022



7.14% Acc. Overdoses Open
92.86% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



24% Female
76% Male

Race



2% Asian
24% Black
12% Latinx
0% Native American
62% White
0% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
2% 15-24
19% 25-34
19% 35-44
24% 45-54
24% 55-64
12% >=65

Fixed Address



74% Yes (see residence)
21% No
5% Unknown

Residence



32% Tenderloin (94102)
13% SOMA (94103)
6% Haight-Ashbury (94117)
13% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
35% Others

Location of Death



29% Tenderloin (94102)
12% SOMA (94103)
14% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
14% Inner Mission (94110)
31% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER — CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

APRIL 2022



50.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
50.00% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



23% Female
77% Male

Race



2% Asian
33% Black
2% Latinx
0% Native American
54% White
10% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
15% 25-34
29% 45-54
12% >=65
15-24 2%
35-44 15%
55-64 27%

Fixed Address



60% Yes (see residence)
29% No
12% Unknown

Residence



10% Tenderloin (94102)
19% SOMA (94103)
10% Western Addition (94115)
16% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
45% Others

Location of Death



15% Tenderloin (94102)
13% SOMA (94103)
21% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
10% Inner Mission (94110)
40% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER — CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

MAY 2022



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

Gender



22% Female
78% Male

Race



9% Asian
29% Black
13% Latinx
0% Native American
47% White
2% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
2% 15-24
11% 25-34
16% 35-44
33% 45-54
24% 55-64
13% >=65

Fixed Address



73% Yes (see residence)
20% No
7% Unknown

Residence



24% Tenderloin (94102)
9% SOMA (94103)
12% Inner Mission (94110)
12% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
42% Others

Location of Death



29% Tenderloin (94102)
13% SOMA (94103)
9% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
18% Inner Mission (94110)
31% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Reports for January 2021 through December 2021

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER — CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

JAN-DEC 2021



0.16% Acc. Overdoses Open
99.84% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



17% Female
83% Male

Race



4% Asian
28% Black
13% Latinx
1% Native American
48% White
7% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
14% 25-34
22% 45-54
10% >=65
3% 15-24
24% 35-44
27% 55-64

Fixed Address



71% Yes (see residence)
25% No
4% Unknown

Residence



22% Tenderloin (94102)
17% SOMA (94103)
5% Inner Mission (94110)
13% Nob Hill (94109)
43% Others

Location of Death



20% Tenderloin (94102)
19% SOMA (94103)
17% Nob Hill (94109)
10% Inner Mission (94110)
34% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

JANUARY 2021



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

Gender



12% Female
88% Male

Race



2% Asian
26% Black
14% Latinx
2% Native American
54% White
3% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
20% 25-34
14% 45-54
9% >=65
2% 15-24
17% 35-44
38% 55-64

Fixed Address



69% Yes (see residence)
29% No
2% Unknown

Residence



31% Tenderloin (94102)
20% SOMA (94103)
7% Inner Mission (94110)
7% Japantown (94115)
36% Others

Location of Death



20% Tenderloin (94102)
23% SOMA (94103)
12% Nob Hill (94109)
11% Inner Mission (94110)
34% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

FEBRUARY 2021



Gender



Race



Age



Fixed Address



Residence



Location of Death



Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

MARCH 2021



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

Gender



11% Female
89% Male

Race



2% Asian
30% Black
19% Latinx
0% Native American
45% White
4% Other/Unknown

Age



2% <15
15% 25-34
23% 45-54
11% >=65
2% 15-24
23% 35-44
23% 55-64

Fixed Address



75% Yes (see residence)
23% No
2% Unknown

Residence



20% Tenderloin (94102)
25% SOMA (94103)
5% Inner Mission (94110)
8% Nob Hill (94109)
43% Others

Location of Death



25% Tenderloin (94102)
23% SOMA (94103)
13% Nob Hill (94109)
6% Inner Mission (94110)
34% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER — CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

APRIL 2021



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

Gender



13% Female
87% Male

Race



6% Asian
27% Black
10% Latinx
4% Native American
50% White
4% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
6% 25-34
33% 45-54
6% >=65
0% 15-24
23% 35-44
33% 55-64

Fixed Address



71% Yes (see residence)
29% No
0% Unknown

Residence



30% Tenderloin (94102)
19% SOMA (94103)
5% Parkside/Forest Hill (94116)
11% Nob Hill (94109)
35% Others

Location of Death



23% Tenderloin (94102)
15% SOMA (94103)
23% Nob Hill (94109)
13% Inner Mission (94110)
25% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER — CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

MAY 2021



0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00 Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



22% Female
78% Male

Race



2% Asian
31% Black
7% Latinx
0% Native American
49% White
11% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
13% 25-34
24% 45-54
13% >=65
15-24 2%
35-44 24%
55-64 22%

Fixed Address



82% Yes (see residence)
16% No
2% Unknown

Residence



16% Tenderloin (94102)
19% SOMA (94103)
5% Visitacion Valley (94134)
24% Nob Hill (94109)
35% Others

Location of Death



13% Tenderloin (94102)
18% SOMA (94103)
31% Nob Hill (94109)
4% Visitacion Valley (94134)
33% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

JUNE 2021



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

Gender



20% Female
80% Male

Race



2% Asian
22% Black
14% Latinx
0% Native American
54% White
8% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
4% 15-24
14% 25-34
30% 35-44
22% 45-54
16% 55-64
12% >=65

Fixed Address



78% Yes (see residence)
12% No
10% Unknown

Residence



18% Tenderloin (94102)
21% SOMA (94103)
5% Haight-Ashbury (94117)
18% Nob Hill (94109)
38% Others

Location of Death



16% Tenderloin (94102)
22% SOMA (94103)
22% Nob Hill (94109)
12% Inner Mission (94110)
28% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER — CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

JULY 2021



0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00 Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



15% Female
85% Male

Race



6% Asian
31% Black
12% Latinx
0% Native American
46% White
6% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
13% 25-34
23% 45-54
12% >=65
6% 15-24
17% 35-44
29% 55-64

Fixed Address



60% Yes (see residence)
33% No
8% Unknown

Residence



35% Tenderloin (94102)
10% Japantown (94115)
16% Inner Mission (94110)
6% Nob Hill (94109)
32% Others

Location of Death



31% Tenderloin (94102)
10% Inner Mission (94110)
10% Nob Hill (94109)
17% SOMA (94103)
33% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

AUGUST 2021



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

Gender



17% Female
83% Male

Race



0% Asian
24% Black
9% Latinx
2% Native American
61% White
4% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
13% 25-34
20% 45-54
7% >=65
4% 15-24
33% 35-44
24% 55-64

Fixed Address



63% Yes (see residence)
35% No
2% Unknown

Residence



31% Tenderloin (94102)
17% SOMA (94103)
7% Inner Mission (94110)
14% Nob Hill (94109)
31% Others

Location of Death



26% Tenderloin (94102)
11% Inner Mission (94110)
15% Nob Hill (94109)
20% SOMA (94103)
28% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

SEPTEMBER 2021



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

Gender



23% Female
77% Male

Race



13% Asian
30% Black
18% Latinx
0% Native American
36% White
4% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
11% 25-34
21% 45-54
5% >=65
7% 15-24
27% 35-44
29% 55-64

Fixed Address



71% Yes (see residence)
29% No
0% Unknown

Residence



21% Tenderloin (94102)
14% SOMA (94103)
7% Hunters Point (94124)
10% Nob Hill (94109)
48% Others

Location of Death



18% Tenderloin (94102)
11% Inner Mission (94110)
9% Nob Hill (94109)
21% SOMA (94103)
41% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

OCTOBER 2021



Gender



Race



Age



Fixed Address



Residence



Location of Death



Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

NOVEMBER 2021



0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00 Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



15% Female
85% Male

Race



4% Asian
28% Black
15% Latinx
0% Native American
42% White
11% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
17% 25-34
25% 45-54
11% >=65
4% 15-24
21% 35-44
23% 55-64

Fixed Address



79% Yes (see residence)
13% No
8% Unknown

Residence



17% Tenderloin (94102)
17% SOMA (94103)
7% Marina (94123)
14% Nob Hill (94109)
45% Others

Location of Death



19% Tenderloin (94102)
8% Inner Mission (94110)
15% Nob Hill (94109)
21% SOMA (94103)
38% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to June 8, 2022

DECEMBER 2021



1.89% Acc. Overdoses Open
98.11% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender



17% Female
83% Male

Race



4% Asian
26% Black
9% Latinx
0% Native American
47% White
13% Other/Unknown

Age



0% <15
0% 15-24
26% 25-34
17% 35-44
19% 45-54
21% 55-64
17% >=65

Fixed Address



74% Yes (see residence)
21% No
6% Unknown

Residence



21% Tenderloin (94102)
13% SOMA (94103)
10% Ingleside-Excelsior (94112)
15% Nob Hill (94109)
41% Others

Location of Death



19% Tenderloin (94102)
8% Inner Mission (94110)
21% Nob Hill (94109)
17% SOMA (94103)
36% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
"No fixed address" denotes community members who may be experiencing homelessness.
"Residence" denotes address where decedent lived; "Location of Death" denotes the location where death was declared. For "Residence" and "Location of Death", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco and any of out county residences.
"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Subject:	FW: CVSO Semiannual Report to Board of Supervisors
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 9:05:00 PM
Attachments:	BOS_SemiannualReport_Final_05232022.pdf image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png

---

From: Durbeej, Ravi (HSA) <ravi.durbeej@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 10:10 AM
To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Subject: CVSO Semiannual Report to Board of Supervisors

Good afternoon Victor,

This is Ravi, the Secretary of the DAS Commission, I've attached the semiannual CVSO July 1st, 2021 – December 31st, 2021 report. DAS is submitting this report on behalf of the CVSO, could you please forward this report to the members of the Board of Supervisors and please feel free to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Thank you Victor,

Ravi Durbeej
He/Him/His
Executive Assistant to Kelly Dearman
Disability and Aging Services Commission Secretary
DAS Advisory Council Secretary

O: (415) 355-3509
C: (415) 307-0609
Office Address:
1650 Mission St. 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA. 94103
www.SFHSA.org

SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
Department of Disability and Aging Services

SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
Department of Disability and Aging Services

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

TO: The Board of Supervisors
THROUGH: Kelly Dearman, Executive Director at the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS)
FROM: Cindy Kaufman, Deputy Director of Community Services at the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS)
DATE: May 23rd, 2022
SUBJECT: CVSO Semiannual Report, July 1st, 2021 – December 31st 2021

Introduction to CVSO Services

The San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) County Veterans Services Office (CVSO) assists veterans in San Francisco and surrouding counties by helping them acess benefits they are entitled to. CVSO advocates for veterans and manages the veterans' claims process from start to finish. CVSO staff also assists veterans by providing them with linkages to benefit programs in the following areas:

- Education assistance
- Compensation and insurance
- Money management
- Pension
- Records requests

London Breed
Mayor

Kelly Dearman
Executive Director

Semiannual Report Metrics

The total number of veterans served from from July 1st, 2021 – December 31st, 2021 was 1,450. Of the 1,450 veterans served, 274 or 19% were identified as indigent as shown below. The number of veterans identified as homeless was 132 (9%). The amount of federal entitlements obtained during this reporting period was $744,505. The total monthly non-public assistance award amount obtained was $85,888 for this reporting period.

Total veterans served	1,450
1) The total number of indigent veterans served by CVSO during the timeframe listed above	274 (19%)
2) The number of homeless veterans served	132 (9%)
3) The amount of federal entitlements obtained	.
Retro payment	$744,505
Ongoing monthly benefits	$85,888

SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
Department of Disability and Aging Services

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

4) Estimated savings to the City and County of San Francisco because of reductions in General Assistance payments, and any other City and County benefit programs to veterans who qualify for veterans' benefits	$341,688

Cost avoidance to the City and County of San Francisco was estimated by reviewing the number of individual awards granted that exceed the maximum General Assistance benefit amount of $619 per month. Of the monthly non-public assistance veteran awards granted during this reporting period, 46 exceeded the maximum General Assistance award amount of $619. The monthly awards granted ranged from $46 to $3,633 monthly. If awards granted were to result in General Assistance cost avoidance for the 46 veterans receiving awards that exceeded the maximum General Assistance award amount, the total savings annually to the City and County of San Francisco may be as much as $341,688.

For an explanation of how these figures were produced, please see the footnote[1]

[1] The number of indigent veterans served by CVSO during the reporting period was obtained by querying the VetPro database for veterans served who were receiving either Medi-Cal benefits, supplemental security income, or that identified as homeless. The VetPro database was also queried to obtain the number of homeless veterans served during this reporting period.
The number of federal entitlements obtained was acquired by extracting the DVS-16 report from the VetPro database. The amount of federal entitlements obtrained is reported as the total non-public assistance awards amount for the reporting period. Finally, cost avoidance to the City and County of San Francisco was estimated by reviewing DVS-20 and calculating the number of individual monthly awards granted that exceeded the maximum General Assistance benefit amount of $619 per month.

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Subject:	FW: CAO Fleet - Report on HACTO ordinance for FY21
Date:	Friday, June 10, 2022 3:47:00 PM
Attachments:	Annual HACTO Report for FY21 FINAL.pdf

From: Yoshida, Keigo (ADM) <keigo.yoshida@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2022 3:46 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Jones, Don (ADM) <don.jones@sfgov.org>; Legg, Douglas (ADM) <douglas.legg@sfgov.org>
Subject: CAO Fleet - Report on HACTO ordinance for FY21

Angela,

I'm submitting the annual report for FY21 on the Healthy Air and Clean Transportation Ordinance (HACTO), on behalf of City Administrator's Office.
Please don't hesitate if there are any questions on this report and its contents.

Hope you have a nice weekend.

Sincerely,
Keigo

Keigo Yoshida
Business Manager
Fleet Management – Central Shops
Office of the City Administrator
City and County of San Francisco
555 Selby Street, San Francisco, CA 94124
D: 628-652-5619 / M: 415-218-0939 / keigo.yoshida@sfgov.org

****
For Billing / Accounts Receivable / Fuel Keys / General Inquires
→ **Admin Office:** Fleet.Admin@sfgov.org, (628) 652-5600

To Schedule Appointments for City Vehicle Repair and Maintenance Services
→ **Service Center:** FleetService@sfgov.org, (628) 652-5603, M-F 7am – 4pm
****

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

Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator

MEMORANDUM

Date:	June 10, 2022
To:	Board of Supervisors; Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
From:	Don Jones, Director of Fleet Management
RE:	Annual HACTO Report for FY21

This memo serves as a review of progress of Fleet initiatives as mandated by the Healthy Air and Clean Transportation Ordinance (HACTO), as of the end of FY21. HACTO aims to optimize fleet use and reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. The Fleet Management Division (FMD) continues to implement initiatives towards those goals.

Specific Goals Established in HACTO

The July 2015 amendment set the following targets:

- 4% reduction in average per-mile GHG emissions by general-purpose, light-duty vehicles by the end of FY17.
- 15% reduction in average per-mile GHG emissions by general-purpose, light-duty vehicles by the end of FY22.

The May 2017 amendment set the following target:

- Light-duty passenger vehicle fleet is entirely zero-emission by December 31, 2022.

Light-Duty Vehicle Inventory

HACTO applies to the general purpose[1], light-duty vehicles[2] fleet, which consists of roughly 1,800 sedans, light-duty pickups, vans and SUVs. The total vehicle count has fluctuated, but overall it has increased roughly 5% from what it was in FY14. All vehicle types have increased except for the light-duty pickup trucks. This can be explained by a multitude of factors, including how departments are acquiring more long-term rentals than before (53 in FY22 vs 21 in FY14), new fleet additions being approved through the budget process, and departments possibly not turning in old vehicles.



[1] General purpose = excluding vehicles used by public safety departments POL, SHF and FIR.
[2] Light Duty = sedans, SUVs, pickups and vans under 8,500 gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR)

Telematics Program

FMD has installed telematics vehicle tracking devices in all City vehicles since 2017, except for those belonging to public safety and investigations departments[3]. FMD transitioned all vehicles in this program to a newer, more reliable system in the second half of FY21.

In FY18 and FY19, FMD began using the utilization data from telematics to reach out to departments to turn-in their underutilized vehicles. Underutilization is determined through a set of thresholds involving a vehicle's days of use, miles travelled, and trips taken in a given month. Out of approximately 750 general purpose sedans that were regularly reporting data, FMD identified 136 sedans across 16 departments as potentially underutilized. Departments were then asked to submit waivers to justify the utilization and why the sedan was necessary (i.e., special circumstances, operational needs). As a result of this review process, 33 sedans (approximately 24% of the identified vehicles) were turned in and taken out of the City's fleet.

This initiative was not continued in FY20 and FY21 due to COVID and it completely changed how departments used their vehicles. Many vehicles sat idle or saw very low usage because of the lockdown and City employees working from home, and utilization rates have still not recovered to pre-pandemic levels. In addition, many vehicles belonging to select departments were reassigned to disaster service workers, and a few still are as of the end of FY22.

Vehicle Pools

Pooling resources potentially allows departments to meet their transportation demands with incrementally fewer vehicles. FMD has been administering a carsharing system with shared pools across City departments since 2016. This carsharing system essentially allows City employees to reserve vehicles online, and access vehicles with keycards/fobs instead of the vehicle keys.

In June and July 2021, the carsharing system was transitioned from the legacy system to a new system offered by our telematics vendor, Geotab. HSA and SFO still have shared pools, but they opted out of using this particular system. PRT and RPD are expected to transition to the new system in FY23.

Carshare Pool Hubs & Vehicle Count

Department – Hub	Implementation	Vehicles
ADM – City Hall	2016	19
ADM – 49 SVN	2021	20
ADM – Central Shops	2016	2
DPH – Environmental Health	2016	20
DPH – Behavioral Health	2021	1
MTA – 1 SVN	2017	10
MTA – Parking Enforcement	2017	22
PRT	TBD	8
RPD	TBD	2
	TOTAL	**104**

[3] Public safety and investigations departments = POL, SHF, FIR, ADP, JUV, CAT, DAT, PDR

The newly created pool at 49 SVN provides a good example of how the City can incrementally reduce its fleet size. Half of the vehicles in that pool were donated electric vehicles from DPW, and FMD decommissioned one of the vehicles because of its high upkeep costs, making sure it did not create supply issues in that pool. With departments bringing staff back in the office, new patterns of vehicle usage will begin to establish. The expectation is for these pools to reach new normal operating levels in the upcoming year or two, which will manifest in lower utilization rates for their non-pool fleets and allow for discussions to decommission older, fossil fuel-powered vehicles.

ZEV Mandate

The 2017 amendment mandates that the composition of the City's light-duty passenger vehicle[4] fleet be entirely ZEVs by December 31, 2022. To achieve that goal, the legislation states that every non-exempted purchase must be a ZEV, in other words a battery electric vehicle (BEV) or fuel cell electric vehicle (FCEV). The main exemptions are vehicles used for public safety operations, and cases where a department submits a waiver and obtains approval to purchase a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle (PHEV) instead due to legitimate operational or facility-related constraints.

As reliable, market-tested electric options are only available on term contract for sedans, the scope of the data below is for sedans. The table below provides a breakdown of sedans purchased since the passage of the ZEV mandate. Sedans purchased by public safety departments were generally gasoline/hybrid, pursuit-rated sedans. However, those departments have opted for PHEVs and BEVs for vehicles that are not for law enforcement tasks. Non-public safety departments have complied with the legislation to purchase ZEVs, and PHEVs when there were legitimate waiver justifications. With newer model years of electric vehicles offering more electric range, with the City slowly building out electric charging infrastructure, and with hydrogen stations for fuel cell vehicles becoming increasingly more reliable, few legitimate justifications remain that departments can cite on their waivers going forward. It should be noted that because the City has not budgeted for full replacement of gasoline and hybrid vehicles, it is clear that we will not meet the December 31, 2022 deadline in the ordinance for the foreseeable future.

Sedan Purchases by Fuel Type Since Enactment of ZEV Mandate

	Public Safety Departments				Non Public Safety Departments			
	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21
Gasoline	1	14			4			
Hybrid	14	11			5	2		
Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle (PHEV)		6		14	6	22	12	7
Battery Electric Vehicle (BEV)	1				17	22	14	17
Fuel Cell Electric Vehicle (FCEV)							2	
TOTAL	**16**	**31**	**-**	**14**	**32**	**46**	**28**	**24**

The procurement of cleaner vehicles and the continued decommissioning of older gasoline vehicles have contributed to transitioning the City's fleet to a greener composition. The table below shows the year-on-year progress with the percentages of the general-purpose sedan fleet that are electric.

[4] Light-duty passenger vehicles = A passenger vehicle that meets the criteria of a Federal Highway Administration Class 2 Vehicle (including sedans, coupes, station wagons) that is used primarily for the purposes of carrying passengers, and has no more than five seats in addition to the driver's seat.

General-Purpose Sedan Fleet[5] Composition by Fuel Type

	FY14	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21
Gasoline	33%	21%	19%	18%	16%	15%
Hybrid	43%	59%	60%	60%	59%	58%
Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)	23%	11%	9%	5%	4%	3%
Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle (PHEV)	1%	6%	6%	9%	11%	11%
Battery Electric Vehicle (BEV)	<1%	4%	6%	9%	10%	13%
Fuel Cell Electric Vehicle (FCEV)					<1%	<1%

The legislation also mandates that the City shall seek out new and emerging technologies to upgrade the City's other fleet classes such as trucks and vans to zero emission standards. As of the end of FY20, the only proven and widely produced zero emission powertrain technology is that of sedans. FMD is continuing to research OEM and integrated options for heavier vehicle classes, and will look to pilot products that show promise (i.e. Ford's Lightening F150 and e-Transit models). Meanwhile, greener models have been incorporated into the City's vehicle purchase term contracts, such as plug-in hybrid SUVs and vans, hybrid SUVs and police pursuit vehicles, and hybrid pickup trucks.

GHG Emissions Reduction

The ordinance requires the general-purpose, light-duty fleet to reduce its average per-mile GHG emissions by 4% by the end of FY17, and by 15% by the end of FY21, relative to the baseline in FY14. An analysis of available fuel usage and odometer data from the City's general-purpose, light-duty fleet has shown that the City was able to exceed both goals.

The 4% reduction milestone was met by the end of FY17, and the 15% reduction milestone was met by the end of FY19. A progression of this metric through the past five fiscal years is shown below.

Average Per-Mile Fuel Use (i.e. Gallons Per Mile) by General-Purpose, Light-Duty Fleet

	FY14	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21
Average Gallons per Mile (GPM)	0.075	0.069	0.065	0.062	0.061	0.059
% Change from FY14		-7.9%	-12.9%	-17.5%	-18.4%	-21.1%

[5] Includes sedans, often gasoline or hybrid, that are rented by departments through the City's rentals term contracts.

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Appointment of Steve Lipton to the Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 9:28:00 PM
Attachments:	Appointment of Steve Lipton to MHSF Imlementation Working Group - 6.10.22.pdf

From: Zamora, Luis (CAT) <Luis.A.Zamora@sfcityatty.org>
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2022 5:02 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Fennell, Tyra (MYR) <tyra.fennell@sfgov.org>; Littleton, Heather (CON) <heather.littleton@sfgov.org>; Rosenfield, Ben (CON) <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>; Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>; GIVNER, JON (CAT) <Jon.Givner@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Appointment of Steve Lipton to the Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group

Dear Clerk Calvillo,

Attached please find a letter from City Attorney Chiu regarding his appointment of Steve Lipton to the Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group.

Best,

Luis A. Zamora (he/him)
Confidential Executive Assistant to the City Attorney
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
(415) 554-4748 Direct
www.sfcityattorney.org
Find us on: Facebook Twitter Instagram

The information contained in this electronic message may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed . If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify me by telephone at (415) 554-4700, and delete the original message from your e-mail system. Thank you.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

DAVID CHIU
邱信福
City Attorney

Direct Dial: (415) 554-4748
Email: Luis.A.Zamora@sfcityatty.org

June 10, 2022

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

Re: City Attorney's Appointment to the Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group

Dear Clerk Calvillo:

Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 5.44-2(b)(11), I hereby appoint Steve Lipton to Seat 13 on the Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group.

Thank you for your attention.

Very truly yours,

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney

cc: Alisa Somera
Tyra Fennell
Heather Littleton
Ben Rosenfield
Sneha Patil
Jon Givner

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS); Lew, Lisa (BOS)
Subject:	Certification documents for June 2022 election
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 11:40:00 AM
Attachments:	election results.pdf

Hello,

Attached is the certification documents with date stamp for the June 7, 2022 elections.

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.*

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
John Arntz, Director

Memorandum

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: John Arntz, Director of Elections

Date: June 22, 2022

RE: Certification of Local Results from June 7, 2022, Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election

Attached are the documents associated with my certifying the results of votes cast for local measures and contest in the Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election in San Francisco on June 7, 2022.

Please let me know if I can provide more information or answer any questions.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2022 JUN 22 PM 4:10
BY

English (415) 554-4375
Fax (415) 554-7344
TTY (415) 554-4386

sfelections.org
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48, San Francisco, CA 94102

中文 (415) 554-4367
Español (415) 554-4366
Filipino (415) 554-4310

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS John Arntz, Director

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, California 94102

Statement of the Results
Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election – June 7, 2022

I, John Arntz, Director of Elections, certify that I have canvassed the ballots cast at the Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election held on Tuesday, June 7, 2022, in the City and County of San Francisco, in the manner required by Division 15 of the California Elections Code.

I certify that I began the canvass immediately upon the close of the polls on June 7, 2022, and, as a result of the tabulation of all votes recorded, present a complete record entitled "Statement of the Results of the San Francisco Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election – June 7, 2022." I also declare that the number of ballots cast in said election was 229,760; therefore, 46.37**%** of San Francisco's 495,498 registered voters voted in this election.

In accordance with California Elections Code section 15400, I certify that the total number of votes cast for each candidate and for and against each measure is shown in this Statement of the Results and the precinct detail of all votes cast appears in the Statement of the Vote, which is posted on the Department of Elections' website at ***sfelections.org/results*** and is incorporated by reference into this Statement of the Results.

The turnout recorded in the Statement of the Vote indicates that 229,229 of the City's 495,498 registered voters, or 46.26%, cast ballots in this election, which is slightly different than the totals mentioned above. The reason for the difference between the Statement of the Vote and this Statement of the Results is 531 voters voted and returned Card 3 which included the City Propositions than voted and returned Card 1, which included the contest for Governor. Also, the voting system reports turnout based on the number of Card 1s cast whenever an election requires multi-card ballots. In most multi-card elections, more voters will cast Card 1 than the other cards. In this election, however, more voters cast Card 3s, which listed the City Propositions. Despite this slight difference between the two reports, all votes are accounted for in the Statement of the Vote.

This Statement of the Results includes tables that summarize total votes cast in each contest, organized as follows:

A. Voter-Nominated Offices
1. Governor
2. Lieutenant Governor
3. Secretary of State
4. State Controller
5. State Treasurer
6. Attorney General
7. Insurance Commissioner
8. Board of Equalization, District 2
9. U.S. Senator Full Term (Term ending January 3, 2029)
10. U.S. Senator, Partial Term (Term ending January 3, 2023)
11. U.S. Representative, District 2

12. U.S. Representative, District 1
13. U.S. Representative, District 12
14. State Assembly, District 12
15. State Assembly, District 18
16. State Assembly, District 17
17. State Assembly, District 19

B. Nonpartisan Office

1. Superintendent of Public Instruction

C. Local Office

1. City Attorney

D. City and County Propositions

1. **A,** MUNI Reliability and Street Safety Bond
2. **B,** Building Inspection Commission
3. **C,** Recall Timelines and Vacancy Process
4. **D,** Victims and Witness Rights
5. **E,** Behested Payments
6. **F,** Refuse Collection and Disposal
7. **G,** Public Health Emergency Leave
8. **H,** District Attorney Recall Measure

Although the Statement of the Results includes the contests for U.S. Representative, Districts 2 and 12, and contests for State Assembly, Districts 12 and 18, no San Francisco voters live in these districts; therefore, these contests are not included in the attached results tables. The boundary that places U.S. Representative District 2 and State Assembly District 12 within San Francisco extends from the City to a small part of Angel Island. The boundary that places U.S. Representative District 12 and State Assembly District 18 within San Francisco extends to the extreme southwest corner of Alameda Island. Other than these uninhabited Census blocks on the islands attributed to San Francisco, the districts lie entirely within Marin and Alameda Counties respectively.

For each results table, the candidate or ballot measure position with the most votes is preceded by an arrow (→). For contests that were voted on in other counties in addition to San Francisco, the results shown are for San Francisco only; the overall results and outcome may differ.

For this election, all voters used three-card ballots, with the content on each card as follows:

Card 1: Voter-nominated offices of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, State Controller, State Treasurer, and Attorney General, State Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization

Card 2: Voter-nominated offices of United States Senator (Full Term), United States Senator (Partial Term), United States Representative, and Member of the State Assembly; nonpartisan office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Card 3: Office of the City Attorney, and City and County propositions A–H

Voting System and Election Transparency
The City's voting system allows for increased election transparency through the posting of images of voted ballots, equipment transaction logs, and other election reports, all of which will be posted with the final election results on the Department's website, *sfelections.org.*

Voted ballot images. The City's voting system captures images of each voted ballot cast in an election. This creates a visual history of how ballots were marked. After each election, the Department posts the ballot images on its website, allowing members of the public to view each voted ballot cast in the City. Prior to posting the ballot images, the Department reviews the images and redacts identifying information that voters may have placed on ballot cards.

AuditMark. In addition to the voting system capturing images of voted ballot cards, the system also adds an explanation at the bottom of each ballot image indicating how the voting equipment interpreted and tallied each vote mark. These explanations, or AuditMarks, provide the public with information on how the voting system operates in relation to the recording and reporting of every vote cast in this election. This means that for every oval with a mark inside the voting target, even for partial marks, the voting system adds an explanation to the images of voted ballots of how the system understood and registered the markings within each oval.

Ballot Audit and Review. The Department will post an application that allows the public to sort the ballot images according to precinct, contest, and district. The City is the first jurisdiction in the country to utilize this application, known as "Ballot Audit and Review."

Cast Vote Record. The Department posted a "Cast Vote Record" that lists each vote recorded on each ballot card. The data provided in the Cast Vote Record is captured from the ballots as the ballots are scanned by the voting equipment and before vote tabulation occurs, allowing members of the public to tabulate votes from specific precincts, districts, etc. and compare against the official election results.

SHA-512 Cryptographic Hash Algorithm
The Department of Elections applied a SHA-512 cryptographic function to reports associated with this election to establish the integrity of the results in a verifiable manner. Attachment 2 provides information regarding the SHA-512 hash values for all electronic files associated with the final, certified results reports.

Attachments
Attachment 1 provides a table that lists the votes cast in each contest, and for and against each City Proposition.

Attachment 2 is the list of SHA-512 hashes associated with each final election results report and machine audit logs.

Attachment 3 is the report from the manual tallies that the Department conducted on randomly selected polling place, vote-by-mail, and provisional ballots to confirm that the voting equipment operated properly, and accurately counted and reported election results.

In witness whereof, I hereby affix my hand and seal this 22nd day of June, 2022.

John Arntz, Director of Elections



A. VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES

I certify the results for the following **VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES:**
(Results represent votes cast in San Francisco only)

1. GOVERNOR

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
GAVIN NEWSOM	166,667	76.02%
BRIAN DAHLE	13,249	6.04%
LUIS JAVIER RODRIGUEZ	11,079	5.05%
MICHAEL SHELLENBERGER	9,662	4.41%
ROBERT C. NEWMAN II	2,343	1.07%
RONALD A. ANDERSON	2,252	1.03%
SHAWN COLLINS	1,960	0.89%
JENNY RAE LE ROUX	1557	0.71%
JOEL VENTRESCA	1526	0.70%
ANTHONY TRIMINO	1496	0.68%
REINETTE SENUM	1246	0.57%
MAJOR WILLIAMS	1074	0.49%
HEATHER COLLINS	749	0.34%
DAVID LOZANO	716	0.33%
LEO S. ZACKY	561	0.26%
DANIEL R. MERCURI	430	0.20%
WOODROW "WOODY" SANDERS III	394	0.18%
FREDERIC C. SCHULTZ	347	0.16%
CRISTIAN RAUL MORALES	326	0.15%
ARMANDO "MANDO" PEREZ-SERRATO	314	0.14%
JAMES G. HANINK	301	0.14%
RON JONES	264	0.12%
LONNIE SORTOR	246	0.11%
ANTHONY "TONY" FANARA	237	0.11%
BRADLEY ZINK	131	0.06%
SERGE FIANKAN	117	0.05%
JEFF SCOTT*	2	0.00%
GURINDER BHANGOO*	0	0.00%
Total Votes Cast	219,246	
Undervotes	9,159	
Overvotes	824	
Total Ballots Cast	229,229	

*Qualified Write-in Candidate

2. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
ELENI KOUNALAKIS	145,972	70.79%
MOHAMMAD ARIF	17,300	8.39%
ANGELA E. UNDERWOOD JACOBS	13,718	6.65%
DAVID FENNELL	12,821	6.22%
CLINT W. SAUNDERS	5,347	2.59%
WILLIAM CAVETT "SKEE" SAACKE	5,103	2.47%
JEFFREY HIGHBEAR MORGAN	3,919	1.90%
DAVID HILLBERG	2,008	0.97%
JAMES ORLANDO OGLE*	2	0.001%
Total Votes Cast	206,190	
Undervotes	22,847	
Overvotes	192	
Total Ballots Cast	229,229	

*Qualified Write-in Candidate

3. SECRETARY OF STATE

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
SHIRLEY N. WEBER	164,246	80.35%
ROB BERNOSKY	18,914	9.25%
RACHEL HAMM	7,173	3.51%
GARY N. BLENNER	6,649	3.25%
RAUL RODRIGUEZ JR.	3,059	1.50%
JAMES "JW" PAINE	2,419	1.18%
MATTHEW D. CINQUANTA	1,949	0.95%
DESMOND A SILVEIRA*	4	0.002%
Total Votes Cast	204,413	
Undervotes	24,715	
Overvotes	101	
Total Ballots Cast	229,229	

*Qualified Write-in Candidate

4. STATE CONTROLLER

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
MALIA M. COHEN	75,108	36.67%
RON GALPERIN	40,684	19.86%
LANHEE CHEN	32,260	15.75%
YVONNE YIU	31,313	15.29%
STEVE GLAZER	16,931	8.27%
LAURA WELLS	8,517	4.16%
Total Votes Cast	204,813	
Undervotes	24,188	
Overvotes	228	
Total Ballots Cast	229,229	

5. STATE TREASURER

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
FIONA MA	149,614	73.79%
MEGHANN ADAMS	19,950	9.84%
JACK M. GUERRERO	18,578	9.16%
ANDREW DO	14,614	7.21%
Total Votes Cast	202,756	
Undervotes	26,341	
Overvotes	132	
Total Ballots Cast	229,229	

6. ATTORNEY GENERAL

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
ROB BONTA	157,697	76.47%
NATHAN HOCHMAN	16,321	7.91%
ERIC EARLY	13,513	6.55%
ANNE MARIE SCHUBERT	12,713	6.16%
DAN KAPELOVITZ	5,975	2.90%
Total Votes Cast	206,219	
Undervotes	22,900	
Overvotes	110	
Total Ballots Cast	229,229	

7. INSURANCE COMMISSIONER

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
RICARDO LARA	88,282	44.71%
MARC LEVINE	47,031	23.82%
NATHALIE HRIZI	20,162	10.21%
ROBERT HOWELL	13,345	6.76%
GREG CONLON	13,182	6.68%
VINSON EUGENE ALLEN	4,354	2.20%
JASPER "JAY" JACKSON	4,304	2.18%
VERONIKA FIMBRES	4,293	2.17%
ROBERT J. MOLNAR	2508	1.27%
Total Votes Cast	197,461	
Undervotes	31,560	
Overvotes	208	
Total Ballots Cast	229,229	

8. BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, DISTRICT 2

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
SALLY J. LIEBER	94,812	50.14%
MICHELA ALIOTO-PIER	64,632	34.18%
PETER COE VERBICA	29,661	15.68%
Total Votes Cast	189,105	
Undervotes	39,971	
Overvotes	153	
Total Ballots Cast	229,229	

9. UNITED STATES SENATOR (Full term ending January 3, 2029)

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
ALEX PADILLA	162,710	77.90%
MARK P. MEUSER	13,421	6.43%
CORDIE WILLIAMS	5,439	2.60%
JOHN THOMPSON PARKER	2,921	1.40%
JON ELIST	2,855	1.37%
CHUCK SMITH	2,760	1.32%
JAMES P. BRADLEY	2,393	1.15%
DAN O'DOWD	2,380	1.14%
DOUGLAS HOWARD PIERCE	2,081	1.00%
SARAH SUN LIEW	1,999	0.96%
PAMELA ELIZONDO	1,525	0.73%
JAMES "HENK" CONN	1,196	0.57%
AKINYEMI AGBEDE	1,170	0.56%
CARLOS GUILLERMO TAPIA	1,043	0.50%
TIMOTHY J URSICH	916	0.44%
OBAIDUL HUQ PIRJADA	750	0.36%
ELEANOR GARCIA	722	0.35%
MYRON L. HALL	636	0.30%
ENRIQUE PETRIS	539	0.26%
DAPHNE BRADFORD	522	0.25%
ROBERT GEORGE LUCERO, JR	367	0.18%
DEON D. JENKINS	356	0.17%
DON J. GRUNDMANN	175	0.08%
MARK A. RUZON*	2	0.001%
MARC ALEXANDER ROTH*	1	0.0005%
LIJUN (LILY) ZHOU*	0	0.00%
IRENE RATLIFF*	0	0.00%
Total Votes Cast	208,879	
Undervotes	18,025	
Overvotes	2,166	
Total Ballots Cast	229,070	

*Qualified Write-in Candidate

9. UNITED STATES SENATOR (Partial term ending January 3, 2023)

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
ALEX PADILLA	165,360	80.72%
MARK P. MEUSER	16,200	7.91%
JAMES P. BRADLEY	8,136	3.97%
TIMOTHY URSICH JR.	4,244	2.07%
JON ELIST	3,102	1.51%
DAPHNE BRADFORD	2,691	1.31%
MYRON L. HALL	2,663	1.30%
DAN O'DOWD	2,422	1.18%
JOHN THOMPSON PARKER*	28	0.01%
IRENE RATLIFF*	1	0.0005%
Total Votes Cast	204,847	
Undervotes	23,692	
Overvotes	531	
Total Ballots Cast	229,070	

*Qualified Write-in Candidate

10. UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT 11

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
NANCY PELOSI	133,798	71.65%
JOHN DENNIS	20,054	10.74%
SHAHID BUTTAR	19,471	10.43%
EVE DEL CASTELLO	7,319	3.92%
JEFFREY PHILLIPS	3,595	1.93%
BIANCA VON KRIEG	2,499	1.34%
Total Votes Cast	186,736	
Undervotes	19,592	
Overvotes	137	
Total Ballots Cast	206,465	

12. UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT 15

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
KEVIN MULLIN	6,813	35.77%
DAVID J. CANEPA	5,950	31.24%
GUS MATTAMMAL	3,145	16.51%
EMILY BEACH	2,042	10.72%
JIM GARRITY	473	2.48%
ANDREW G. WATTERS	395	2.07%
FERENC PATAKI	231	1.21%
Total Votes Cast	19,049	
Undervotes	3,516	
Overvotes	40	
Total Ballots Cast	22,605	

13. MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY, DISTRICT 17

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
MATT HANEY	69,412	63.24%
DAVID CAMPOS	27,270	24.85%
BILL SHIREMAN	13,071	11.91%
Total Votes	109,753	
Undervotes	13,485	
Overvotes	85	
Total Ballots Cast	123,323	

14. MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY, DISTRICT 19

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
PHIL TING	71,775	79.94%
KARSTEN WEIDE	18,011	20.06%
Total Votes	89,786	
Undervotes	15,948	
Overvotes	13	
Total Ballots Cast	105,747	

B. NONPARTISAN OFFICES

I certify the results for the following **NONPARTISAN OFFICE:**

1. SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Candidates	Vote Totals	% of Votes
TONY K. THURMOND	98,600	53.68%
MARCO AMARAL	28,101	15.30%
GEORGE YANG	19,390	10.56%
AINYE E. LONG	18,398	10.02%
LANCE RAY CHRISTENSEN	8,347	4.54%
JIM GIBSON	5,968	3.25%
JOSEPH GUY CAMPBELL	4,886	2.66%
Total Votes	183,690	
Undervotes	45,244	
Overvotes	136	
Total Ballots Cast	229,070	

C. LOCAL OFFICE

I certify the results for the following **LOCAL OFFICE.**

1. CITY ATTORNEY

Candidate	Vote Totals	% of Votes
→ DAVID CHIU	163,569	100.00%
Total Votes	163,569	
Undervotes	66,185	
Overvotes	6	
Total Ballots Cast	229,760	

F. CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

I certify the results for the following **CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS:**
Unless otherwise noted, measures required 50% + 1 affirmative votes to pass.

1. PROPOSITION A, "MUNI Reliability and Street Safety Bond."

		Vote Totals	% of Votes		
→	**NO**	**74,350**	**34.89%**	Undervotes	**16,632**
	YES	**138,730**	**65.11%**	Overvotes	**48**

Measure required 66 2/3% affirmative votes to pass.

2. PROPOSITION B, "Building Inspection Commission."

		Vote Totals	% of Votes		
→	**YES**	**129,230**	**61.99%**	Undervotes	**21,247**
	NO	**79,234**	**38.01%**	Overvotes	**49**

3. PROPOSITION C, "Recall Timelines and Vacancy Appointments."

		Vote Totals	% of Votes		
→	**NO**	**123,685**	**57.95%**	Undervotes	**16,268**
	YES	**89,731**	**42.05%**	Overvotes	**76**

4. PROPOSITION D, "Office of Victim and Witness Rights; Legal Services for Domestic Violence Victims."

		Vote Totals	% of Votes		
→	**YES**	**125,795**	**59.08%**	Undervotes	**16,761**
	NO	**87,128**	**40.92%**	Overvotes	**76**

5. PROPOSITION E, "Behested Payments."

		Vote Totals	% of Votes		
→	**YES**	**144,114**	**69.41%**	Undervotes	**22,060**
	NO	**63,520**	**30.59%**	Overvotes	**66**

6. PROPOSITION F, "Refuse Collection and Disposal."

		Vote Totals	% of Votes		
→	**YES**	**144,129**	**70.68%**	Undervotes	**25,795**
	NO	**59,796**	**29.32%**	Overvotes	**40**

7. PROPOSITION G, "Public Health Emergency Leave."

		Vote Totals	% of Votes		
→	**YES**	**137,842**	**64.44%**	Undervotes	**15,792**
	NO	**76,077**	**35.56%**	Overvotes	**49**

8. PROPOSITION H, "Recall Measure Regarding the District Attorney."

		Vote Totals	% of Votes		
→	**YES**	**122,588**	**55.03%**	Undervotes	**6,936**
	NO	**100,177**	**44.97%**	Overvotes	**59**

List of SHA-512 Hash Values for Certified Results Reports
Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election, June 7, 2022

This list represents the various certified results reports the Department of Elections issued for the June 7, 2022, Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election. The file names for each report are listed numerically, and underneath each file name is the SHA-512 cryptographic hash value applicable to each file. All reports are posted on the Department's website: www.sfelections.org/results

1. "**Summary – PDF**," lists a summary of votes cast by contest, using a PDF format.

   Hash value:
   45DA39D433E397E9A34D1D066D6464DBF97892663E109263FF0B4DEDC07994A893DE274AFB
   80AF4986CE14C8FE6E417E7DE7B4BE4A1D7958D99EA3538FB64A3F

2. "**Summary – Excel**," lists a summary of votes cast by contest, using Microsoft Excel.

   Hash value:
   25658FEC87E15CC987BFB4066F6A04A694C03C816273D923F0404849B78D621A1511DF5BA0
   4EF203C1A0C365494871EB45F6ECDD2E67105BD7D87C16E4E89501

3. "**Summary – XML**," lists a summary of votes cast by contest, using XML format.

   Hash value:
   4A60278546E5B9500BD4469951C3083739DBBAA1577D49FA0A4380023A0C0E598AC43FCE47
   3F7147DF95CD6E2CEC68ACA4FB2FC8FD890C95291077674D1BA9B7

4. "**SOV – PDF**," lists votes cast in each precinct and for each contest, using a PDF format.

   Hash value:
   10D1165F0EBBECC8BEA473A127853A51763215B6D3EF365B4D7D5DC7E3CBF9752952DC8F4
   0DB7DBA70FED5111578095E09213589051E506353E0AD88EBA1364B

5. "**SOV – Excel**," lists votes cast in each precinct and for each contest, using Microsoft Excel.

   Hash value:
   B3A79D6798F729DD14F6EF62597D3B6DC411C4D23C89EA39D77290D749A29A3AF0A08B1D4
   B8EC23D110C48E2A91335AD223B33463B6DB200BFBC158FAFBB22CB

6. "**District SOV – PDF**," lists votes cast in each district and for each contest, using a PDF format.

   Hash value:
   FFC8727104CF44A07589EA75DDCDED291B745ADBA37B4CCFD3C198A5231E2BA5091C3139
   086DECF2798AF08FEB623D8C65AE0D9DE1D52455D5F80B3F4B113EDA

List of SHA-512 Hash Values for Certified Results Reports
Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election, June 7, 2022

7. "**District SOV – Excel**," lists votes cast in each district and for each contest, using Microsoft Excel.

   Hash value:
   3361996DAA6E8C3DC51672DEEEE79B50BD457EFA4463920C3D3C90C4E5238C8C73E5E45E1
   FBBEC86A177F779D2267E82EE4FD1FFDBE7594774DE4232E4D50496

8. **"Cast Vote Record - JSON**," lists votes cast on each ballot card in a zipped JSON format.

   Hash value:
   953721AC77677147A48AB2D85CBBF11E78284E5B1387E3865C7D5DCC53889197E08A49BAEE
   D3918C8752A40EB14084872423DDAD14BAEDCBDCA2AF76D2F4BD43

9. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 1 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

   Hash value:
   078C43E3045B0F585F4D61C4AE240A496457E1CEC6C7BA1904F95CD5A4CCD8132C5B4F063
   9205BD1EB73EEF184BE3B4C2E3DA1618D79C1DC4E76221621F42A44

10. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 2 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    A582556A3232AE7BDE406F73BF0C353B03A608F76607EBFFC2580B43442A73E4103C42DC7D
    F46E70AB0B20B00147BC18D0518C03EEE4FF7172D5897069CCBA8D

11. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 3 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    170EF7921FD9D0E94A2726F0E034EC6AF2ACADC54785732F817EB0BF6F3BE306D2EFE29D5
    73976DFCA2150C1B3DF2F08446013D15501C16F6BFEF94C5340B93D

12. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 4 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    A0C8116547EF66FED4A223482A12941264CF28BE4B76928A639C5C630EC5CD39B254639D05
    1D58B389D83142A610EF728E1829CC10B2F1854DBD843016B393B4

List of SHA-512 Hash Values for Certified Results Reports
Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election, June 7, 2022

13. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 5 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    0E9649B7008C8240EF9A71F63CFAA593BE9D9F056801AFB12047A72ACB9C94B756E0893D6D
    18635F04BFB2D1E4BB4FB4692D86361042DDC8F5C33B241C8807AD

14. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 6 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    11EAE68139E7C9D097E857B58EDC3BC462A1BF04E667ACBA5E68FC8726400C188109EF6FA
    AC606BC30DB6EB249B066EB79DA8234E51647DE1EB3DD111A3D40B0

15. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 7 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    1595EE51757D0FCBBDD157E5380DCCF10DFF8A8C0953C685CEB342CB03BCEE78FF55E064
    D4170A01CD88F1F58776DDC09C33C0FA7B2571FE9F416BBBD74E53E5

16. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 8 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    FD3B7E8DA25F8840CC0521FBA3278BBBCFE0F1CB20A22DEEBCED9413D512ED83AB9BD4F
    759CED3DFE27460B738C1EA8809D82006AE1E340A0393BD2C63E5F83A

17. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 9 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    E8412A4C1A597E51ACBE944BFAE9C028F05FA3FBE78F9545CF6423AAA90C107342F018660F
    7A808C7F682F05567DAA9C40B92BDA87F021F9EDCC45854BD2F98F

18. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 10 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    A842D3C2087CD1679CA82D521AC8D7B530B3E0DB7783EFDCFDB487AC1CDB5D46000F97D4
    F12D82C7AA4BB4F1AFDAF719AC001E9E7C89B12A7AE783DABB815B3D

List of SHA-512 Hash Values for Certified Results Reports
Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election, June 7, 2022

19. "**Ballot Images, Supervisorial District 11 - ZIP**", contains scanned ballot images in zipped TIFF format.

    Hash value:
    7BAB1393798B5B3E7224CBEAD4F96E8943724812AA3B75786E96D46FA6B056766C800750F71
    FF12B995F5244F567559A91C37AA076AD328BB87D03BA0CE636BB

20. "**Ballot Scanning Machine Logs - ZIP**," audit logs from Ballot Scanning Machines used at Polling Places on Election Day.

    Hash value:
    3C80991F423B3CE7E83BC9B3022BF9C9D93971A6B5B416D3B61E06C1CB7353A89CF65A1402
    3491F11468148B7AB6D9E528B0385F8BE60F6944D6A3E346067741

21. "**ImageCast Central Logs - ZIP**," audit logs from ImageCast Central machines used at City Hall.

    Hash value:
    5A3A9C88428069D1128B87BE2C8243191D70A399F2665537A777BEF7CE3D775AD6228BD438A
    F47B105889C6F47F9360BD92C811FFD16393C1812945AEC0336E5

22. "**Vote-by-Mail Status Report**," lists the disposition of the vote-by-mail ballots the Department received.

    Hash value:
    F46B23C8B6EA3DFE694C73328D5930DA05146CEFD71D4F2448E185E51F007E1D83E591D48C
    2DC54545E5962989DD2842840B2E736B5672B70CA32CBF4EBF2C6F

23. "**Provisional Ballot Status Report**," lists the disposition of the provisional ballots the Department received.

    Hash value:
    662CBBFC73CE44DED0E005EC2122DE9DDD2633BEB68CB5FE914728ED587018B20590CB37A
    4A3947C6164A96BC8513F1F338BB61F483360F96A78DFF26693FCCA

24. **"Conditional Voter Registration Report,"** lists the disposition of the ballots cast during the Conditional Voter Registration period.

    Hash value:
    ED0F51B0E101FD809C494FBCCFA7C655774E9A72DE5C9D6DD4F2D6688D14FC3F3FEC91962
    9DC96E93ECC986E1EA169E3EC04659C0EA9D7F35164CC6F7C6AACA0

List of SHA-512 Hash Values for Certified Results Reports
Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election, June 7, 2022

25. "**SHA-512.csv**," provides a list of all hashed election results files in CSV format.

Hash value:
64B53E8DCFD2C64C6389BF15223BECE1B192B14841B77188CF6A06CC404DA9C02DF6E4865F
52FFCDE2F5CBE4FCF3DE20BAF29F2310F606BFA2EDB222A87E5037

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
John Arntz, Director

June 21, 2022

California Secretary of State
1500 11th Street, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

June 7, 2022, Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election
Results of 1% Post-Election Manual Tallies

Pursuant to state elections law, the San Francisco Department of Elections (Department) is required to conduct a manual tally of all ballots cast in 1% of San Francisco's polling places and 1% of the vote-by-mail ballots (VBM) cast, and may also manually tally 1% of provisional ballots (PV) cast, as part of the Official Canvass of the election. The Department compares the results of the manual tallies to the results reports generated by the voting equipment used to tabulate ballot cards. The purpose of the manual tallies is to verify the accuracy of the voting equipment used in the election. Upon completion of the 1% manual tallies, the Department prepares a report on the results of the manual tallies and includes the report in the certification of the Official Canvass for the election.

The following is a report on the results of the manual tallies of 1% of the polling place, vote-by-mail, and provisional ballots cast in the June 7, 2022, Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election.

Random Selection of Precincts
On June 14, 2022, the Department conducted a random selection of precincts and batches for the manual tallies in accordance with California Elections Code section 15360.

Five days prior to selecting the precincts and batches for the manual tallies, the Department issued a press release and posted a public notice on its website, *sfelections.org*, and outside its office, announcing the date, time, and place of the random selection of precincts and batches. Additionally, the Department webcast the random selection process and posted the recording on its website.

For the June 2022 election, the Department conducted manual tallies of ballots cast in a minimum of six precincts, to represent 1% of San Francisco's 588 polling places included in the election, 11 VBM batches to represent 1% of 1,035 batches of vote-by-mail ballots and, finally, and one PV batch to represent the 1% of the 23 batches of provisional ballots. State elections law also requires a manual tally of votes cast to be conducted on all contests present in the election.

The random selection was divided in three categories. The first category was for selecting six precincts for ballots cast at the polling places. The second category was for selecting 11 batches (or boxes) of VBM ballots. The third category was for selecting one batch (or box) for the PV ballots.

Using three 10-sided dice, the Department randomly selected the precincts and using four 10-sided dice, randomly selected the VBM batches to be tallied in full. For the random selection of 1 batch of PV ballots, two 10-sided dice were rolled. After the six precincts were selected for the precinct ballots, there was one contest (United States Representative District 15) that was not included amongst the contests in the selected precincts. To include this contest, the Department again rolled three dice to randomly select a precinct which included the necessary contest on its ballot. The additional precinct selected was 7042. For this precinct, only the one contest was tallied. For a list of randomly selected precincts and batches contests tallied in each precinct (see Part I table at the end of this report).

Conducting the 1% Manual Tallies

The 1% manual tallies of randomly selected precincts and batches began on Thursday, June 16, 2022, and was completed on June 18th. The manual tallies occurred in the Department's warehouse on Pier 31, which is located on The Embarcadero. The manual tallies were open to public observation both in person and via live streaming on the Department's website at *sfelections.org/live*.

For each selected precinct and batch, Department personnel manually tallied votes cast on the ballots, including polling place ballots cast using the Ballot Scanning Machines (BSM), and accepted vote-by-mail and provisional ballots, including those issued at the Department's City Hall Voting Center. Vote-by-mail and provisional ballots, and paper duplications of ballots through the remake process using the Ballot Marking Device are tabulated using the ImageCast Central (ICC) machines. The manual counts were then compared against the results reports issued by the voting system. If there were any discrepancies between the two tallies, the Department sought resolution or explanations for these discrepancies and document the resolutions using Manual Tally Incident forms.

Department personnel worked in four, four-person teams to manually tally votes on polling place ballots, vote-by-mail, and provisional ballots. Each team was assigned one precinct or one batch to count at a time. After all the votes for a contest had been counted, a supervisor verified whether the manual count matched the machine count. If all the vote counts matched, the team proceeded to the next contest until all the contests on the card had been counted.

Results of the 1% Manual Tallies

In accordance with the Post-Election Manual Tally Emergency Regulations, a "variance" means any difference between the machine tally and the manual tally for a contest, including, but not limited to, differences due to machine malfunction, operator error, or voter error in marking a ballot. Upon completion of the manual tallies associated with ballots cast in San Francisco for the June 7, 2022, Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election, the Department found two incidences of a mismatch in votes counted in two contests only on the VBM ballots (see Part II table at the end of this report).

These two incidences of variance were found in the VBM ballots under batch 98 and batch 970. However, the variances were not due to machine error but due to a lightly marked ballot. In both cases, the vote marking on one of the candidates in the ballot was very light that the machine did not picked up the mark making it an undervote thus creating the discrepancy (see Part III table at the end of this report).

Overall, no variances were found between the manual tallies and the results reports caused by any voting equipment malfunction. The results of the 1% manual tallies confirm that the voting equipment used in the June 2022 election accurately tabulated and reported votes cast for contests appearing on the official ballot.

The following are tables that summarizes the manual tallies.

Part I. Randomly Selected Precincts and Contests Tallied for the 1% Manual Tally
Part II. Summary of Results of the 1% Manual Tally
Part III. Comparison of Manual and Machine Tallies (for discrepancies only)

Part I: Randomly Selected Precincts, Batches, and Contests Tallied for the 1% Manual Tallies

Randomly Selected Precincts/Batches and Contests Tallied for the 1% Manual Tally June 7, 2022, Election

Initial six precincts selected for Precinct Ballots

Order Drawn	Precinct	Ballot Type	Contests Tallied	Order Drawn	Precinct	Ballot Type	Contests Tallied
1st	9409	2	All	4th	7341	2	All
2nd	9719	4	All	5th	9451	2	All
3rd	7525	4	All	6th	7308	4	All

Additional one precinct selected for Precinct Ballots

Order Drawn	Precinct	Ballot Type	Contests Tallied
7th	7042	3	United States Representative District 15

Eleven batches selected for VBM Ballots

Order Drawn	Batch	Ballot Type	Contests Tallied	Order Drawn	Precinct	Ballot Type	Contests Tallied
1st	68	Mix	All	7th	96	Mix	All
2nd	777	Mix	All	8th	338	Mix	All
3rd	247	Mix	All	9th	979	Mix	All
4th	137	Mix	All	10th	1020	Mix	All
5th	138	Mix	All	11th	970	Mix	All
6th	1022	Mix	All				

One batch selected for PV Ballots

Order Drawn	Batch	Ballot Type	Contests Tallied
7th	21	Mix	All

Part II: Summary of Results of the 1% Manual Tallies

Summary of Results of the 1% Manual Tally June 7, 2022, Election			
Precinct	Contests Tallied	Precinct Ballots Discrepancies found?	Causes
7308	All	No	NA
7341	All	No	NA
7525	All	No	NA
9409	All	No	NA
9451	All	No	NA
9719	All	No	NA
7042	United States Representative District 15	No	NA
VBM Batch (Box) #	Contests Tallied	Vote-by-Mail Ballots Discrepancies found?	Causes
68	All	No	NA
96	All	Yes	Very light vote mark on 1 candidate
137	All	No	NA
138	All	No	NA
247	All	No	NA
338	All	No	NA
777	All	No	NA
970	All	Yes	Very light vote mark on 1 candidate
979	All	No	NA
1020	All	No	NA
1022	All	No	NA
PV Batch (Box) #	Contests Tallied	Provisional Ballots Discrepancies found?	Causes
21	All	No	NA

Part III: Comparison of Manual and Machine Tallies (for discrepancies only)

The following table details each discrepancy found during the 1% Manual Tally, including the precinct/batch number for which the discrepancy was found, the type of ballot on which the discrepancy was found, the number of votes indicated by the voting equipment results report (machine tally), the number of votes indicated by the manual tally, and the variance between the results report and manual tally. Each discrepancy is color-coded to indicate the identified cause of variance. For this Election there was only 1 type of cause of variance which was caused by faint vote marks.

Type of ink and density

Crease/ faint vote mark

Vote mark off the bubble

Misplaced ballot card/s

Comparison of Manual and Machine Tallies June 7, 2022, Election						
VBM Batch 98	**Precinct Ballots**			**Vote-By-Mail Ballots**		
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR	**Machine Tally**	**Manual Tally**	**Variance**	**Machine Tally**	**Manual Tally**	**Variance**
ANGELA E. UNDERWOOD JACOBS				9	10	1
UNDERVOTES				10	9	-1
VBM Batch 970						
TREASURER	**Machine Tally**	**Manual Tally**	**Variance**	**Machine Tally**	**Manual Tally**	**Variance**
FIONA MA				121	122	1
UNDERVOTES				22	21	-1

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	Department of Public Health - Health Officer Directives
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 2:12:00 PM
Attachments:	- CCSF DPH 1 2022.06.06 FINAL Signed Directive No. 2020-02h Blanket Isolation and Quarantine Directive.pdf - CCSF DPH 2 2022.06.06 FINAL Signed Directive No. 2020-03.pdf - CCSF DPH 3 C19-07-Safer-Return-Together-Health-Order_0.pdf - CCSF DPH 4 Directive-2020-14-Childcare.pdf - CCSF DPH 5 Directive-2020-33-Schools.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see attached the following Health Officer Directives and Orders:

- DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-02h
  - DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING COVID-19 ISOLATION AND QUARANTINE
- DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-03g
  - DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING ALL INDIVIDUALS DIAGNOSED WITH OR LIKELY TO HAVE COVID-19 TO SELF-ISOLATE
- ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)
  - ENCOURAGING COVID-19 VACCINE COVERAGE AND REDUCING DISEASE RISKS
- DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-14k (updated)
  - DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING REQUIRED BEST PRACTICES FOR CHILDCARE PROVIDERS
- DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-33j
  - DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING REQUIRED BEST PRACTICES FOR SCHOOLS

Sincerely,

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

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-02h

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING COVID-19 ISOLATION AND QUARANTINE

(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY DIRECTIVE)

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: June 6, 2022

Summary: SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes Coronavirus 2019 Disease ("COVID-19"), can still be easily transmitted, regardless of vaccination status. This combined directive lists the current isolation rules and quarantine recommendations and requirements in the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") that apply to all people in the City in order to reduce the spread of COVID-19.

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, 120175, 120215, 120220, AND 120225 THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ("HEALTH OFFICER") DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Definitions.

   a. *CDC*. "CDC" means the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

   b. *CDPH*. "CDPH" means the California Department of Public Health.

   c. *Close Contact*. "Close Contact" means sharing the same indoor airspace with a Person With COVID-19 for a total of 15 minutes or more in a 24-hour period while the person is contagious. A person is considered contagious if they *either* (i) had symptoms, from 48 hours before their symptoms began until at least five days after the start of symptoms, *or* (ii) did not have symptoms but learned they were COVID-19 positive from a test, from 48 hours before their COVID-19 test was collected until five days after they were tested. (Note that Cal/OSHA may have different rules regarding being a close contact in the workplace, and those rules apply in the workplace setting.)

      A health care professional who provides treatment to a Person With COVID-19 is not considered a Close Contact as long as the health care professional was wearing appropriate personal protective equipment during the contact as defined by their institution.

   d. *Isolate* and *Isolation*. "Isolation" means to avoid all contact with other people, including by trying to limit contact with other members of the same household, for the limited period described in this Directive while a person is a Person with COVID-19. To "isolate" means to be in Isolation.

   e. *Person With COVID-19*. "Person With COVID-19" means a person who tests positive for the virus that causes COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) or has been clinically diagnosed with COVID-19 by a healthcare provider. A person is no longer considered a Person With

COVID-19 once all of the following occur: (a) at least one (1) day (24 hours) has passed since their last fever (without use of fever-reducing medications), and (b) there has been improvement of other symptoms, and (c) at least five (5) days have passed since symptoms first appeared. A person who tested positive for COVID-19 but never had symptoms is no longer considered a Person With COVID-19 five (5) days after the date of their first positive test.

f. *Quarantine*. "Quarantine" means to avoid all contact with other people, including by trying to limit contact with other members of the same household, for the limited period described in this Directive either immediately after being exposed to COVID-19 due to being a Close Contact.

g. *Up-to-Date on Vaccination*. "Up-to-Date on Vaccination" means (i) two weeks after a person has completed the entire recommended initial series of vaccination (usually one or two doses) with a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization (WHO) (also defined as being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series) and (ii) when the person has received their first Booster vaccine dose once a person is eligible for a Booster. Until a person is eligible for a Booster, they are considered Up-to-Date on Vaccination two weeks after completing their full initial series of vaccination.

h. *Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series*. "Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series" means two weeks after completing the entire recommended initial series of vaccination (usually one or two doses) with a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization (WHO). For example, as of the date of issuance of this Order, an individual has completed an initial vaccination series at least two weeks after receiving a second dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine or two weeks after receiving the single dose Johnson & Johnson's Janssen COVID-19 vaccine. A list of FDA-authorized vaccines is available at www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines. A list of WHO-authorized vaccines is available at https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/vaccines/covid-19-vaccines.

Other terms used in this Directive have the same meaning given to them in Health Officer Order No. C19-07, including as that order may be updated in the future.

2. General Rules and Recommendations Regarding Isolation and Quarantine. At this point in the pandemic, it is still important that we take steps to protect those around us if we are infected with the virus that causes COVID-19 or if we think we might be infected with that virus. CDPH has published recommendations, "Guidance on Isolation and Quarantine for COVID-19 Contact Tracing" (https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-on-Isolation-and-Quarantine-for-COVID-19-Contact-Tracing.aspx). Although the CDPH guidelines are only recommendations, here in the City this Directive makes some of those recommendations a mandated requirement.

HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-02h

In general, the rule is that anyone who has been diagnosed with COVID-19 (through a positive test or medical diagnosis), regardless of vaccination status, **must** isolate using the guidelines listed in the CDPH guidance. Anyone who has COVID-19 symptoms or who is a close contact of someone with COVID-19 is *strongly recommended* to follow the CDPH guidelines, and they **must** isolate if they test positive.

Given that there are a lot of nuances around isolation and quarantine in different settings, this Directive lists the rules and recommendations that apply in specific situations in the City. The table attached to this Directive as **Attachment A** lists the rules or recommendations that apply in each setting. Attachment A is incorporated into this Directive by this reference. If Attachment A is updated in the future, it may be revised and attached to this Directive without any need for further revision or amendment to this Directive. The date at the top of Attachment A lists the date of its revision.

You can find additional guidance on isolation and quarantine at:

sf.gov/information/youve-had-close-contact-or-positive-test (isolation)
sf.gov/quarantining-covid-19 (quarantine)

3. This Directive becomes effective immediately on issuance and will be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer. Also, effective immediately on issuance, this Directive revises and replaces Directive Number 2020-02g, updated April 8, 2022.

4. For purposes of this Directive, any future changes provided online to the CDPH isolation and quarantine guidance documents or any other guidance listed in this Directive are automatically incorporated by this reference.



Susan Philip, MD, MPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

June 6, 2022

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02h

Attachment A – City and County of San Francisco Isolation Rules & Quarantine Recommendations (revised June 6, 2022)

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
General Public	**COVID-19 Infection** (positive PCR or antigen test or medical diagnosis)	**ISOLATION REQUIREMENTS** CDPH isolation recommendations **must** be followed in the City. Isolation is **required** regardless of vaccination status or recent infection. Use these rules: 1) Stay home for at least 5 days after start of symptoms (or after date of first positive test if no symptoms). 2) Isolation can end after day 5 if symptoms are not present or are resolving and a diagnostic specimen (antigen test preferred) collected on Day 5 or later tests negative. 3) If unable to test, choosing not to test, or testing positive on Day 5 (or later), isolation can end after Day 10 if fever-free for 24 hours without the use of fever-reducing medications. 4) If fever is present, isolation must be continued until 24 hours after fever resolves. 5) If symptoms, other than fever, are not resolving, continue to isolate until symptoms are resolving or until after Day 10. 6) Per CDPH masking guidance, infected persons should wear a well-fitting mask around others for a total of 10 days, especially in indoor settings.
	Close Contact without COVID-19 Symptoms	CDPH quarantine recommendations should be followed in the City. Quarantine is *recommended* regardless of vaccination status unless the person had a COVID-19 infection in the prior 90 days (unless symptoms develop). Use these recommendations: 1) Test within 3-5 days after last exposure. 2) Per CDPH masking guidance, close contacts should wear a well-fitting mask around others for a total of 10 days, especially in indoor settings and when near those at higher risk for severe COVID-19 disease. 3) If symptoms develop: a) Test and stay home (see next section on symptomatic persons), AND b) If test result is positive, follow **isolation requirements** above.

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
General Public (continued)	COVID-19 Symptoms without Close Contact	CDPH "self-isolation" recommendations should be followed in the City pending a test. "Self-isolation" is regardless of vaccination status or recent infection. Use these recommendations: 1) Self-isolate and test as soon as possible to determine infection status. Knowing one is infected early during self-isolation enables (a) earlier access to treatment options, if indicated (especially for those that may be at risk for severe illness), and (b) notification of exposed persons (close contacts) who may also benefit by knowing if they are infected. For symptomatic persons who have tested positive within the previous 90 days, using an antigen test is preferred. 2) Remain in self-isolation while waiting for testing results. If not tested, continue isolating for 10 days after the day of symptom onset, and if you cannot isolate, you should wear a well-fitting mask for 10 days. 3) Consider continuing self-isolation and retesting in 1-2 days if testing negative with an antigen test, particularly if tested during the first 1-2 days of symptoms. 4) Continue to self-isolate if test result is positive, follow **isolation requirements** above, and contact your healthcare provider about available treatments if symptoms are severe or you are at high risk for serious disease or if you have any questions concerning your care.

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNFs)	Close Contact without COVID-19 Symptoms -or- COVID-19 Infection (positive PCR or antigen test or medical diagnosis)	Staff: SNF staff are subject to CDPH AFL 21-08 (and any future updates to that AFL) as well as any facility-specific rules. For Close Contact without COVID-19 symptoms: If Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including a Booster once eligible) or after recovery from a COVID-19 infection within the previous 90 days, there is no work restriction for staff if they have a negative diagnostic test (antigen or nucleic acid) upon identification of the exposure and again at 5-7 days after last exposure. For all others (meaning people who are unvaccinated or Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series but without a Booster once eligible, and both without a COVID-19 infection within the previous 90 days), staff quarantine is **required** for at least 7 days, with a negative diagnostic test (antigen or nucleic acid) required upon identification of the exposure and again within 48 hours prior to the return to work. (Refer to the AFL for special rules during critical staffing shortages.) For COVID-19 Infection: If Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including a Booster once eligible), staff is **required** to generally follow the **isolation requirements** above, but isolation can end after 5 days with a negative diagnostic test (antigen preferred) on the same day as return or within 24 hours prior to return to work or can end after 10 days without a test. (Refer to the AFL for special rules during critical staffing shortages.) For all others (meaning people who are unvaccinated or Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series but without a Booster once eligible), staff is **required** to generally follow the **isolation requirements** above, but isolation can end after 7 days with a negative diagnostic test (antigen preferred) on the same day as return or within 24 hours prior to return to work or can end after 10 days without a test. (Refer to the AFL for special rules during critical staffing shortages.) Residents/patients: It is recommended that the facility adhere to CDC Infection Control Guidance and San Francisco DPH Long Term Care Facility Interim Guidance for residents/patients.

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
General Acute Care Hospitals	Close Contact without COVID-19 Symptoms -or- COVID-19 Infection (positive PCR or antigen test or medical diagnosis)	Staff: SNF staff are subject to CDPH AFL 21-08.8 (and any future updates to that AFL) as well as any facility-specific rules. For Close Contact without COVID-19 symptoms: If Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including a Booster once eligible) or after recovery from a COVID-19 infection within the previous 90 days, there is no work restriction for staff if they have a negative diagnostic test (antigen or nucleic acid) upon identification of the exposure and again at 5-7 days after last exposure. For all others (meaning people who are unvaccinated or Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series but without a Booster once eligible, and both without a COVID-19 infection within the previous 90 days), staff quarantine is ***recommended*** for at least 7 days, with a negative diagnostic test (antigen or nucleic acid) required upon identification of the exposure and again within 48 hours prior to the return to work. (Refer to the AFL for special rules during critical staffing shortages.) For COVID-19 Infection: If Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including a Booster once eligible), staff is **required** to generally follow the **isolation requirements** above, but isolation can end after 5 days with a negative diagnostic test (antigen preferred) on the same day as return or within 24 hours prior to return to work or can end after 10 days without a test. (Refer to the AFL for special rules during critical staffing shortages.) For all others (meaning people who are unvaccinated or Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series but without a Booster once eligible), staff is **required** to generally follow the **isolation requirements** above, but isolation can end after 7 days with a negative diagnostic test (antigen preferred) on the same day as return or within 24 hours prior to return to work or can end after 10 days without a test. (Refer to the AFL for special rules during critical staffing shortages.) Residents/patients: It is recommended that the facility adhere to CDC Infection Control Guidance for residents/patients.

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
Adult and Senior Care Programs (as defined by Community Care Licensing, such as Adult Residential Facilities (ARFs); Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly (RCFEs); Residential Care Facilities – Continuing Care; Social Rehabilitation Facilities; Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill (RCFCIs))	For staff only: Close Contact without COVID-19 Symptoms -or- COVID-19 Infection (positive PCR or antigen test or medical diagnosis)	Staff: ASC program staff are subject to CCL PIN 22-09-ASC (and any future updates to that PIN) as well as any facility-specific rules. For Close Contact without COVID-19 symptoms: If Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including a Booster once eligible), there is no work restriction for staff if they have a negative diagnostic test (antigen or nucleic acid) upon identification of the exposure and again at 5-7 days after last exposure. For all others (meaning people who are unvaccinated or Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series but without a Booster once eligible), staff quarantine is **required** for at least 7 days, with a negative diagnostic test (antigen or nucleic acid) required upon identification of the exposure and again within 48 hours prior to the return to work. (Refer to the PIN for special rules during critical staffing shortages.) For COVID-19 Infection: If Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including a Booster once eligible), staff is **required** to generally follow the **isolation requirements** above, subject to these additional requirements: Isolation can end after 5 days with a negative diagnostic test (antigen preferred) on the same day as return or within 24 hours prior to return to work or can end after 10 days without a test. Isolation must last for 20 days if the staff member had severe symptoms or is immunocompromised, using a test-based strategy (see PIN for details). If unable to test prior to return, then staff may provide direct care only for persons in care with confirmed COVID-19 infection, preferably in a cohort setting. Staff must wear an N95 respirator for source control at all times within the facility and wear a mask in public until the isolation period has been completed. (Refer to the PIN for special rules during critical staffing shortages.) For all others (meaning people who are unvaccinated or Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series but without a Booster once eligible), staff is **required** to generally follow the **isolation requirements** above, subject to these additional requirements:

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
Adult and Senior Care Programs (continued)		Isolation can end after 7 days with a negative diagnostic test (antigen preferred) on the same day as return or within 24 hours prior to return to work or can end after 10 days without a test. Isolation must last for 20 days if the staff member had severe symptoms or is immunocompromised, using a test-based strategy (see PIN for details). If unable to test prior to return, then staff may provide direct care only for persons in care with confirmed COVID-19 infection, preferably in a cohort setting. Staff must wear an N95 respirator for source control at all times within the facility and wear a mask in public until the isolation period has been completed. (Refer to the PIN for special rules during critical staffing shortages.)
	In relation to residents only	The rules are complex. Please see the following Community Care Licensing Division PIN for the rules, including Appendix A (isolation) and Appendix B (quarantine): PIN 22-15-ASC - Resident Cohorting, Isolation and Quarantine, Staffing, and Use of Personal Protective Equipment Based on Resident Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Status

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
Shelters	Close Contact (Note: if staff/residents have a COVID-19 Infection (positive PCR or antigen test or medical diagnosis), follow the isolation requirements above.)	Staff/clients/people experiencing homelessness: If Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or had a COVID-19 in the prior 90 days, quarantine is not required if no symptoms are present (subject to facility rules). If not Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or no COVID-19 infection in the prior 90 days, quarantine is ***recommended*** following these rules: 1) Quarantine for at least 5 days after last exposure. 2) Quarantine can end after Day 5 if symptoms are not present and a diagnostic specimen collected on Day 5 or later tests negative. 3) If unable to test or choosing not to test, and symptoms are not present, quarantine can end after day 10. 4) Comply with CDPH masking guidance (i.e., universal masking and, in some cases, where surgical masks or higher filtration respirators may be required). 5) Strongly encouraged to get vaccinated or boosted. 6) If symptoms develop: a) stay home (or isolate) and test as soon as possible; AND b) if test result is positive, follow **isolation requirements** above.

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02h

Attachment A – City and County of San Francisco Isolation Rules & Quarantine Recommendations (revised June 6, 2022)

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
Jails/ Correctional Settings	Close Contact (Note: if staff/residents have a COVID-19 Infection (positive PCR or antigen test or medical diagnosis), follow the isolation requirements above.)	Staff/residents: If Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including a Booster once eligible) or had a COVID-19 in the prior 90 days, quarantine is not required if no symptoms are present (subject to facility rules). If not Up-to-Date on Vaccination (meaning not Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or no Booster once eligible) or no COVID-19 infection in the prior 90 days, quarantine is **required** following these rules: 1) Quarantine for at least 5 days after last exposure. 2) Quarantine can end after Day 5 if symptoms are not present and a diagnostic specimen collected on Day 5 or later tests negative. 3) If unable to test or choosing not to test, and symptoms are not present, quarantine can end after day 10. 4) Comply with CDPH masking guidance (i.e., universal masking and, in some cases, where surgical masks or higher filtration respirators may be required). 5) Strongly encouraged to get vaccinated or boosted. 6) If symptoms develop: a) stay home (or isolate) and test as soon as possible; AND b) if test result is positive, follow **isolation requirements** above.

Setting*	Situation	Rules or Recommendations
Other Healthcare Settings (staff only) **Other Residential Living Facilities** (staff and residents)	Close Contact (Note: if staff/residents have a COVID-19 Infection (positive PCR or antigen test or medical diagnosis), follow the isolation requirements above.)	Staff/residents: If Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or had a COVID-19 in the prior 90 days, quarantine is not required if no symptoms are present (subject to facility rules). If not Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or no COVID-19 infection in the prior 90 days, quarantine is *recommended* following these rules: 1) Quarantine for at least 5 days after last exposure. 2) Quarantine can end after Day 5 if symptoms are not present and a diagnostic specimen collected on Day 5 or later tests negative. 3) If unable to test or choosing not to test, and symptoms are not present, quarantine can end after day 10. 4) Comply with CDPH masking guidance (i.e., universal masking and, in some cases, where surgical masks or higher filtration respirators may be required). 5) Strongly encouraged to get vaccinated or boosted. 6) If symptoms develop: a) stay home (or isolate) and test as soon as possible; AND b) if test result is positive, follow **isolation requirements** above.

* Note that in some workplaces, employers are subject to the Cal/OSHA Aerosol Transmissible Diseases (ATD) Standard and should consult those regulations for additional applicable requirements.

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-03g

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING ALL INDIVIDUALS DIAGNOSED WITH OR LIKELY TO HAVE COVID-19 TO SELF-ISOLATE

(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY ISOLATION DIRECTIVE)

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: June 6, 2022

The Health Officer has combined the isolation and quarantine directives into Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02h, including as that directive is updated in the future. For the isolation rules and guidance, refer to that combined directive, available online at www.sfdph.org/directives.

This revision and consolidation with Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02h, including as that directive is updated in the future, is effective immediately on issuance and will be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer. Also, effective immediately on issuance, this Directive revises and replaces Directive Number 2020-03f, updated April 8, 2022.

Susan Philip, MD, MPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

June 6, 2022

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ENCOURAGING COVID-19 VACCINE COVERAGE AND REDUCING DISEASE RISKS (Safer Return Together)

DATE OF ORDER: June 11, 2021, updated July 8, 2021, July 20, 2021, August 2, 2021, August 12, 2021, August 24, 2021, September 10, 2021, October 13, 2021, December 14, 2021, December 29, 2021, January 10, 2022, January 26, 2022, February 14, 2022, March 2, 2022, March 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and April 21, 2022

Please read this Order carefully. Violation of or failure to comply with this Order is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. (California Health and Safety Code § 120295, *et seq.*; California Penal Code §§ 69, 148(a)(1); and San Francisco Administrative Code § 7.17(b).)

Summary: As of April 21, 2022, this Order replaces the prior update of this health order, Health Officer Order No. C19-07y (issued March 31, 2022), in its entirety. The only change made by the April 21, 2022 update is to change the indoor masking rules related to public transportation and transportation hubs, changing them from a mandate to a strong recommendation, subject to any future state or federal masking mandates.

The Health Officer is updating the Order in light of the recent changes to State guidelines and the lower number of cases and hospitalizations in the community associated with the spread in San Francisco and the Bay Area region of SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. There remains the ongoing threat that the virus, including other future variants or subvariants, pose particularly to the health of medically vulnerable residents. But, based on current scientific knowledge, San Francisco is well positioned to address future increases in cases due in large part to the high rate of vaccination in the community, greater availability of effective treatments for those who are vulnerable to severe disease, and effective use of mitigation strategies, such as masking in indoor public settings when there are high levels of community transmission. The best pathway for San Francisco to continue to move forward in the face of the virus is for as many people as possible to complete their initial series of vaccination and receive their boosters when eligible. Medical data to date show that individuals who have received a booster shot increase their immunity to a level that confers significantly more protection from all circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants, including the Omicron variant and BA.2 subvariant, compared to completing just the initial vaccine series, and generally prevents severe disease. The United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the California Department of Public Health recommend that everyone who has been vaccinated receive a booster shot as soon as they are eligible because immunity wanes several months after completion of the initial vaccine series. In the future, the Health Officer may need to adjust health precautions depending on the specific characteristics of future variants, and

if so, the Health Officer will continue to use the least restrictive health measures to prevent severe disease on a population level basis in the community.

Even though a high percentage of people are vaccinated in San Francisco and the Bay Area region and a significant percentage are boosted against the virus that causes COVID-19, there remains a risk that people may come into contact with others who have COVID-19 when outside their residence, particularly during periods of high community transmission. Many COVID-19 infections are caused by people who have no symptoms of illness. Also, there are people in San Francisco who have not completed their initial vaccine series or who are not yet boosted or eligible to receive a Booster, including children under five years old, and people who are immuno-compromised and may be particularly vulnerable to infection and disease.

Based on current health conditions and balancing those considerations with acknowledgement that there remains ongoing risk to vulnerable populations and the potential for future surges, this Order transitions face covering guidelines to an individual risk-focused approach. In this Order the Health Officer recommends that individuals wear a Well-Fitted Mask in indoor public settings based on three factors. First, you should consider your own risk tolerance. Second, you should consider the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur (*e.g.*, the higher the rate of community transmission, the more seriously you should consider wearing a mask in indoor public settings). Third, you should consider whether you or someone with whom you work or live is at risk of severe disease.

At the same time, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask is still required under federal and state health rules in certain settings, including: in emergency shelters and cooling centers; in healthcare settings; in state and local correctional facilities and detention centers; in homeless shelters; and in long term care settings and adult and senior care facilities. A copy of the current CDPH masking order is available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/guidance-for-face-coverings.aspx. Consistent with changes by the State of California on April 20, 2022, (and subject to any future state or federal masking mandates), the Health Officer now strongly recommends, but does not require, that all people, regardless of vaccination status, wear a Well-Fitted Mask on public transportation and in indoor public transportation facilities.

This Order maintains the requirement, layered on top of the recently revised CDPH health orders, for (1) Personnel working in designated High-Risk Settings—meaning general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, homeless shelters, and jails, all as further defined below—as well as (2) Personnel working in other higher-risk settings—including adult care facilities, adult day programs, dental offices, home health care workers, and pharmacists, and (3) Personnel who routinely visit hospitals as part of their work and are part of the City's first responder medical care system, such as firefighters, paramedics and emergency medical technicians—to both receive the full initial course of vaccination and, once they are eligible, to receive a Booster. But, based on changed health conditions

including the ebbing of the previous Omicron surge, the lower number of cases and hospitalizations in the community, high levels of vaccination, availability of effective treatments, and reduced outbreak risk as determined by federal, state, and local public health officials, Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to High-Risk Settings but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings on an intermittent or occasional basis or for short periods of time (such as police and lawyers who visit people in the jails) are no longer required to receive a Booster, but are strongly encouraged to do so. And, firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs now have until June 30, 2022 to receive a Booster. Additionally, Personnel at homeless shelters (other than congregate living health facilities) are no longer required to receive a Booster, but are strongly encouraged to do so.

On March 17, 2022, the State of California announced that beginning on April 1, 2022, it will no longer require that people attending Indoor Mega-Events (*i.e.*, events with 1,000 or more attendees) provide proof of vaccination or negative testing to gain entry. Instead, the State will strongly recommend that venues hosting Indoor Mega-Events continue to impose that requirement. This Order aligns with the change in State rules for Indoor Mega-Events.

And this Order maintains other minimum COVID-19 safety requirements on businesses and governmental entities, such as a general requirement to report outbreaks in the workplace.

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORDERS:

1. Definitions.

   For purposes of this Order, the following initially capitalized terms have the meanings given below.

   a. *Booster*. A "Booster" means an additional dose of a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization (WHO), for which a person is Booster-Eligible. Consistent with CDC and CDPH guidance, either the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine is preferred for the Booster.

   b. *Booster-Eligible*. A person is "Booster-Eligible" once they meet criteria to receive a Booster under CDC guidance. For example, as of the date of issuance of this update to the Order, individuals who are 18 or older may receive a booster of the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty), Moderna (Spikevax), or Johnson & Johnson's Janssen COVID-19 vaccine at least five months after receiving a second dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine or two months after receiving the single dose Johnson & Johnson's Janssen COVID-19 vaccine, and

adolescents who are 12 to 17 years old may receive a booster of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine at least five months after their second dose of that vaccine. Consistent with CDC guidance (available online at www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/booster-shot.html), anyone who received a WHO-authorized vaccine or a combination of vaccines should receive the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) vaccine as their booster pursuant to the timing listing in that guidance. Those preferences apply to all initial vaccination series, regardless of which vaccine an individual received. The CDC has been frequently updating booster eligibility. More up-to-date information on booster eligibility may be found online at www.sfcdcp.org/boosters, and individuals, Businesses, and governmental entities are urged to stay informed about changes.

c. *Business*. A "Business" includes any for-profit, non-profit, or educational entity, whether a corporate entity, organization, partnership or sole proprietorship, and regardless of the nature of the service, the function it performs, or its corporate or entity structure.

d. *Cal/OSHA*. "Cal/OSHA" means the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health, better known as Cal/OSHA.

e. *CDC*. "CDC" means the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

f. *CDPH*. "CDPH" means the California Department of Public Health.

g. *Close Contact*. "Close Contact" means being within six feet of a Person With COVID-19 for a total of 15 minutes or more in a 24-hour period while the person is contagious. In turn, a "Person With COVID-19" means a person who tests positive for the virus that causes COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) or has been clinically diagnosed with COVID-19 by a healthcare provider. A person is no longer considered a Person With COVID-19 once all of the following occur: (a) at least one day (*i.e.*, 24 hours) has passed since their last fever (without use of fever-reducing medications), and (b) there has been improvement of other symptoms, and (c) at least five days have passed since symptoms first appeared. A person who tested positive for COVID-19 but never had symptoms is no longer considered a Person With COVID-19 five days after the date of their first positive test. The person is considered contagious if they *either* (i) had symptoms, from 48 hours before their symptoms began until at least five days after the start of symptoms, *or* (ii) did not have symptoms but learned they were COVID-19 positive from a test, from 48 hours before their COVID-19 test was collected until five days after they were tested.

h. *County*. The "County" means the City and County of San Francisco.

i. *COVID-19*. "COVID-19" means coronavirus disease 2019, the disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus and that resulted in a global pandemic.

j. *DPH*. "DPH" means the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

k. *DPH Core Guidance*. "DPH Core Guidance" means the webpage and related materials titled *Core Guidance for COVID-19* that DPH regularly updates and includes health and safety recommendations for individuals and Businesses as well as web links to additional resources, available online at sf.gov/information/core-guidance-covid-19.

l. *Face Covering Requirements*. "Face Covering Requirements" means the limited requirements to wear a Well-Fitted Mask (i) under federal or state law including, but not limited to, California Department of Public Health guidance and Cal/OSHA's regulations; (ii) in indoor common areas of homeless shelters, emergency shelters, and cooling centers, except while sleeping, showering, engaged in personal hygiene that requires removal of face coverings, or actively eating or drinking; (iii) in indoor common areas of jails except while sleeping, showering, engaged in personal hygiene that requires removal of face coverings, or actively eating or drinking; and (iv) under Section 3(b), below and Appendix A, attached to the Order. If a separate state, local, or federal order or directive imposes different face covering requirements, including requirements to wear respirators or surgical masks in certain settings, the more health protective requirement applies.

m. *FDA*. "FDA" means the United States Food and Drug Administration.

n. *Fully Vaccinated*. "Fully Vaccinated" has the same meaning as the newer term "Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series," defined below. Because other pre-existing Health Officer orders and directives and other DPH or County guidance materials may still use the term Fully Vaccinated that term continues to be defined in this Order.

o. *Health Officer*. "Health Officer" means the Health Officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

p. *High-Risk Settings*. "High-Risk Settings" means certain care or living settings involving many people, including many congregate settings, where vulnerable populations reside out of necessity and where the risk of COVID-19 transmission is high, consisting of general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities (including subacute facilities), intermediate care facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, homeless shelters, and jails (including, but not limited to, the Juvenile Justice Center Juvenile Hall).

q. *Household*. "Household" means people living in a single Residence or shared living unit. Households do not refer to individuals who live together in an institutional group living situation such as in a dormitory, fraternity, sorority, monastery, convent, or residential care facility.

r. *Mega-Event*. "Mega-Event" means an event with either more than 1,000 people attending indoors or more than 10,000 people attending outdoors. As provided in the State's Post-Blueprint Guidance, a Mega-Event may have either assigned or

unassigned seating, and may be either general admission or gated, ticketed and permitted events.

s. *Personnel*. "Personnel" means the following people who provide goods or services associated with a Business in the County: employees; contractors and sub-contractors (such as those who sell goods or perform services onsite or who deliver goods for the Business); independent contractors; vendors who are permitted to sell goods onsite; volunteers; and other individuals who regularly provide services onsite at the request of the Business. "Personnel" includes "gig workers" who perform work via the Business's app or other online interface, if any.

t. *Qualifying Medical Reason*. "Qualifying Medical Reason" means a medical condition or disability recognized by the FDA or CDC as a contra-indication to COVID-19 vaccination.

u. *Religious Beliefs*. "Religious Beliefs" means a sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance protected by state or federal law.

v. *Residence*. "Residence" means the location a person lives, even if temporarily, and includes single-family homes, apartment units, condominium units, hotels, motels, shared rental units, and similar facilities. Residences also include living structures and outdoor spaces associated with those living structures, such as patios, porches, backyards, and front yards that are only accessible to a single family or Household.

w. *Schools*. "Schools" mean public and private schools operating in the County, including independent, parochial, and charter schools.

x. *State's Post-Blueprint Guidance*. The "State's Post-Blueprint Guidance" means the guidance entitled "Beyond the Blueprint for Industry and Business Sectors" that the California Department of Public Health issued on May 21, 2021 and updated as of March 17, 2022, including as the State may further extend, update or supplement that guidance in the future. (See www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx.)

y. *Test* and *Tested*. "Tested" means to have a negative test (a "Test") for the virus that causes COVID-19 within the applicable timeframe as listed in this Order. Both nucleic acid (including polymerase chain reaction (PCR)) and antigen tests are acceptable. The following are acceptable as proof of a negative COVID-19 test result: a printed document (from the test provider or laboratory) or an email, text message, webpage, or application (app) screen displayed on a phone or mobile device from the test provider or laboratory. The information should include person's name, type of test performed, negative test result, and date the test was administered. If any state or federal agency uses a more restrictive definition of what it means to be Tested for specified purposes (such as Cal/OSHA rules for employers in workplaces), then that more restrictive definition controls for those purposes. Some sections of this Order require antigen tests to be third-party verified (meaning administered or

observed by the third-party) to meet requirements for showing proof of a negative Test.

z. *Unvaccinated*. "Unvaccinated" refers to a person age two or older who is eligible for COVID-19 vaccination and who is either (i) not at least Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or (ii) in an indoor setting where this Order requires proof of being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series as a condition of entry but has not provided such proof.

aa. *Up-to-Date on Vaccination*. "Up-to-Date on Vaccination" means when a person both (i) is Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and (ii) has received a Booster once the person is Booster-Eligible. A person is Up-to-Date on Vaccination immediately on receipt of a Booster. Until a person is Booster-Eligible, they are considered Up-to-Date on Vaccination two weeks after completing their full initial series of vaccination.

bb. *Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series*. "Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series" means two weeks after completing the entire recommended initial series of vaccination (usually one or two doses) with a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization (WHO). For example, as of the date of issuance of this Order, an individual has completed an initial vaccination series at least two weeks after receiving a second dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine or two weeks after receiving the single dose Johnson & Johnson's Janssen COVID-19 vaccine. A list of FDA-authorized vaccines is available at www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines. A list of WHO-authorized vaccines is available at https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/vaccines/covid-19-vaccines. On August 23, 2021, the FDA granted full approval for the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) vaccine for people age 16 and older, and on January 31, 2022, the FDA granted full approval for the Moderna (Spikevax) vaccine for people age 18 and older. And, on October 29, 2021, the FDA granted emergency use authorization for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine for children age five to 11.

Unless otherwise specified, the following are acceptable as proof of being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination: (i) the CDC vaccination card, which includes name of person vaccinated, type of vaccine provided, and date last dose administered, or similar documentation issued by another foreign governmental jurisdiction, (ii) a photo of a vaccination card as a separate document, (iii) a photo of the a vaccination card stored on a phone or electronic device, (iv) documentation of vaccination from a healthcare provider, (v) unless prohibited elsewhere in this Order in a specific context, written self-attestation of vaccination signed (including an electronic signature) under penalty of perjury and containing the name of the person vaccinated, type of vaccine taken, and date of last dose administered, or (vi) a personal digital COVID-19 vaccine record issued by the State of California and available by going to https://myvaccinerecord.cdph.ca.gov or

similar documentation issued by another State, local, or foreign governmental jurisdiction, or by an approved private company (a list of approved companies offering digital vaccine verification is available at www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/files/vaccine-verification-sites.asp). If any state or federal agency uses a more restrictive definition of what it means to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or to prove that status for specified purposes (such as Cal/OSHA rules for employers in workplaces), then that more restrictive definition controls for those purposes. Also, to the extent Cal/OSHA approves an alternate means of documenting whether an employee has completed the full initial series or is "fully vaccinated," even if less restrictive than the definition contained here, employers may use the Cal/OSHA standard to document their employees' vaccination status.

cc. *Ventilation Guidelines*. "Ventilation Guidelines" means ventilation guidance from recognized authorities such as the CDC, the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, or the State of California (available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-Guidance-for-Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx), including Cal/OSHA.

dd. *Well-Fitted Mask*. A "Well-Fitted Mask" means a face covering that is well-fitted to an individual and covers the nose and mouth especially while talking, consistent with the Face Covering Requirements. CDC guidance regarding Well-Fitted Masks may be found at www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/effective-masks.html. A well-fitting non-vented N95, KN95, or KF94 respirator is strongly recommended as a Well-Fitted Mask, even if not fit-tested, to provide maximum protection. A well-fitting surgical/procedural mask with a cloth mask worn over it to increase fit is also recommended. Given higher transmissibility of the Omicron variant, cloth masks alone are no longer recommended. A Well-Fitted Mask does not include a scarf, ski mask, balaclava, bandana, turtleneck, collar, or single layer of fabric or any mask that has an unfiltered one-way exhaust valve.

2. Purpose and Intent.

a. Purpose. The public health threat of serious illness or death from COVID-19 is much lower in the County and the Bay Area than many parts of the State and country due to the high rate of vaccination of the community. But COVID-19 continues to pose a risk especially to individuals who are not eligible to be vaccinated or are not yet Up-to-Date on Vaccination, and certain safety measures continue to be necessary or strongly recommended to protect against COVID-19 cases and deaths. Being Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receiving a Booster as soon as Booster-Eligible, is the most effective method to prevent transmission and ultimately COVID-19 hospitalizations and deaths. It is important to ensure that as many eligible people as possible are vaccinated against COVID-19. Further, it is critical to ensure there is continued reporting of cases to protect individuals and the larger community. Accordingly, this Order allows Businesses, schools, and other activities to resume

fully while at the same time putting in place certain requirements or recommendations designed to (1) extend vaccine coverage to the greatest extent possible; (2) limit transmission risk of COVID-19; (3) contain any COVID-19 outbreaks; and (4) generally align with guidance issued by the CDC and the State relating to COVID-19 except in limited instances where local conditions require more restrictive measures. This Order is based on evidence of continued community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 within the County as well as scientific evidence and best practices to prevent transmission of COVID-19. The Health Officer will continue to monitor data regarding the evolving scientific understanding of the risks posed by COVID-19, including the impact of vaccination, and may amend or rescind this Order based on analysis of that data and knowledge. It is possible that the Health Officer will determine in the future that prior health precautions that have been relaxed or removed need to be imposed again, based on changes in local health conditions and the course of the pandemic.

b. Intent. The primary intent of this Order is to continue to protect the community from COVID-19, including by providing health recommendations as requirements are lifted, and to also increase vaccination rates to reduce transmission of COVID-19 long-term, so that the whole community is safer and the COVID-19 health emergency can come to an end.

c. Interpretation. All provisions of this Order must be interpreted to effectuate the purposes and intent of this Order as described above. The note and summary at the beginning of this Order as well as the headings and subheadings of sections contained in this Order are for convenience only and may not be used to interpret this Order. In the event of any inconsistency between the summary, headings, or subheadings and the text of this Order, the text will control. Certain initially capitalized terms used in this Order have the meanings given them in Section 1 above. The interpretation of this Order in relation to the health orders or guidance of the State is described in Section 10 below.

d. Application. This Order applies to all individuals, Businesses, and other entities in the County. For clarity, the requirements of this Order apply to all individuals who do not currently reside in the County when they are in the County. Governmental entities must follow the requirements of this Order that apply to Businesses, unless otherwise specifically provided in this Order or directed by the Health Officer.

e. DPH Core Guidance. All individuals and Businesses are strongly urged to follow the DPH Core Guidance (available online at sf.gov/information/core-guidance-covid-19) containing health and safety recommendations for COVID-19.

f. Effect of Failure to Comply. Failure to comply with any of the provisions of this Order constitutes an imminent threat and menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both, as further provided in Section 12 below.

3. General Requirements for Individuals.

a. Vaccination. Individuals are strongly urged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, meaning, as further provided in Section 1, that they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and, as soon as they are Booster-Eligible, receive their Booster. In particular, people at risk for severe illness with COVID-19—such as unvaccinated older adults and unvaccinated individuals with health risks—and members of their Household, are urged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receiving a Booster, as soon as they can. Information about who is at increased risk of severe illness and people who need to take extra precautions can be found at www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-with-medical-conditions.html. For those who are not yet Up-to-Date on Vaccination, making informed choices about the risk of different activities, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask indoors, testing before gathering indoors, or choosing outdoor activities as much as possible are also ways to prevent the risk of COVID-19 transmission. Individuals who are Up-to-Date on Vaccination have the best protection against COVID-19.

b. Face Coverings. Everyone, and especially those who remain Unvaccinated, is recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in the following situations:

- When an individual wants added protection based on individual risk tolerance, for example, when indoors with people whose vaccination status is unknown. People should respect an individual's decision to wear face coverings even in settings where they are not required, and no Business or other person should take an adverse action against individuals who chose to wear a face covering to protect their health.

- When there is a higher risk of community spread and infection, such as during surges caused by future variants.

- When an individual, or someone with whom an individual lives or works, is at a higher risk of a negative health outcome, such as older and immuno-compromised individuals.

i. Masks Required or Strongly Recommended in Certain Settings. Everyone is required to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, regardless of vaccination status, in the following indoor settings: High-Risk Settings; health care and other long-term care facilities where masking is required by regulatory orders and rules; and anywhere else that federal or state health orders require doing so. In addition, and subject to any future state or federal masking mandates, everyone, regardless of vaccination status, is strongly recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when riding or waiting inside to ride on public transit, including everyone who is inside the vehicle or other mode of transportation or is indoors at a public transit stop or station. This strong recommendation extends to all modes of transportation other than private vehicles, such as

airplanes, trains, subways, buses, taxis, ride-shares, maritime transportation, street cars, and cable cars.

Appendix A lists exceptions and allowances in such settings when a Well-Fitted Mask is not required. Face covering requirements in Schools and Programs for Children and Youth are covered in Health Officer Directive Nos. 2020-33 and 2020-14, respectively, including as those directives are further updated in the future. And, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask is strongly recommended for those in isolation or quarantine.

ii. Fit and Filtration Guidance. When wearing a mask, everyone should consistently wear the best mask they can obtain, considering fit and filtration (and without using a one-way exhalation valve that is not filtered). As provided in the definition of a Well-Fitted Mask, a well-fitting non-vented N95, KN95, or KF94 respirator is strongly recommended. A well-fitting surgical/procedural mask with a cloth mask worn over it to increase fit is also recommended. More information about fit and filtration and the best mask options is available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Get-the-Most-out-of-Masking.aspx.

c. Monitor for Symptoms. Individuals should monitor themselves for symptoms of COVID-19. A list of COVID-19 symptoms is available online at www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html. Anyone with any symptom that is new or not explained by another condition must comply with subsections 3(d) and 3(e) below regarding isolation and quarantine.

d. Isolation. Anyone who has or likely has COVID-19, meaning that person (i) has a positive COVID-19 test result, (ii) is diagnosed with COVID-19, or (iii) has a COVID-19 symptom that is new or not explained by another condition, must refer to the latest COVID-19 isolation health directive issued by the Health Officer (available online at www.sfdph.org/directives) and follow the requirements detailed there. There are special requirements for healthcare workers and emergency medical services personnel in healthcare settings.

e. Quarantine. Anyone who had Close Contact must refer to the latest COVID-19 quarantine health directive issued by the Health Officer (available online at www.sfdph.org/directives) and follow the requirements detailed there. There are special requirements for healthcare workers and emergency medical services personnel in healthcare settings.

f. Moving to, Traveling to, or Returning to the County. Everyone is strongly encouraged to comply with (1) any State travel advisories (available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Travel-Advisory.aspx) and (2) CDC travel guidelines (available online at www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/travelers/travel-during-covid19.html).

g. Minimum Requirements. Based on their risk preferences, individuals may decide for themselves to take greater safety precautions than required or even recommended under this Order. Also, nothing in this section limits any requirements that apply under this Order to indoor public settings, indoor Mega-Events, or that Cal/OSHA or other State authority may impose on any indoor setting involving gatherings.

4. General Requirements for Businesses and Governmental Entities.

a. Vaccination. Businesses and governmental entities are generally encouraged to require Personnel and patrons to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, meaning they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and have received a Booster when they are Booster-Eligible.

i. Vaccination or Testing Recommendation for Certain Indoor Businesses. The following Businesses are strongly encouraged (though not mandated) to require patrons and staff to provide either proof of being Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including receipt of a Booster once Booster-Eligible) or proof of a negative Test before entry or service:

- Operators or hosts of establishments or events where food or drink is served indoors—including, but not limited to, dining establishments, bars, clubs, theaters, and entertainment venues.

- Gyms, recreation facilities, yoga studios, dance studios, and other fitness establishments, where any patrons engage in cardiovascular, aerobic, strength training, or other exercise involving elevated breathing.

- Operators and hosts of indoor and outdoor Mega-Events, as set forth in Section 7 below.

b. Masking.

i. Mask Requirements and Allowances. Businesses and governmental entities must follow the requirements for masking listed in this Order and Appendix A to this Order and may, but are not required by this Order, to require masks be worn indoors.

ii. Providing a Well-Fitted Mask. Businesses and other entities subject to this Order are encouraged to provide a Well-Fitted Mask at no cost to people (patrons and Personnel) who do not have one upon entry inside the facility.

iii. Cal/OSHA Requirements. Businesses and other entities should also follow any additional Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace, including regarding masking, and more information can be found online at www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html. Nothing in this Order is

intended to reduce any of those requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an individual's own choices to take more health protective measures.

c. Personnel Health Screening. Businesses and governmental entities should develop and implement a process for screening Personnel for COVID-19 symptoms, but this requirement does not mean they must perform on-site screening of Personnel. Businesses and governmental entities should ask Personnel to evaluate their own symptoms before reporting to work. If Personnel have symptoms consistent with COVID-19, they should follow subsections 3(d) and 3(e) above. Businesses and governmental entities may be required to conduct such screenings for Personnel under Cal/OSHA's regulations. Businesses and other entities must adhere to applicable Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace and should frequently check for updates to those regulations such as by checking online at www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html.

d. Businesses Must Allow Personnel to Stay Home When Sick. Businesses are required to follow Cal/OSHA regulations allowing Personnel to stay home where they have symptoms associated with COVID-19 that are new or not explained by another condition or if they have been diagnosed with COVID-19 (by a test or a clinician) even if they have no symptoms, and to not to have those Personnel return to work until they have satisfied certain conditions, all as further set forth in the Cal/OSHA rules. Also, Businesses must comply with California Senate Bill 114 (Labor Code, sections 248.6 and 248.7), which provides that employers with more than 25 employees must give every employee up to 80 hours of COVID-related sick leave retroactive to January 1, 2022 and through September 30, 2022 (pro-rated for less than full time employees), including that employees may use this paid sick leave to get vaccinated or for post-vaccination illness. Each Business is prohibited from taking any adverse action against any Personnel for staying home in any of the circumstances described in this subsection.

e. Signage. All Businesses and governmental entities are encouraged to conspicuously post signage reminding individuals of the following COVID-19 prevention best practices to reduce transmission:

Get vaccinated and boosted;

Stay home if sick;

Wear a mask indoors if you are unvaccinated; and

Clean your hands.

Businesses and governmental entities are also encouraged to include in signage any custom requirements the business or entity requires of its patrons or Personnel regarding testing, vaccination, and masking. Sample signage is available online at https://sf.gov/outreach-toolkit-coronavirus-covid-19.

f. Ventilation Guidelines. All Businesses and governmental entities with indoor operations are urged to review the Ventilation Guidelines and implement ventilation strategies for indoor operations as feasible. Nothing in this subsection limits any ventilation requirements that apply to particular settings under federal, state, or local law.

g. Mandatory Reporting by Businesses and Governmental Entities. Consistent with Cal/OSHA regulations, Businesses and governmental entities must require that all Personnel immediately alert the Business or governmental entity if they test positive for COVID-19 and were present in the workplace either (1) within 48 hours before onset of symptoms or within 10 days after onset of symptoms if they were symptomatic; or (2) within 48 hours before the date on which they were tested or within 10 days after the date on which they were tested if they were asymptomatic. If a Business or governmental entity is concerned about a workplace outbreak among Personnel, it may get additional information www.sfcdcp.org/covid19-positive-workplace. Businesses and governmental entities must also comply with all case investigation and contact tracing measures directed by DPH including providing any information requested within the timeframe provided by DPH, instructing Personnel to follow isolation and quarantine protocols specified by CDPH and Cal/OSHA and any additional protocols specified by DPH, and excluding positive cases and unvaccinated close contacts from the workplace during these isolation and quarantine periods.

   Schools and Programs for Children and Youth are subject to separate reporting requirements set forth in Health Officer Directive Nos. 2020-33 and 2020-14, respectively, including as those directives are further updated in the future.

h. Compliance with CDPH Vaccination Status Order's Mask Requirements. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in Acute Health Care Settings, Long-Term Care Settings, High-Risk Congregate Settings, and Other Health Care Settings—as those terms are defined in the CDPH Vaccination Status Order, available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Unvaccinated-Workers-In-High-Risk-Settings.aspx—must provide appropriate face coverings as required by the CDPH Vaccination Status Order.

i. Minimum Requirements; Ability to Adopt More-Restrictive Measures. This Order establishes the minimum requirements related to COVID-19 protections. Nothing in this Order is intended to reduce any other federal, state, or local legal requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an individual Business' or governmental entity's choices to take more health protective measures. Businesses or governmental entities may impose further restrictions that are more protective of public health than the minimum requirements or recommendations under this Order, including requiring patrons or Personnel to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination, requiring them to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, requiring them to have a negative Test, or taking

other more restrictive measures that are more protective of public health and meet their operational needs.

5. Schools and Programs for Children and Youth

   a. Schools. Largely because many children are not yet Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or eligible for a Booster, schools must follow the health and safety requirements set forth in Health Officer Directive No. 2020-33, including as it may be amended in the future, to ensure the safety of all students and Personnel at the school site. All children who are Booster-Eligible (including under an emergency use authorization) are strongly urged to receive a Booster as soon as possible. Also, adult Personnel in TK-12 schools, including educators, aides, administrators, and other staff, are strongly encouraged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination.

   b. Programs for Children and Youth. Largely because some children are not eligible to be vaccinated against COVID-19 at this time and many children are not yet Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or eligible for a Booster, the following Programs for Children and Youth must operate in compliance with the health and safety requirements set forth in Health Officer Directive No. 2020-14, including as it may be amended in the future: (1) group care facilities for children who are not yet in elementary school—including, for example, licensed childcare centers, daycares, family daycares, and preschools (including cooperative preschools); and (2) with the exception of schools, which are addressed in subsection (a) above, educational or recreational institutions or programs that provide care or supervision for school-aged children and youth—including for example, learning hubs, other programs that support and supplement distance learning in schools, school-aged childcare programs, youth sports programs, summer camps, and afterschool programs.

   c. Mega-Events. Operators or hosts of events held at schools or under Programs for Children and Youth that meet the definition of a Mega-Event are strongly recommended to comply with the State's Post-Blueprint Guidance concerning Mega Events.

6. Vaccination Requirements for Personnel in High-Risk Settings and Other Health Care Personnel.

   a. High-Risk Settings. Except for some Personnel as provided in subsections (a)(iii), (b), and (c) below, and for Personnel exempt under subsection (d) below, all of the following requirements apply in High-Risk Settings:

      i. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in High-Risk Settings must:

         1. As of September 30, 2021, ascertain vaccination status of all Personnel in High-Risk Settings who routinely work onsite;

2. As of September 30, 2021, ensure that before entering or working in any High-Risk Setting, all Personnel who routinely work onsite have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below; and

3. As of March 1, 2022, ensure that all such Personnel who routinely work onsite, within 15 days of being Booster-Eligible, receive a Booster. And for the period between when such Personnel are Booster-Eligible but have not yet received one and when they become Up-to-Date on Vaccination (meaning one week after receipt of a Booster), the operator of the High-Risk Setting must ensure that each such person comply with the public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below regarding testing even though they have already received their full initial course of vaccination. For clarity, those who are Booster-Eligible on or before February 14, 2022 must have received their Booster by March 1, 2022, and those who are Booster-Eligible after February 14, 2022 must receive it within 15 days after they become eligible.

   And consistent with updated CDPH "Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement" guidance (linked below in Section 6(b)), such Personnel who provide proof of COVID-19 infection after being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series (a "Recent Pre-Booster Infection") may defer Booster administration under this subsection for up to 90 days from the date of their first positive COVID-19 test or clinical diagnosis, which in some situations may extend the deadline for receipt of a Booster beyond March 1, 2022. Such Personnel who are not eligible for a Booster by March 1, 2022 must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the timeframe specified in this paragraph for receiving the Booster. Personnel with a deferral due to a proven COVID-19 infection must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the expiration of their deferral.

ii. As of September 30, 2021, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings must have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below. As of March 1, 2022, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings must, within 15 days of being Booster-Eligible, receive a Booster. For clarity, those who are Booster-Eligible on or before February 14,

2022 must have received their Booster by March 1, 2022, and those who are Booster-Eligible after February 14, 2022 must receive it within 15 days after they become eligible. Personnel who are required by this subsection 6(a)(ii) to receive a Booster may use the Recent Pre-Booster Infection deferral described above in subsection 6(a)(i)(3) and must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the expiration of the deferral described in that subsection. For clarity, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings and subject to this subsection 6(a)(ii) includes firefighters, paramedics, emergency medical technicians (EMTs), and jail staff subject to CDPH's State and Local Correctional Facilities and Detention Centers Health Care Worker Vaccination Requirement (available at: https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Correctional-Facilities-and-Detention-Centers-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccination-Order.aspx). Notwithstanding the foregoing, Personnel who routinely work onsite at homeless shelters (other than congregate living health facilities) are strongly recommended (but not required) to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination when they are Booster-Eligible.

For purposes only of this subsection (ii), firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs, have until June 30, 2022 to receive a Booster, or if they are not yet eligible before that date, then within 15 days of being Booster-Eligible. Until such firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs receive a Booster, they must be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, free of any COVID-19 symptom, wear a Well-Fitted Mask, and have a negative Test in the manner required by subsection (iv)(1) below, to continue to work in a High-Risk Setting.

iii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to a High-Risk Setting but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings on an intermittent or occasional basis or for short periods of time—including police, other law enforcement, and attorneys who enter jail settings or other High-Risk Settings as part of their work—are required to (1) ascertain vaccination status of all such Personnel and (2) ensure that before entering or working in any High-Risk Setting, all such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series with any vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization, unless exempt under subsection (d) below. Additionally, as of September 29, 2021, all such Personnel must have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below. Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to a High-Risk Setting but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings even on an intermittent or occasional

basis or for short periods of time are strongly recommended (but not required) to receive a Booster when they are Booster-Eligible. For clarity, Personnel subject to this subsection (a)(iii) who have not received their Booster but are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial series are not subject to the health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below, but must follow the Face Covering Requirements and any other applicable federal, state, or local requirements.

iv. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must require any Personnel who routinely work onsite at a High-Risk Setting and are exempt or who are otherwise not Up-to-Date on Vaccination (for clarity, the reference to these Personnel means any person who is Booster-Eligible for but not yet received a Booster) to comply with at least the following public health and safety measures:

1. get Tested for COVID-19 at least once a week—and at least twice a week for Personnel who are in general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, and jails—using either a nucleic acid (including polymerase chain reaction (PCR)) or antigen test; and

2. at all times at the worksite in the High-Risk Setting wear a face covering in compliance with the State Public Health Officer Order of July 26, 2021 ("CDPH Vaccination Status Order"), available at https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Unvaccinated-Workers-In-High-Risk-Settings.aspx.

   Because of the COVID-19 risks to any exempt Personnel who are not Up-to-Date on Vaccination, the High-Risk Setting must provide such Personnel, on request, with a well-fitting non-vented N95 respirator and strongly encourage such Personnel to wear that respirator at all times when working with patients, residents, clients, or incarcerated people.

   Regular testing and masking as required under this Section 6 are not as protective of public health as being Up-to-Date on Vaccination in helping prevent transmission of COVID-19; accordingly, those measures are a minimum safety requirement for exempt Personnel in High-Risk Settings. Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 may require additional safety measures for such Personnel. For example, factors a Business or governmental entity may consider in determining appropriate safety measures for exempt Personnel include, but are not limited to:

   a) Whether the Personnel will place other people at risk of transmission of COVID-19 because they are required to come into contact (including on an emergency basis) with other Personnel or with persons whose vaccination status is unknown, who are not yet eligible

for the vaccine, or who are members of a vulnerable population (*e.g.*, the elderly, incarcerated people, and acute care patients);

b) The type and frequency of testing available to the Personnel and whether the Business or governmental entity has the ability to provide testing to Personnel, without relying on public health resources, and track the requisite testing;

c) Whether the Business or governmental entity can ensure compliance with the mask mandate whenever the Personnel are around other people in the workplace; and

d) Whether the proposed accommodation imposes an undue burden because it is costly, infringes on other Personnel's job rights or benefits, compromises workplace safety, decreases workplace efficiency, or requires other Personnel to do more than their share of potentially hazardous or burdensome work.

Nothing under the Order limits the ability of a Business or governmental entity under applicable law to determine whether they are unable to offer a reasonable accommodation to unvaccinated Personnel with an approved exemption and to exclude such exempt Personnel from a High-Risk Setting.

v. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must, consistent with applicable privacy laws and regulations, maintain records of employee vaccination or exemption status.

vi. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must provide these records to the Health Officer or other public health authorities promptly upon request, and in any event no later than the next business day after receiving the request.

vii. This mandated vaccination schedule allows Businesses, governmental entities, and affected Personnel adequate time to comply with this Order. In the interest of protecting residents of High-Risk Settings, Personnel, and their families, Businesses, governmental entities, and affected Personnel are strongly urged to meet these vaccination requirements as soon as possible.

For clarity, this requirement applies to Personnel in other buildings in a site containing a High-Risk Setting, such as a campus or other similar grouping of related buildings, where such Personnel do any of the following: (i) access the acute care or patient, resident, client, or incarcerated person areas of the High-Risk Setting; or (ii) work in-person with patients, residents, clients, or incarcerated people who visit those areas. All people in San Francisco who work in a clinical setting with a population that is more vulnerable to COVID-19 are strongly urged to be Up-to-Date

on Vaccination, including receiving a Booster as soon as Booster-Eligible.

If a person covered by the requirements of this Section 6 to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination recently had COVID-19 when that person would otherwise have been Booster-Eligible based on the period since becoming Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, then that person should try to obtain the Booster as soon as possible at least 10 days after recovering and ending isolation. But to continue working in the High-Risk Setting that person does not need to receive the Booster until 30 days after recovering from infection and discontinuing isolation, unless a healthcare provider recommends in a note that the Booster be delayed for a longer specified period.

b. CDPH Requirements For Adult Care Facilities, Direct Care Workers, Other Health Care Workers, and Pharmacists. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in certain types of facilities and contexts, including those that provide health care, certain other care services, services in congregate settings, and the Personnel who work in those settings must comply with the following CDPH Orders and All Facilities Letters, including as they are updated in the future, which require Personnel of such Businesses and governmental entities to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receipt of a Booster when Booster-Eligible, unless exempt under those Orders and All Facilities Letters by the deadlines listed in each order or letter:

"Adult Care Facilities and Direct Care Worker Vaccine Requirement", updated February 22, 2022, available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Adult-Care-Facilities-and-Direct-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx

"Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement", updated February 22, 2022, available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx

"Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Testing, Vaccination Verification and Personal Protective Equipment for Health Care Personnel (HCP) at Health Care Facilities" (AFL 21-29.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-29.aspx

"Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Testing, Vaccination Verification and Personal Protective Equipment for Health Care Personnel (HCP) at the Various Types of Intermediate Care Facilities" (AFL 21-30.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-30.aspx

"Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccine Requirement for Healthcare Personnel (HCP)" (AFL 21-34.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-34.aspx.

c. Dental Offices. Personnel who provide healthcare in dental offices are considered to provide care in "Clinics & Doctor Offices (including behavioral health, surgical)" under the following CDPH order and must comply with the requirements in that order: "Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement", updated February 22, 2022, available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx.

d. Limited Exemptions. Personnel covered by this Section 6 may be exempt from the vaccination requirements under this section only upon providing the requesting Business or governmental entity a declination form stating either of the following: (1) the individual is declining vaccination based on Religious Beliefs or (2) the individual is excused from receiving any COVID-19 vaccine due to Qualifying Medical Reasons. A sample ascertainment and declination form is available online at www.sfdph.org/dph/covid-19/files/declination.pdf. As to declinations for Qualifying Medical Reasons, to be eligible for this exemption Personnel must also provide to their employer or the Business a written statement signed by a physician, nurse practitioner, or other licensed medical professional practicing under the license of a physician stating that the individual qualifies for the exemption (but the statement should not describe the underlying medical condition or disability) and indicating the probable duration of the individual's inability to receive the vaccine (or if the duration is unknown or permanent, so indicate). As to declinations based on Religious Beliefs, a Business or governmental entity may seek additional information as allowed or required by applicable law to determine whether Personnel have a qualifying Religious Belief. Personnel who qualify for and are granted by the employing Business or governmental entity an exemption due to Religious Beliefs or Qualifying Medical Reasons, as provided above, must still follow at least the minimum health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv), above. Nothing in this Order is intended to limit any Business's or governmental entity's ability under applicable law to determine whether they are able to offer a reasonable accommodation to Personnel with an approved exemption. Because testing and masking is not as effective as being Up-to-Date on Vaccination at preventing the spread of COVID-19, a Business may determine that the minimum requirements in subsection (a)(iv) above are not sufficient to protect the health and safety of people in High-Risk Settings.

e. Record Keeping Requirements. Businesses or governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must maintain records with following information:

   i. For Personnel who are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, and also for Personnel where being Up-to-Date on Vaccination is required by this Order: (1) full name and date of birth; (2) vaccine manufacturer; and (3) date of vaccine administration (for first dose and, if applicable, all subsequent doses required by this Order). Nothing in this subsection is intended to prevent an employer from requesting additional information or documentation to verify vaccination status, to the extent permissible under the law.

ii. For unvaccinated Personnel: signed declination forms with written health care provider's statement where applicable, as described in subsection (d) above.

f. Compliance with CDPH Orders. In addition to the requirements set forth above:

i. Until any more health protective requirements in this section take effect, Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in High-Risk Settings must comply with the requirements of the CDPH Vaccination Status Order; and

ii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in adult care facilities and Other Health Care Settings—as that term is defined in the CDPH Vaccination Status Order—must be in full compliance with the requirements of the CDPH Vaccination Status Order.

iii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel who provide services or work in facilities covered by the State Public Health Officer Order of August 5, 2021, updated most recently on February 22, 2022 (titled "Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement"), must comply with the requirements of that order, including as that order may be amended in the future. See www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx.

g. Cooperation with Public Health Authorities. Businesses or governmental entities with Personnel subject to this Section 6 must cooperate with Health Officer or DPH requests for records, documents, or other information regarding the Business or governmental entity's implementation of these vaccination requirements. This cooperation includes, but is not limited to, identifying all jobs or positions within the organization and describing: (1) whether a given job or position is subject to the vaccination requirements of this Section 6, (2) how the Business or governmental entity determined a job or position is subject to vaccination requirements of this Section 6, and (3) how the Business or governmental entity is ensuring full compliance with the vaccination requirements set forth in this Section 6. Complete responses to these requests must be provided to the Health Officer or DPH promptly upon request, and in any event within three business days after receiving the request.

h. Chart. For convenience of reference, a chart summarizing which settings and Personnel are subject to which state and local vaccination requirements is available at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/files/C19-07-State-and-Local-Mandates-Chart.pdf.

7. Mega-Events. All Businesses, governmental entities, and other organizations hosting Mega-Events, including when held at schools or under Programs for Children and Youth as provided in Section 5 above, are strongly urged (but no longer required) to continue to follow the recommendations in the State's Post-Blueprint Guidance for Mega-Events, available online at www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx, including requiring patrons and staff to either show proof of

being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or having received a negative COVID-19 Test as a condition to entry for indoor Mega-Events.

8. COVID-19 Health Indicators. The City will, for the time being, continue to make publicly available on its website updated data on COVID-19 case rates, hospitalizations and vaccination rates. That information can be found online at https://sf.gov/resource/2021/covid-19-data-and-reports. The Health Officer will monitor this data, along with other data and scientific evidence, in determining whether to modify or rescind this Order, as further described in Section 2(a) above.

9. Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and Federal and State Health Orders. The Health Officer is issuing this Order in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the emergency proclamations and other federal, state, and local orders and other pandemic-related orders described below in this Section. But this Order also functions independent of those emergency proclamations and other actions, and if any State, federal, or local emergency declaration, or any State or federal order or other guidance, is repealed, this Order remains in full effect in accordance with its terms (subject to Section 13 below).

   a. State and Local Emergency Proclamations. This Order is issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by the Governor, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by the Mayor Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency, and the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, as each of them have been and may be modified, extended, or supplemented.

   b. State Health Orders. This Order is also issued in light of the various orders, directives, rules, and regulations of the State, including, but not limited to, those of the State's Public Health Officer and Cal/OSHA. The State has expressly acknowledged that local health officers have authority to establish and implement public health measures within their respective jurisdictions that are more restrictive than those implemented by the State Public Health Officer.

   c. Federal Orders. This Order is further issued in light of federal emergency declarations and orders, including, but not limited to, the January 20, 2021 Executive Order on Protecting the Federal Workforce and Requiring Mask-Wearing, which requires all individuals in Federal buildings and on Federal land to wear masks, maintain physical distance, and adhere to other public health measures, as each of them may have been and may be modified, extended or supplemented.

10. Obligation to Follow Stricter Requirements of Orders.

    Based on local health conditions, this Order includes a limited number of health and safety restrictions that are more stringent or more detailed than those contained under State orders. Where a conflict exists between this Order and any state or federal public health order related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the most restrictive provision (*i.e.*, the

more protective of public health) controls. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code section 131080 and the Health Officer Practice Guide for Communicable Disease Control in California, except where the State Health Officer may issue an order expressly directed at this Order and based on a finding that a provision of this Order constitutes a menace to public health, any more restrictive measures in this Order continue to apply and control in this County.

11. Obligation to Follow Health Officer Orders and Directives and Mandatory State Guidance.

    In addition to complying with all provisions of this Order, all individuals and entities, including all Businesses and governmental entities, must also follow any applicable orders and directives issued by the Health Officer (available online at www.sfdph.org/healthorders and www.sfdph.org/directives) and any applicable mandatory guidance issued by the State Health Officer or California Department of Public Health. To the extent that provisions in the orders or directives of the Health Officer and the mandatory guidance of the State conflict, the more restrictive provisions (*i.e.*, the more protective of public health) apply. In the event of a conflict between provisions of any previously-issued Health Officer order or directive and this Order, this Order controls over the conflicting provisions of the other Health Officer order or directive.

12. Enforcement.

    Under Government Code sections 26602 and 41601 and Health and Safety Code section 101029, the Health Officer requests that the Sheriff and the Chief of Police in the County ensure compliance with and enforce this Order. The violation of any provision of this Order (including, without limitation, any health directives) constitutes an imminent threat and immediate menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. DPH is authorized to respond to such public nuisances by issuing Notice(s) of Violation and ordering premises vacated and closed until the owner, tenant, or manager submits a written plan to eliminate all violations and DPH finds that plan satisfactory. Such Notice(s) of Violation and orders to vacate and close may be issued based on a written report made by any City employees writing the report within the scope of their duty. DPH must give notice of such orders to vacate and close to the Chief of Police or the Chief's designee to be executed and enforced by officers in the same manner as provided by San Francisco Health Code section 597. As a condition of allowing a Business to reopen, DPH may impose additional restrictions and requirements on the Business as DPH deems appropriate to reduce transmission risks, beyond those required by this Order and other applicable health orders and directives.

13. Effective Date.

    This Order is effective at 12:01 a.m. on June 15, 2021 and will continue, as updated, to be in effect until the Health Officer rescinds, supersedes, or amends it in writing. The changes made in the April 21, 2022 update are effective at 12:01 a.m. on April 21, 2022.

ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)

14. Relation to Other Orders of the San Francisco Health Officer.

    At 12:01 a.m. on April 21, 2022, this Order revises and entirely replaces the prior update to Health Officer Order No. C19-07y (issued March 31, 2022). Leading up to and in connection with the effective date of this Order, the Health Officer has rescinded a number of other orders and directives relating to COVID-19, including those listed in the Health Officer's Omnibus Rescission of Health Officer Orders and Directives, dated June 11, 2021. On and after the effective date of this Order, the following orders and directives of the Health Officer shall continue in full force and effect: Order Nos. C19-16 (hospital patient data sharing), C19-18 (vaccine data reporting), C19-19 (minor consent to vaccination), and C19-20 (test collection sites); and the directives that this Order references in Sections 3 and 5, as the Health Officer may separately amend or later terminate any of them. Health Officer Order No. C19-15 was also reinstated on August 19, 2021, and remains in effect as outlined in that order (including as it is amended in the future). Also, this Order also does not alter the end date of any other Health Officer order or directive having its own end date or that continues indefinitely.

15. Copies.

    The County must promptly provide copies of this Order as follows: (1) by posting on the DPH website (www.sfdph.org/healthorders); (2) by posting at City Hall, located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102; and (3) by providing to any member of the public requesting a copy.

16. Severability.

    If a court holds any provision of this Order or its application to any person or circumstance to be invalid, then the remainder of the Order, including the application of such part or provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected and shall continue in full force and effect. To this end, the provisions of this Order are severable.

IT IS SO ORDERED:



Susan Philip, MD, MPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

Dated: April 21, 2022

Attachment:
- Appendix A – Face Covering Requirements (last updated April 21, 2022)

Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements

[April 21, 2022]

1. General Recommendation to Wear a Well-Fitted Mask; Requirement in Limited Indoor Settings.

The intent of this Order and the masking rules in this Appendix is to align with the masking rules and recommendations issued by the State of California and the federal government, with this Appendix providing additional information for specific situations to help Businesses, governmental entities, and individuals comply with those rules and recommendations and make informed choices to improve safety during the pandemic.

Everyone, including even people who are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or are Up-to-Date on Vaccination (meaning they have completed their initial course of vaccination and have received a Booster once eligible for a Booster, as further defined in Section 1 of the body of the Order), is recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in indoor public settings in the following situations:

- When an individual wants added protection based on individual risk tolerance, for example, when indoors with people whose vaccination status is unknown. People should respect an individual's decision to wear face coverings even in settings where they are not required, and no Business or other person should take an adverse action against individuals who chose to wear a face covering to protect their health.

- When there is a higher risk of community spread and infection, such as during surges caused by future variants.

- When an individual, or someone with whom an individual lives or works, is at a higher risk of a negative health outcome, such as older and immuno-compromised individuals.

Additional Face Covering Requirements may be imposed elsewhere in this Order or by state or federal rules or regulations.

Also, everyone is required to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, regardless of vaccination status, in the following indoor settings: emergency shelters and cooling and heating centers; High-Risk Settings (as defined in Section 1 of the Order); health care and other long-term care and adult and senior care facilities where masking is required by regulatory orders and rules; and anywhere else that federal or state health orders require doing so, as described in Section 3(b)(i) of the Order and this Appendix. For public transportation and public transportation facilities, subject to any future state or federal masking mandates, masks are strongly recommended for all people indoors, regardless of vaccination status, consistent with the CDPH Guidance for the Use of Face Masks.

Employees may be subject to additional restrictions or be required to provide additional documentation under state or federal laws and regulations, including Cal/OSHA's regulations. Businesses and other entities must adhere to applicable Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace and should frequently check for updates to those regulations such as by checking online at www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html.

And as provided in Section 6 below, individual Businesses, governmental entities, or venue operators or hosts may impose requirements regarding masking, in addition to those in this Order, that are more protective of public health.

2. Ventilation.

Businesses and operators of other public and private facilities where people may remove their Well-Fitted Masks indoors are encouraged to use at least one of the following ventilation strategies: (1) all available windows and doors accessible to fresh outdoor air are kept open as long as air quality and weather conditions permit; (2) fully operational HVAC system; or (3) appropriately sized portable air cleaners in each room. For clarity, if windows and doors are closed due to air quality or weather conditions, then a Business or operator of a public or private facility should whenever feasible follow at least one of remaining ventilation strategies before allowing people to remove their Well-Fitted Masks under this Order.

3. Proof of Vaccination.

Businesses, governmental entities, and other venue operators or hosts are encouraged to require people to provide proof that they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or are Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including receipt of a Booster once Booster-Eligible) before allowing people to remove their Well-Fitted Mask indoors. And as provided in the Order, each Business, governmental entity, and other entity that is required to confirm proof of being Vaccinated with the Complete Initial Series is strongly urged to implement measures as soon as possible to require its patrons and staff (as distinct from Personnel) to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including requiring them to show proof of receipt of a Booster once they are eligible.

Despite the easing of masking requirements under this update to the Order, Businesses, governmental entities, and other venue operators or hosts may still require all patrons to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in their facilities. And no person can be prevented from wearing a Well-Fitted Mask as a condition of participation in an activity or entry into a Business.

4. Status-Based Exemptions. The following exemptions apply in the limited situations where Well-Fitted Masks are still required under this Order.

a. Medical or Safety Exemption. A person does not need to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when they can show: (1) a medical professional has provided a written exemption to the Face Covering Requirement, based on the person's medical condition, other health concern, or disability; or (2) that they are hearing impaired, or communicating with a person who is hearing impaired, where the ability to see the mouth is essential for communication; or (3) wearing a Well-Fitted Mask while working would create a risk to the person related to their work as determined by local, state, or federal regulators or workplace safety guidelines. In accordance with CDPH and CDC guidelines, if a person is required by this Order to wear a Well-Fitted Mask but is exempt from wearing one under this paragraph, they still must wear an alternative face covering, such as a face shield with a drape on the bottom edge, unless they can show either: (1) a medical professional has provided a written exemption to this alternative face covering requirement, based on the person's medical condition, other health concern, or disability; or (2) wearing an alternative face covering while working would create a risk to the person related to their work as determined by local, state, or federal regulators or workplace safety guidelines.

   A Well-Fitted Mask should also not be used by anyone who has trouble breathing or is unconscious, incapacitated, or otherwise unable to remove the Well-Fitted Mask without assistance.

b. Children. In accordance with CDPH and CDC guidelines, any child younger than two years old must not wear a Well-Fitted Mask because of the risk of suffocation. When required to do so by this Order, Children age two to nine years must wear Well-Fitted Masks to the greatest extent feasible. Children age two to nine years may wear an alternative face covering (as that term is described in Section 4(a), above) if their parent or caregiver determines it will improve the child's ability to comply with this Order. Children age two to nine and their accompanying parents or caregivers should not be refused any essential service based on a child's inability to wear a Well-Fitted Mask (for example, if a four-year old child refuses to keep a Well-Fitted Mask on in a grocery store), but the parent or caregiver should when possible take reasonable steps to have the child, when required to do so by this Order, wear a Well-Fitted Mask to protect others and minimize instances when children without Well-Fitted Masks are brought into settings with other people. Parents and caregivers of children age two to nine years must supervise the use of Well-Fitted Masks to ensure safety and avoid misuse. Children must wear face coverings in schools as required under State health rules.

c. Personal Protective Equipment. A person required by this Order to wear a Well-Fitted Mask does not need to do so when wearing personal protective equipment ("PPE") that is more protective than a Well-Fitted Mask, including when required by (i) any workplace policy or (ii) any local, state, or federal law, regulation, or other mandatory guidance. When a person is not required to wear such PPE and in an indoor public setting, they must wear a Well-Fitted Mask or PPE that is more protective unless otherwise exempted under this Order.

5. Activity- and Location-Based Exemptions.

The activity- and location-based exemptions in this Section apply to everyone in the designated settings where this Order requires everyone, regardless of vaccination status, to wear a Well-Fitted Mask. To the extent allowed under Face Covering Requirements and subject to any additional health restrictions a particular Business, governmental entity, or other venue operator or host may impose for a facility or other setting it owns, operates, or controls, people in settings where this Order requires wearing a Well-Fitted Mask are not required do so in any of the following situations:

a. Indoor Public Setting While Alone or With a Member of Household. A person does not need to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when they are alone or with a member of their Household in a public building or completely enclosed space such as an office, and people who are not part of their Household are not likely to be in the same space. If someone who is not part of a person's Household enters the enclosed space, both people must wear a Well-Fitted Mask for the duration of the interaction unless otherwise exempt under Sections 4 and 5 of this Appendix.

b. Active Eating and Drinking. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask while actively eating or drinking.

c. Showering, Personal Hygiene, or Sleeping. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask only while showering or actively engaging in personal hygiene that requires removal of the Well-Fitted Mask. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask while sleeping in indoor public settings.

6. Minimum Requirements; Ability to Adopt More-Restrictive Measures.

This Order establishes the minimum requirements related to indoor masking. Nothing in this Order, including this Appendix A, is intended to reduce any other federal, state, or local legal requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an individual Business' or governmental entity's choices to take more health protective measures. Businesses or governmental entities may impose further restrictions that are more protective of public health than the minimum requirements under this Order, including, without limitation, requiring patrons or Personnel to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination, requiring them to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, or taking other measures that meet their operational needs (such as, by way of example only, mandating that people be Up-to-Date on Vaccination and only allowing a testing alterative if someone has an exemption to vaccination based on Religious Beliefs or a Qualifying Medical Reason.)

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-14k (updated)

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING REQUIRED BEST PRACTICES FOR CHILDCARE PROVIDERS

(PUBLIC HEALTH DIRECTIVE)
DATE OF DIRECTIVE: August 13, 2021, updated May 2, 2022

By this Directive, the Health Officer of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Health Officer") issues industry-specific direction that programs for children and youth, as described below, must follow as part of the local response to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19") pandemic. This Directive goes into effect immediately upon issuance, and remains in effect until suspended, superseded, or amended by the Health Officer.

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. **This Directive applies to "Programs for Children and Youth," which includes:**
   a) **all group care facilities for children who are not yet in elementary school, including child care centers; child development facilities; family daycare homes; and preschools, co-operative ("co-op") preschools, that are not part of an elementary school (including transitional Kindergartens, pre-Kindergartens and Kindergartens that are part of preschool programs or are independent of both preschool and elementary school programs) ("Childcare Programs"); and**
   b) **educational or recreational institutions or programs that provide care or supervision for school-aged children and youth—including for example, learning hubs, other programs that support distance learning, school-aged childcare programs, summer camps, youth sports programs, and afterschool programs ("Out of School Time Programs" or "OST Programs").**

   This Directive does not apply to schools, which are covered in Health Officer Directive No. 33.

2. **Attached as Exhibit A to this Directive is updated guidance from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) for Programs for Children and Youth: Childcare, Out-of-School Time Programs, and Day Camps ("Guidance"). All Programs for Children and Youth must comply with all applicable requirements listed in the Guidance.**

3. **All Programs for Children and Youth are strongly urged to immediately implement measures to require all Personnel to be fully vaccinated with a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization.**

4. **Each Program for Children and Youth must cooperate with SFDPH in relation to the Program for Children and Youth and the subject matter of this Directive. Such cooperation includes, but is not limited to, all of the following:**
   - **Immediately (within one hour of learning of the result) reporting any COVID-19 diagnosis or positive or inconclusive test result received by any child, teacher, or other Personnel to SFDPH Schools/Childcare COVID-19 Response**

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-14k

Team: call 628-217-7499 or email cases.schools@sfdph.org (please put "SECURE" in the subject line);

- **Promptly taking and responding to telephone calls, emails, and other inquiries and requests by representatives of SFDPH;**
- **Allowing SFDPH personnel on-site without advance notice;**
- **Responding to all SFDPH requests for information in a timely manner;**
- **Communicating with Personnel, students, and their parent(s) or guardian(s) as directed by SFDPH; and**
- **Taking immediate action as required by SFDPH in the event of an outbreak or other time-sensitive situation that poses a risk to the health and safety of youth, Personnel, or the community.**

5. **This Directive may be revised by the Health Officer, through revision of this Directive or another future directive or order, as conditions relating to COVID-19 require, in the discretion of the Health Officer. All Programs for Children and Youth must stay updated regarding any changes to this Directive by checking the Department of Public Health website (www.sfdph.org/directives) regularly.**

Where a conflict exists between this Directive and any state, local, or federal public health order related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the most restrictive provision controls. Failure to carry out this Directive constitutes an imminent threat to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.



Susan Philip, MD, MPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

Dated: May 2, 2022

San Francisco Department of Public Health

Guidance

Guidance for TK-12 Schools, Childcare & Programs for Youth & Children

May 2, 2022

This guidance was developed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) for local use. It will be posted at https://sfcdcp.org/school.

Summary of changes since 4/13/2022

- Consolidated and combined guidance for childcare and programs for youth and children into this unified guidance document for all schools and programs serving children.
- In alignment with CDPH, eliminated requirement for masking on public transportation.
- Added testing guidance for asymptomatic children with continual exposures, such as household exposures. Specifically, it is reasonable to recommend testing 3-5 days after first exposure and if negative, recommend testing again 3-5 days after that. No further testing is recommended if child remains asymptomatic.

Summary of changes since 3/11/2022

- In alignment with CDPH, eliminated requirement for quarantine for children after exposure to a positive COVID-19 case, regardless of vaccination status, location, or type of exposure.
- SFDPH now recommends that individuals wear well-fitted masks indoors based on three factors: (1) their own risk tolerance, (2) the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur, and (3) whether the individual or someone they live or work with is at risk of severe disease.

(Updates in **green**)

AUDIENCE: Public, private, and parochial TK-12 schools in San Francisco as well as all programs for children and youth, including childcare programs, out-of-school time programs, summer and day camps, youth sports, community learning hubs, and other recreational and educational programs for children outside of school. Childcare includes child care centers; child development facilities; family child care homes; all preschools, transitional kindergarten, pre-kindergartens and kindergarten programs. For the purposes of this document, the terms “student”, “child”, or “youth” may be used interchangeably.

PURPOSE: To help TK-12 schools and all programs that serve or care for youth and children understand health and safety practices needed to prevent the spread of COVID-19 for in-person instruction, supervision, and care.

BACKGROUND: Given the important health and education benefits of in-person learning, stable routines, and the knowledge gained since the start of the COVID-19 epidemic, **our priority must be to ensure continued safe in-person attendance for all students and children in San Francisco**. By layering effective prevention strategies, schools and programs can reduce the risk of COVID-19 and provide in-person instruction, supervision, and care safely for staff and children.

These recommendations are based on the science available at this time. They are subject to change as new knowledge emerges, local transmission changes, or as COVID-19 vaccination rates change.

Contents

Key Messages 3
Procedures and Protocols 3
Establish COVID-19 health and safety protocols. 3
Recommended Signs. 3
Strategies to prevent the spread of COVID-19 4
Promote COVID-19 vaccination. 4
Recommendations on wearing face masks indoors. 4
Who should not wear face masks. 4
Testing. 5
Improve ventilation and use outdoor spaces. 6
Outdoor spaces 6
Indoor spaces 6
Stay home when sick. 7
Travel 7
Hand hygiene: Follow pre-COVID protocols. 7
Cohorting is not required. 8
Physical distancing is not required. 8
Sports, dance, wind instruments, singing, and related activities 8
Recommended testing for higher risk indoor activities 8
Reporting and notification of COVID-19 cases 8
Additional steps to reduce the risk of COVID-19 with higher-risk activities. 9
Specific Situations 10
Transportation. 10
Meals and snacks. 10
Children receiving special services. 10
Frequently Asked Questions: What's allowed 11
What to do when someone has COVID-19 symptoms, infection, or exposure 11
When staff or children become sick at school or program 11
When someone reports a positive test or has symptoms of COVID-19. 12
When a child reports an exposure to COVID-19 outside of school or program. 12
Returning to school or program after COVID-19 symptoms or a positive test. 12
Resources 12
San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) 12
California Department of Public Health (CDPH). 13
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) 13

Key Messages

- **Vaccination and boosters of staff, eligible children, and household members for COVID-19 is one of the most effective ways to decrease the risk of COVID-19 in schools and programs.** Up-to-date vaccinated adults and eligible children also provide protection to younger children who are not yet eligible for vaccination.
- **In-person attendance is crucial** to children's physical and mental health as well as their learning and social-emotional development. Measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19 must consider and prioritize children's access to safe and full in-person programming, keeping them in school, childcare, and enrichment programs as much as possible and limiting unnecessary missed days.

Procedures and Protocols

Establish COVID-19 health and safety protocols.

- **Designate a COVID-19 staff or liaison** to be the single point of contact at each site for questions, concerns, or exposures. This person will also serve as a liaison to SFDPH.
- **Create a plan** describing what your school or program will do to follow the requirements in this guidance and any relevant Health Directives or Orders, including Health Directive No. 2020-33 "Required Best Practices for Schools" and Health Directive No. 2020-14 "Required Best Practices for Childcare Providers", both which can be found at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/coronavirus-health-directives.asp
    - Update your plan regularly to reflect changes in COVID-19 guidance and local transmission.
    - **Share your plan** on your website and with staff, families, and other members of your community.
- **Establish written protocols** for what your school or program will do if someone at your site is exposed to COVID-19, has symptoms of COVID-19, and/or tests positive for COVID-19.
- Employers must follow Cal/OSHA COVID-19 Prevention Emergency Temporary Standards, at https://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/ETS.html
- Licensed childcare providers must also follow requirements in CDSS and CCLD provider information notices.
- Do not exclude children and youth because of medical conditions that may increase their risk of severe COVID-19. Let the child's medical team and family decide if it's safe for them to attend.

Recommended Signs.

Programs may post the following signs, available here in different sizes and colors:

- Post at all public entrances: **Best practices for COVID-19 prevention**
- Post in staff break rooms and other staff areas: **Get Vaccinated, SF!**

Signs are available in different sizes and colors at sf.gov/outreach-toolkit-coronavirus-covid-19. The toolkit also has a variety of signs, posters, and fact sheets on COVID-19.

Strategies to prevent the spread of COVID-19

Promote COVID-19 vaccination.

- Encourage COVID-19 vaccination for staff, volunteers, children old enough to be vaccinated, and family members.
- **Limit non-essential visitors who are not fully vaccinated**, including volunteers and activities involving external groups.

Recommendations on wearing face masks indoors.

Face masks can keep infection from spreading, by trapping respiratory droplets and aerosols before they can travel through the air and help prevent someone from getting infected. They are a proven prevention strategy in indoor spaces.

For this guidance, face masks includes cloth face coverings that cover the mouth **and** nose.

- Individuals should wear well-fitted masks in indoor settings based on three factors: (1) their own risk tolerance, (2) the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur, and (3) whether the individual or someone they live or work with is at risk of severe disease.
- Masks should be well-fitted and cover the mouth and nose. Scarves and other loose face coverings are not recommended.
- No one can be prevented from wearing a mask as a condition of participation in an activity or entry into school or program, unless wearing a mask would pose a safety hazard (for example, water sports).
- Keep a supply of face masks for people who forget to bring their own.
- Face masks are not required outdoors as the risk of transmission is low in most outdoor settings. They may be considered when people are stationary and in crowded situations like on the sidelines of a game or spectators in the stands.
- Make sure that children wearing face masks do not overheat in hot weather.

Who should not wear face masks.

- Children under 24 months old must not wear face masks, due to the risk of suffocation.
- People who are unconscious, asleep, or unable to remove a face mask independently.

What does it mean to be "up-to-date" for COVID-19?

To be "up-to-date" you are either (a) two weeks past completing the full initial course of vaccines—either two doses of Moderna or Pfizer or one dose of a Johnson & Johnson vaccine AND (b) immediately after receiving a Booster of any type once a person is eligible for a Booster. Until a person is eligible for a Booster, they are considered Up-to-Date on Vaccination two weeks after completing their primary series.

For more information on face masks, see CDPH Face Mask guidance, CDPH TK-12 guidance, CDPH Schools Questions and Answers, and San Francisco Health Order C19-07.

Testing.

Testing is most useful when people are more likely to be infected, for example, after close contact to someone with COVID-19, with higher-risk activities like indoor sports, and when community levels of COVID-19 are high. Testing is less useful when the chance of infection is low, for example, for people who are fully vaccinated for COVID-19, with low-risk activities like classroom instruction, and when community levels of COVID-19 are low.

- In alignment with CDPH Health Order for TK-12 Schools, SFDPH **requires** regular once weekly testing of:
    - On-site **TK-12 school** personnel who are **not vaccinated** for COVID-19, including volunteers, interns, and student teachers.
        - Testing must be at least once weekly with PCR, other nucleic acid amplification test (NAAT), or an antigen test.
        - If personnel decline testing, the school must not allow them on campus.
        - Unvaccinated personnel must either sign a release of information for test results to be shared with the school or commit to notifying the school within 1 hour of a positive or inconclusive result, and within 24 hours of a negative result.
        - Unvaccinated individuals who have a documented COVID-19 infection (for example either with a doctor's note or a confirmed test) in the previous 90 days may be exempted from testing for 90 days from the date of infection. They should resume screening testing after 90 days.
    - Schools must keep a log of all test results. For tests not done by the school, verify results (i.e., by viewing an electronic or paper copy of the negative result or note from the test site or clinic, with the person's name and date tested).
- In alignment with CDPH, SFDPH **strongly recommends** testing for the following groups across all schools, childcare, and programs for youth:
    - All people with symptoms of COVID-19 or close contact to someone with COVID-19, even if they have been vaccinated for COVID-19.
    - Weekly testing for all participants and personnel who participate in indoor activities that are higher-risk for transmission due to heavy breathing or exertion (like sports or playing wind instruments) if masks are not worn, regardless of vaccination status. People who have had COVID-19 in the last 90 days are excluded from this recommendation. For more information, see *CDPH K-12 Schools Guidance*.
- SFDPH does not recommend routine testing of the following groups:
    - Children without COVID-19 symptoms or known exposures who do not participate in higher-transmission risk activities.
    - Vaccinated staff without COVID-19 symptoms or known exposures.
    - Staff and children who had COVID-19 in the last 90 days, confirmed by a test, who do not have symptoms.

Improve ventilation and use outdoor spaces.

Increasing indoor air circulation lowers the risk of infection by "diluting" any infectious respiratory droplets with outdoor air. Being outside is even lower risk.

Outdoor spaces

- Do as many activities outside as possible, especially snacks/meals and exercise.
- To be considered an outdoor space, structures should meet SFDPH ventilation guidelines for outdoor structures, at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/COVID-19/Outdoor-Structures.asp.

Indoor spaces

Good ventilation decreases the number of respiratory droplets in the air by replacing indoor air with fresh, uncontaminated air and/or filtering infectious droplets out of the air. It is another important measure to prevent COVID-19 transmission indoors.

During wildfires or other times when air quality is poor, prioritize maintaining healthy air quality indoors. Your school or program can stay open even if you need to close your windows or decrease outdoor air intake by your ventilation system during these times. Portable air cleaners (HEPA filters) can be helpful.

Review CDPH Ventilation Guidance. General recommendations include:

- Open windows to increase natural ventilation with outdoor air when health and safety allow. When possible, consider also leaving room doors slightly open to promote flow of outdoor air through the indoor space.
- If open windows pose a risk of falls for children, use window locks to keep windows from opening more than 4 inches, or other safety devices to prevent falls.
- Do not prop or wedge open fire doors. Continue to follow fire and building safety requirements.
- If your building has an HVAC system (also called mechanical ventilation, forced air, or central air):
    - Have your HVAC system checked by a professional to make sure that it is working properly.
    - Open outdoor air dampers and close recirculation dampers ("economizers"). This will maximize the amount of outdoor air that the HVAC system takes in and minimize the amount of indoor air that is recirculated.
    - If you can use higher-efficiency air filters without reducing airflow or damaging your HVAC system, use air filters rated MERV13 or better.
    - Disable "demand-control ventilation controls" so fans keep running even when a room doesn't need to be heated or cooled.
    - If your HVAC system has a timer, set it to run at least 1-2 hours before the building opens until 2-3 hours after everyone has left the building, including custodial staff.
- If your school or program uses fans, adjust the direction of fans to so that air does not blow from one person's space to another's space.
- Consider portable air cleaners ("HEPA filters").

For more information, see:

- https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/ventilation.html

Stay home when sick.

Asking people about symptoms after they arrive is not very effective in keeping COVID-19 out of programs. It is more important to tell people to stay home if they are sick.

Make sure that staff, volunteers, children, and families know the symptoms of COVID-19.
Tell people to stay home if they have symptoms.

- Give a list of COVID-19 symptoms to staff, volunteers, children, and families. Make sure they know to stay home if they have symptoms. **Schools and programs do not have to confirm that people have reviewed the list each day.**

  SFDPH has created a sample handout for families,
  For Parents and Guardians: COVID-19 Symptom and Exposure Check, at sfcdcp.org/school

- Encourage family members of children and staff to get tested promptly if they have symptoms of COVID-19. This will lower the risk of infection spreading to people in your school or program.
- SFDPH does not recommend temperature checks.

Travel.

- SFDPH recommends, but does not require, staff and children to follow CDC recommendations for travel at https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/travelers/travel-during-covid19.html.

Hand hygiene: Follow pre-COVID protocols.

- Teach and reinforce the importance of washing hands, avoiding contact with one's eyes, nose, and mouth, and covering coughs and sneezes among children and staff.
- Promote hand washing throughout the day, especially before and after eating, after using the toilet, and after handling garbage, or removing gloves.
- Make sure that people have supplies to clean their hands, including soap, paper towels, and/or hand sanitizer with at least 60 percent ethyl alcohol for staff and children who can safely use hand sanitizer.
- Keep hand sanitizer out of the reach of young children and supervise use.
  - The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) does not recommend hand sanitizer for children under 24 months old.
  - Call Poison Control at 1 800- 222- 1222 if hand sanitizer is consumed.

Cleaning and disinfection: *Routine disinfection to prevent COVID-19 is no longer recommended for schools and programs. Surfaces are not a significant route of transmission.*

- Cleaning once a day is usually enough to remove potential virus that may be on surfaces.
- Paper-based materials like books and magazines do not need cleaning between uses.
- Outdoor playgrounds do not need cleaning and disinfection between groups.

For more information, see https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/disinfecting-building-facility.html

Cohorting is not required.

A cohort is a small, stable group with the same staff and children each day. Keeping people in cohorts lowers their exposure risk by limiting the number of people they interact with. It is less important when community transmission is low.

SFDPH does not recommend cohorting if it will limit full enrollment for in-person participation. Schools and programs should prioritize full enrollment over strict cohorting.

- Staff and volunteers may work with more than one group and there is no maximum group size.
- Children may participate in more than one group each day.
    - For example, a child can be with a regular group for most of the day, also attend a cooking elective and choose between arts and crafts, dance or sports activities in the afternoon.
- Single-day programs and drop-in programs are allowed. Programs can add new children and youth at any time.

Physical distancing is not required.

Physical distancing decreases the risk of COVID-19 from respiratory droplets. It is less important in settings where vaccination rates are high and spread of COVID-19 is low.

- **Physical distancing is no longer required.** Because of the importance of in-person learning, CDC, CDPH, and SFDPH do not recommend physical distancing if it will limit full enrollment.

Sports, dance, wind instruments, singing, and related activities

Sports, dance, and activities involving singing, chanting, shouting, and playing wind instruments are higher risk for COVID-19 because people breathe more air and breathe out more forcefully when doing these activities. ***The risk is much higher indoors than outdoors, and higher without face masks.***

- These activities are allowed outdoors without face masks.
- As for other school and program activities, individuals may wear well-fitted masks in indoor settings based on three factors: (1) their own risk tolerance, (2) the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur, and (3) whether the individual or someone they live or work with is at risk of severe disease.

Recommended testing for higher risk indoor activities

- It is strongly recommended that individuals who participate in indoor activities that are higher-risk for transmission due to heavy breathing or exertion undergo regular COVID-19 testing if masks are not worn, unless they had COVID-19 in the past 90 days (See Testing).

Reporting and notification of COVID-19 cases.

Schools, programs, and event organizers must:

1. Inform SFDPH of positive tests within 24 hours, whether detected during on-site testing or communicated to the team or organizer.
2. Identify and notify individuals with exposure to a COVID-19 case**, including other teams or referees**.
3. If informed by another team of a positive case, identify, and notify contacts on the team, and notify SFDPH of the exposure at cases.schools@sfdph.org.

4. Leagues and tournaments/multi-team events should establish procedures for notifying other teams and referees of a positive COVID-19 case that occurs during competition.

Additional steps to reduce the risk of COVID-19 with higher-risk activities.

Strongly encourage or require COVID-19 up-to-date vaccination.

COVID-19 vaccination is strongly recommended for all participants who are old enough to be eligible for vaccination, as well as coaches, staff and volunteers. Having everyone in your league "up to date" on vaccination will greatly decrease the risk of transmission of the virus among teammates and between teams, and will protect teams against severe illness, hospitalization, and death.

- Leagues, teams, and tournaments/events are encouraged to require that all eligible participants and personnel be up to date on vaccination for COVID-19.
- When transmission is high, consider cancelling high-risk sports and extracurricular activities unless all participants are up to date on vaccination, as recommended by CDC Guidance for COVID-19 Prevention in Schools.

Move higher-risk activities outdoors, when practical.

- Exercise, physical conditioning, and training, including practices and games.
- Cheer, stunt, drill team, etc.
- Wind instruments.
- Choir, or any singing.
- Drama and dance.

Prevent spread of COVID-19 off the field.

- Remind participants and families that COVID-19 often spreads off-the-field, especially in situations when groups let their guard down and eat or socialize together (post-game parties, locker rooms, carpools).
- Locker rooms are high-risk because they are often crowded and poorly ventilated.
    - Have players arrive dressed to play as much as possible.
    - Use locker rooms only to change or use the restroom. Don't use the locker room for coaching or pregame, halftime or postgame talks.
    - Avoid having different teams use a locker room at the same time.
- Follow guidance below for shared transportation.

Travel.

- When traveling overnight, team members not from the same household should sleep in separate rooms or in consistent groups when feasible.
- Socializing with other teams is strongly discouraged.
- Teams that travel out-of-state or outside the Bay Area are encouraged to follow CDC recommendations for quarantine after travel.

Specific Situations

Transportation.

Since vehicles are small, enclosed spaces are higher risk of COVID-19 transmission. Biking and walking are lower risk than shared vehicles.

- Carpools and shared rides
  - Tell staff and families to try to carpool with the same stable group of people.
  - Open windows. Turn the fan on high, set to outdoor air.
- School/Program Buses and Vans
  - Individuals may wear well-fitted masks on school or program buses based on three factors: (1) their own risk tolerance, (2) the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur, and (3) whether the individual or someone they live or work with is at risk of severe disease.
  - Keep vehicle windows open when weather and safety permit.
  - Turn the fan on high, set to outdoor air.
  - If more than one vehicle is used, for example, for a sports team, have the same people ride together each time, and try to assign groups that already interact with each other to the same vehicle (ex. varsity vs JV, offense vs defense).
  - You do not have to ask riders about symptoms and exposures before they board.
- Walking School Buses
  - Prioritize pedestrian safety.
  - Keep a record of staff and children on the walking school bus each day.
  - Outdoor equipment such as walking ropes do not need additional cleaning. Instead, have children and staff wash or sanitize their hands before touching the equipment.

Meals and snacks.

- Eat outdoors when space and weather allow.
- Meals do not need to be individually plated or bagged.
- For food service such as cafeterias, clean frequently touched surfaces. Surfaces that come in contact with food should be washed, rinsed, and sanitized before and after meals.

Children receiving special services.

- Do not exclude children because of medical conditions that may increase their risk of severe COVID-19. Let the child's medical team and family decide if it's safe for them to attend.
- Do not limit access to essential staff that are not school or program employees, such as direct service providers, occupational therapists or physical therapists. Provide accommodations and related services for special education, learning disabilities and medical conditions.

- Additional accommodations may be needed for children to safely attend . For example, children may need additional supervision and support around face masks or handwashing.
- When children are unable to attend due to COVID-19 infection or exposure, consider remote video sessions for therapy.

Frequently Asked Questions: What's allowed

- Parents and caregivers may enter the building for pick-up and drop-off, even if they are not vaccinated for COVID-19.
- Therapists who are not employees but provide direct services to children onsite, such as ABA providers, occupational therapists, and physical therapists should be allowed to provide services. Providers should also be allowed on-site for vision, hearing, and dental screening.
- Festivals, performances, and other events that involve families; tours; and open houses are allowed. Keep a log of all persons who attend. This will be helpful if someone at an event, tour or open house later tests positive for COVID-19.
- Drinking fountains can be used.
- Children can share toys, computers, books, games, play areas, and area rugs.
- All restrictions on field trips have been removed. You can go on field trips to outdoor or indoor destinations. You may use shared vehicles or public transportation following the guidance outlined in this document. Family-style meals are allowed.
- Brushing children's teeth is allowed. CDC recommends that staff involved in toothbrushing be fully vaccinated for COVID-19.
- You may conduct fire drills.
- If hosting large events, please follow CDPH recommendations for how to minimize risk of transmission; for example, by requiring vaccinations for all eligible attendees, holding events outdoors whenever possible, making a plan for how to identify close contacts, and so on.

What to do when someone has COVID-19 symptoms, infection, or exposure

When staff or children become sick at school or program

- If rapid antigen testing is available on-site, test the person with symptoms:
  - If the test is negative, the staff or child may remain at school or program if they feel well enough. A PCR/NAAT is not needed to confirm the result.
  - If the test is positive, follow the instructions in the Guide to COVID-19 Infections, Symptoms and Exposures at Schools and Programs for Children.
- If rapid antigen testing is not available at school or program:
  - Staff must inform their supervisor and leave work as soon as they can.
  - Send sick children home. Keep children who are waiting to be picked up in a designated isolation space. Children must be wearing masks while they are waiting to be picked up.

When someone reports a positive test or has symptoms of COVID-19.

- See the Guide to COVID-19 Infections, Symptoms and Exposures at Schools and Programs for Children for what to do if someone tests positive for COVID-19 or has symptoms of COVID-19.
- Schools and programs **must** report COVID-19 cases to SFDPH at **cases.schools@sfdph.org**. SFDPH staff will work with schools and programs on case management and provide input on next steps, including isolation, quarantine, and outbreak management.

When a child reports an exposure to COVID-19 outside of school or program.

- It is no longer necessary to require children exposed to COVID-19 outside of the school or program to quarantine at home. If they are asymptomatic, they may return immediately and recommend testing 3-5 days after the exposure.
- It is **strongly recommended** that exposed children over age 2 wear a well-fitting mask whenever feasible for 10 days after exposure and particularly when around others indoors.
- If children become symptomatic, they should isolate at home immediately until their symptoms start to improve and their test result is known.
- For continual exposures, such as those in the household where the child is not isolating away from the person with COVID-19, asymptomatic children are allowed to return to the program throughout the duration of exposure. It is reasonable to recommend testing once 3-5 after initial exposure and, if the test is negative, repeat testing again 3-5 days after the first test. If both tests are negative, no further testing is recommended as long as child remains asymptomatic.

Returning to school or program after COVID-19 symptoms or a positive test.

Refer to the Guide to Isolation and Quarantine for Schools and Programs for Children and COVID-19 Schools & Childcare Decision Tree.

Resources

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH)

- **SFDPH Schools and Childcare Hub** for COVID-19 consultation and guidance
  (628) 217-7499 or cases.schools@sfdph.org
- COVID-19 guidance for the public, including employers
  https://www.sfcdcp.org/covid19
- COVID-19 guidance for schools at https://sfcdcp.org/school

  "Guide to COVID-19 Infections, Symptoms and Exposures at Schools and Programs for Children"

  "Parent Handout: Symptom and Exposure Check/Returning to School after Symptoms"

  COVID-19 Schools & Childcare Decision Tree
- Outreach Toolkit for Coronavirus. https://sf.gov/outreachtoolkitcoronavirusCOVID19

California Department of Public Health (CDPH).

- State of California Safe Schools for All Hub
  https://schools.covid19.ca.gov/
- COVID-19 Public Health Guidance for K-12 Schools, 2021-22 School Year
  https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/K-12-Guidance-2021-22-School-Year.aspx
- K-12 Schools Guidance FAQ https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Schools-FAQ.aspx
- K-12 School-Based COVID-19 Testing Strategies for School Year 2021-22
  https://testing.covid19.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/332/2021/07/School-Testing-Considerations.pdf
- Evidence Summary: TK-12 Schools and COVID-19 Transmission
  https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Safe-Schools-for-All-Plan-Science.aspx
- Guidance for Child Care Providers and Programs
  https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Child-Care-Guidance.aspx
- Guidance for the Use of Face Coverings
  https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/guidance-for-face-coverings.aspx

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

- Guidance for COVID-19 Prevention in K-12 Schools
  https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/k-12-guidance.html
- Schools and Child Care Programs
  https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/index.html
- Guidance for Operating Early Childhood Education/Child Care Programs
  https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/child-care-guidance.html

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-33j

DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGARDING REQUIRED BEST PRACTICES FOR SCHOOLS

(PUBLIC HEALTH DIRECTIVE)
DATE OF DIRECTIVE: February 4, 2022, updated May 2, 2022

By this Directive, the Health Officer of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Health Officer") issues industry-specific direction that schools as described below must follow as part of the local response to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19," including SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes the disease) pandemic. This Directive goes into effect immediately upon issuance, and remains in effect until suspended, superseded, or amended by the Health Officer.

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. **This Directive applies to all transitional kindergarten (TK)-12 schools in the City and County of San Francisco ("Schools"). All schools are permitted and encouraged to remain for in-person, on-site instruction.**

2. **Attached as Exhibit A to this Directive is guidance from the Department of Public Health regarding reopening Schools for in-person, on-site instruction ("TK-12 Guidance"). All Schools offering in-person, on-site instruction must comply with all applicable requirements listed in the Guidance, including as it may be amended in the future.**

3. **Each School must make their health and safety plan available (a) online at a permanent URL and (b) in hard copy upon request to all personnel working on site and to the parent(s) and guardian(s) of students in the School. Also, each School must provide a copy of the Health and Safety Plan and evidence of its implementation to any authority enforcing this Directive upon demand.**

4. **Schools are strongly urged to immediately implement measures to require all adults based in a School facility, including but not limited to teachers, staff, paraprofessionals, contracted janitorial staff, security, therapists, aides, essential volunteers, interns, and student teachers ("School-Based Adults") to be fully vaccinated with a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization.**

5. **Schools must comply with the following requirements with respect to testing:**

    a. **Routine Asymptomatic Testing for School-Based Adults**

        i. **All school-based personnel who are not fully vaccinated must test at least once weekly.**
            1. **Testing may be with PCR, another nucleic acid amplification test, or an antigen test.**

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-33j

2. **School-based personnel include interns, volunteers, and student teachers.**
3. **Each School must maintain a log of testing for all School-Based Adults who work or provide services onsite at the School (the "Testing Log"), including all of the information set forth in the Excel File for Testing Tracking available at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/ig/School-Testing-Log-Worksheet.xlsx. The log must be retained for 12 months and be made available to SFDPH upon request.**

ii. **A School must not allow any School-Based Adult who is not fully vaccinated to come to work or otherwise enter the School's premises if that person refuses to be tested as outlined in subsection (i) above or to provide test results to the School, unless expressly permitted in advance and in writing by the Health Officer or the Health Officer's designee.**

iii. **Schools must take all steps necessary to ensure the School receives the results of these tests promptly. Specifically, Schools must require School-Based Adults who are not fully vaccinated to either (1) sign a release of information (ROI) authorizing the testing lab or ordering provider to share the COVID-19 test result directly with the School or (2) commit to providing results to the School within *one hour* of receiving a *positive* or *inconclusive* result and *24 hours* of receiving a *negative* result. A sample ROI is available online at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/covid-19/schools-education.asp. If a School-Based Adult chooses to report results to the School themselves, the person may make an initial verbal report of a positive or inconclusive result to facilitate rapid infection control measures, but must follow-up with documentation of any result within 48 hours whether it be a positive, inconclusive, or negative result.**

iv. **Schools must immediately (within one hour of learning of the result) report any positive or inconclusive test result to the SFDPH Schools and Childcare Response Team: call 628-217-7499 or email cases.schools@ sfdph.org (please put "SECURE" in the subject line).**

v. **School-Based Adults who test positive for COVID-19 must not be allowed to return to the School until the relevant criteria set forth in SFDPH's isolation and quarantine guidelines are satisfied. *See* https://www.sfdph.org/directives and https://www.sfdph.org/dph/COVID-19/Isolation-and-Quarantine.asp. School-Based Adults who receive an inconclusive test result may get retested and use the new result. If they choose not to get retested, they must follow the isolation and quarantine guidelines as though they have a positive result.**

Health Officer Directive No. 2020-33j

b. Symptomatic Testing

i. If any School-Based Adult has symptoms of COVID-19, the School must send that person home in compliance with the procedures set forth in the TK-12 Guidance. The person must not be allowed to return to the School until the relevant criteria set forth in SFDPH's isolation and quarantine guidelines are satisfied. *See* https://www.sfdph.org/directives and https://www.sfdph.org/dph/COVID-19/Isolation-and-Quarantine.asp. It is strongly recommended that the person be tested as soon as possible for COVID-19. Schools must take all steps necessary to ensure the School receives the results of these tests promptly. Schools must immediately (within 24 hours of learning of the result) report any positive or inconclusive test result to the SFDPH Schools and Childcare Response Team: call 628-217-7499 or email cases.schools@ sfdph.org (please put "SECURE" in the subject line).

ii. If any student has symptoms of COVID-19, the School must send that student home in compliance with the procedures set forth in the TK-12 Guidance. The student must not be allowed to return to the School until the relevant criteria set forth at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/COVID-19/Schools-Returning.asp are satisfied. It is strongly recommended that the student be tested as soon as possible for COVID-19. Schools must require parents or guardians to inform the School immediately (within 24 hours of learning of the test result) if their child tests positive or has an inconclusive test result and to provide documentation of the positive or inconclusive result within 48 hours. Schools must immediately (within 24 hours of learning of the test result) report any positive or inconclusive test result to the SFDPH Schools and Childcare Response Team: call 628-217-7499 and email cases.schools@sfdph.org.

c. General Requirements

i. The School must share information about testing with SFDPH as required by this Directive and as requested by SFDPH at any time while this Directive is in effect. Such information may include and is not limited to information about attendance, contact information, health information, employment information (for School-Based Adults), and any other information related to this Directive required by SFDPH. The disclosure of any confidential information under this subsection is limited to the minimum necessary for public health purposes as determined by SFDPH, and any such information that is confidential must be protected by SFDPH as required by law.

ii. All Testing must be done using tests that are authorized by the United States Food and Drug Administration or by the California Department of Public Health.

iii. **Testing results, including but not limited to the Testing Log, are considered confidential health information of staff and students, and must be handled accordingly. For example, Schools can consider the following measures:**

- **If test results are to be faxed to the School, the fax machine must be placed in a private, secure area;**
- **Hard copy documentation must be kept in a secure location, such as a locked file cabinet behind a locked door, and must not be left unsecured while unattended;**
- **Electronic information must be stored on password-protected computers; and**
- **Any electronically-stored information must not be maintained in a cloud-based system that is located outside the United States.**

iv. **The School must maintain the confidentiality of information about testing results of School-Based Adults and students, and may only share such information as allowed or required by law.**

v. **In relation to reporting test results for School-Based Adults or students, the School must provide all information requested by SFDPH.**

vi. **The School must comply with SFDPH requirements regarding reporting of metrics as stated in "SFDPH Reporting Metrics" (available at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/covid-19/schools-education.asp).**

6. **Each School must cooperate with SFDPH by working and collaborating with SFDPH, and otherwise following the direction of SFDPH, in relation to the School and the subject matter of this Directive. Such cooperation includes, but is not limited to, all of the following:**

- **Promptly taking and responding to telephone calls, emails, and other inquiries and requests by representatives of SFDPH;**
- **Allowing SFDPH personnel on-site without advance notice;**
- **Responding to all SFDPH requests for information in a timely manner;**
- **Communicating with School-Based Adults, students, and their parent(s) or guardian(s) as directed by SFDPH; and**
- **Taking immediate action as required by SFDPH in the event of an outbreak or other time-sensitive situation that poses a risk to the health and safety of students, School-Based Adults, or the community.**

7. **Schools must advise all students and School-Based Adults that, unless they meet criteria set forth in SFDPH's "COVID-19 Infections, Symptoms, and Exposures"**

(https://www.sfdph.org/dph/covid-19/schools-isolation-and-quarantine.asp) to be exempted from quarantine (see subsection "Quarantine exceptions and special situations"), they must notify the school and stay home if any household member or other close contact has a positive or inconclusive COVID-19 test or was otherwise diagnosed with COVID-19 by a healthcare provider. School-Based Adults and students may return to school when the relevant criteria set forth at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/COVID-19/Schools-Returning.asp are satisfied. It is strongly recommended that unvaccinated individuals get tested for COVID-19 on or after five days after their last close contact with the person with COVID-19.

8. **This Directive may be revised by the Health Officer, through revision of this Directive or another future directive or order, as conditions relating to COVID-19 require, in the discretion of the Health Officer. All Schools must stay updated regarding any changes to this Directive by checking the Department of Public Health website (www.sfdph.org/healthorders; www.sfdph.org/directives) regularly.**

Where a conflict exists between this Directive and any state, local, or federal public health order related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the most restrictive provision controls. Failure to carry out this Directive constitutes an imminent threat and menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.



Susan Philip, MD, MPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

Dated: May 2, 2022

San Francisco Department of Public Health

Guidance

Guidance for TK-12 Schools, Childcare & Programs for Youth & Children

May 2, 2022

This guidance was developed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) for local use. It will be posted at https://sfcdcp.org/school.

Summary of changes since 4/13/2022

- Consolidated and combined guidance for childcare and programs for youth and children into this unified guidance document for all schools and programs serving children.
- In alignment with CDPH, eliminated requirement for masking on public transportation.
- Added testing guidance for asymptomatic children with continual exposures, such as household exposures. Specifically, it is reasonable to recommend testing 3-5 days after first exposure and if negative, recommend testing again 3-5 days after that. No further testing is recommended if child remains asymptomatic.

Summary of changes since 3/11/2022

- In alignment with CDPH, eliminated requirement for quarantine for children after exposure to a positive COVID-19 case, regardless of vaccination status, location, or type of exposure.
- SFDPH now recommends that individuals wear well-fitted masks indoors based on three factors: (1) their own risk tolerance, (2) the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur, and (3) whether the individual or someone they live or work with is at risk of severe disease.

(Updates in **green**)

AUDIENCE: Public, private, and parochial TK-12 schools in San Francisco as well as all programs for children and youth, including childcare programs, out-of-school time programs, summer and day camps, youth sports, community learning hubs, and other recreational and educational programs for children outside of school. Childcare includes child care centers; child development facilities; family child care homes; all preschools, transitional kindergarten, pre-kindergartens and kindergarten programs. For the purposes of this document, the terms “student”, “child”, or “youth” may be used interchangeably.

PURPOSE: To help TK-12 schools and all programs that serve or care for youth and children understand health and safety practices needed to prevent the spread of COVID-19 for in-person instruction, supervision, and care.

BACKGROUND: Given the important health and education benefits of in-person learning, stable routines, and the knowledge gained since the start of the COVID-19 epidemic, **our priority must be to ensure continued safe in-person attendance for all students and children in San Francisco**. By layering effective prevention strategies, schools and programs can reduce the risk of COVID-19 and provide in-person instruction, supervision, and care safely for staff and children.

These recommendations are based on the science available at this time. They are subject to change as new knowledge emerges, local transmission changes, or as COVID-19 vaccination rates change.

Contents

Key Messages 3
Procedures and Protocols 3
Establish COVID-19 health and safety protocols. 3
Recommended Signs. 3
Strategies to prevent the spread of COVID-19 4
Promote COVID-19 vaccination. 4
Recommendations on wearing face masks indoors. 4
Who should not wear face masks. 4
Testing. 5
Improve ventilation and use outdoor spaces. 6
Outdoor spaces 6
Indoor spaces 6
Stay home when sick. 7
Travel 7
Hand hygiene: Follow pre-COVID protocols. 7
Cohorting is not required. 8
Physical distancing is not required. 8
Sports, dance, wind instruments, singing, and related activities 8
Recommended testing for higher risk indoor activities 8
Reporting and notification of COVID-19 cases 8
Additional steps to reduce the risk of COVID-19 with higher-risk activities. 9
Specific Situations 10
Transportation. 10
Meals and snacks. 10
Children receiving special services. 10
Frequently Asked Questions: What's allowed 11
What to do when someone has COVID-19 symptoms, infection, or exposure 11
When staff or children become sick at school or program 11
When someone reports a positive test or has symptoms of COVID-19. 12
When a child reports an exposure to COVID-19 outside of school or program. 12
Returning to school or program after COVID-19 symptoms or a positive test. 12
Resources 12
San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) 12
California Department of Public Health (CDPH). 13
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) 13

Key Messages

- **Vaccination and boosters of staff, eligible children, and household members for COVID-19 is one of the most effective ways to decrease the risk of COVID-19 in schools and programs.** Up-to-date vaccinated adults and eligible children also provide protection to younger children who are not yet eligible for vaccination.
- **In-person attendance is crucial** to children's physical and mental health as well as their learning and social-emotional development. Measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19 must consider and prioritize children's access to safe and full in-person programming, keeping them in school, childcare, and enrichment programs as much as possible and limiting unnecessary missed days.

Procedures and Protocols

Establish COVID-19 health and safety protocols.

- **Designate a COVID-19 staff or liaison** to be the single point of contact at each site for questions, concerns, or exposures. This person will also serve as a liaison to SFDPH.
- **Create a plan** describing what your school or program will do to follow the requirements in this guidance and any relevant Health Directives or Orders, including Health Directive No. 2020-33 "Required Best Practices for Schools" and Health Directive No. 2020-14 "Required Best Practices for Childcare Providers", both which can be found at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/coronavirus-health-directives.asp
    - Update your plan regularly to reflect changes in COVID-19 guidance and local transmission.
    - **Share your plan** on your website and with staff, families, and other members of your community.
- **Establish written protocols** for what your school or program will do if someone at your site is exposed to COVID-19, has symptoms of COVID-19, and/or tests positive for COVID-19.
- Employers must follow Cal/OSHA COVID-19 Prevention Emergency Temporary Standards, at https://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/ETS.html
- Licensed childcare providers must also follow requirements in CDSS and CCLD provider information notices.
- Do not exclude children and youth because of medical conditions that may increase their risk of severe COVID-19. Let the child's medical team and family decide if it's safe for them to attend.

Recommended Signs.

Programs may post the following signs, available here in different sizes and colors:

- Post at all public entrances: **Best practices for COVID-19 prevention**
- Post in staff break rooms and other staff areas: **Get Vaccinated, SF!**

Signs are available in different sizes and colors at sf.gov/outreach-toolkit-coronavirus-covid-19. The toolkit also has a variety of signs, posters, and fact sheets on COVID-19.

Strategies to prevent the spread of COVID-19

Promote COVID-19 vaccination.

- Encourage COVID-19 vaccination for staff, volunteers, children old enough to be vaccinated, and family members.
- **Limit non-essential visitors who are not fully vaccinated**, including volunteers and activities involving external groups.

Recommendations on wearing face masks indoors.

Face masks can keep infection from spreading, by trapping respiratory droplets and aerosols before they can travel through the air and help prevent someone from getting infected. They are a proven prevention strategy in indoor spaces.

For this guidance, face masks includes cloth face coverings that cover the mouth **and** nose.

- Individuals should wear well-fitted masks in indoor settings based on three factors: (1) their own risk tolerance, (2) the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur, and (3) whether the individual or someone they live or work with is at risk of severe disease.
- Masks should be well-fitted and cover the mouth and nose. Scarves and other loose face coverings are not recommended.
- No one can be prevented from wearing a mask as a condition of participation in an activity or entry into school or program, unless wearing a mask would pose a safety hazard (for example, water sports).
- Keep a supply of face masks for people who forget to bring their own.
- Face masks are not required outdoors as the risk of transmission is low in most outdoor settings. They may be considered when people are stationary and in crowded situations like on the sidelines of a game or spectators in the stands.
- Make sure that children wearing face masks do not overheat in hot weather.

Who should not wear face masks.

- Children under 24 months old must not wear face masks, due to the risk of suffocation.
- People who are unconscious, asleep, or unable to remove a face mask independently.

What does it mean to be "up-to-date" for COVID-19?

To be "up-to-date" you are either (a) two weeks past completing the full initial course of vaccines—either two doses of Moderna or Pfizer or one dose of a Johnson & Johnson vaccine AND (b) immediately after receiving a Booster of any type once a person is eligible for a Booster. Until a person is eligible for a Booster, they are considered Up-to-Date on Vaccination two weeks after completing their primary series.

For more information on face masks, see CDPH Face Mask guidance, CDPH TK-12 guidance, CDPH Schools Questions and Answers, and San Francisco Health Order C19-07.

Testing.

Testing is most useful when people are more likely to be infected, for example, after close contact to someone with COVID-19, with higher-risk activities like indoor sports, and when community levels of COVID-19 are high. Testing is less useful when the chance of infection is low, for example, for people who are fully vaccinated for COVID-19, with low-risk activities like classroom instruction, and when community levels of COVID-19 are low.

- In alignment with CDPH Health Order for TK-12 Schools, SFDPH **requires** regular once weekly testing of:
    - On-site **TK-12 school** personnel who are **not vaccinated** for COVID-19, including volunteers, interns, and student teachers.
        - Testing must be at least once weekly with PCR, other nucleic acid amplification test (NAAT), or an antigen test.
        - If personnel decline testing, the school must not allow them on campus.
        - Unvaccinated personnel must either sign a release of information for test results to be shared with the school or commit to notifying the school within 1 hour of a positive or inconclusive result, and within 24 hours of a negative result.
        - Unvaccinated individuals who have a documented COVID-19 infection (for example either with a doctor's note or a confirmed test) in the previous 90 days may be exempted from testing for 90 days from the date of infection. They should resume screening testing after 90 days.
    - Schools must keep a log of all test results. For tests not done by the school, verify results (i.e., by viewing an electronic or paper copy of the negative result or note from the test site or clinic, with the person's name and date tested).
- In alignment with CDPH, SFDPH **strongly recommends** testing for the following groups across all schools, childcare, and programs for youth:
    - All people with symptoms of COVID-19 or close contact to someone with COVID-19, even if they have been vaccinated for COVID-19.
    - Weekly testing for all participants and personnel who participate in indoor activities that are higher-risk for transmission due to heavy breathing or exertion (like sports or playing wind instruments) if masks are not worn, regardless of vaccination status. People who have had COVID-19 in the last 90 days are excluded from this recommendation. For more information, see *CDPH K-12 Schools Guidance*.
- SFDPH does not recommend routine testing of the following groups:
    - Children without COVID-19 symptoms or known exposures who do not participate in higher-transmission risk activities.
    - Vaccinated staff without COVID-19 symptoms or known exposures.
    - Staff and children who had COVID-19 in the last 90 days, confirmed by a test, who do not have symptoms.

Improve ventilation and use outdoor spaces.

Increasing indoor air circulation lowers the risk of infection by "diluting" any infectious respiratory droplets with outdoor air. Being outside is even lower risk.

Outdoor spaces

- Do as many activities outside as possible, especially snacks/meals and exercise.
- To be considered an outdoor space, structures should meet SFDPH ventilation guidelines for outdoor structures, at https://www.sfdph.org/dph/COVID-19/Outdoor-Structures.asp.

Indoor spaces

Good ventilation decreases the number of respiratory droplets in the air by replacing indoor air with fresh, uncontaminated air and/or filtering infectious droplets out of the air. It is another important measure to prevent COVID-19 transmission indoors.

During wildfires or other times when air quality is poor, prioritize maintaining healthy air quality indoors. Your school or program can stay open even if you need to close your windows or decrease outdoor air intake by your ventilation system during these times. Portable air cleaners (HEPA filters) can be helpful.

Review CDPH Ventilation Guidance. General recommendations include:

- Open windows to increase natural ventilation with outdoor air when health and safety allow. When possible, consider also leaving room doors slightly open to promote flow of outdoor air through the indoor space.
- If open windows pose a risk of falls for children, use window locks to keep windows from opening more than 4 inches, or other safety devices to prevent falls.
- Do not prop or wedge open fire doors. Continue to follow fire and building safety requirements.
- If your building has an HVAC system (also called mechanical ventilation, forced air, or central air):
    - Have your HVAC system checked by a professional to make sure that it is working properly.
    - Open outdoor air dampers and close recirculation dampers ("economizers"). This will maximize the amount of outdoor air that the HVAC system takes in and minimize the amount of indoor air that is recirculated.
    - If you can use higher-efficiency air filters without reducing airflow or damaging your HVAC system, use air filters rated MERV13 or better.
    - Disable "demand-control ventilation controls" so fans keep running even when a room doesn't need to be heated or cooled.
    - If your HVAC system has a timer, set it to run at least 1-2 hours before the building opens until 2-3 hours after everyone has left the building, including custodial staff.
- If your school or program uses fans, adjust the direction of fans to so that air does not blow from one person's space to another's space.
- Consider portable air cleaners ("HEPA filters").

For more information, see:

- https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/ventilation.html

Stay home when sick.

Asking people about symptoms after they arrive is not very effective in keeping COVID-19 out of programs. It is more important to tell people to stay home if they are sick.

Make sure that staff, volunteers, children, and families know the symptoms of COVID-19.
Tell people to stay home if they have symptoms.

- Give a list of COVID-19 symptoms to staff, volunteers, children, and families. Make sure they know to stay home if they have symptoms. **Schools and programs do not have to confirm that people have reviewed the list each day.**

  SFDPH has created a sample handout for families,
  For Parents and Guardians: COVID-19 Symptom and Exposure Check, at sfcdcp.org/school

- Encourage family members of children and staff to get tested promptly if they have symptoms of COVID-19. This will lower the risk of infection spreading to people in your school or program.
- SFDPH does not recommend temperature checks.

Travel.

- SFDPH recommends, but does not require, staff and children to follow CDC recommendations for travel at https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/travelers/travel-during-covid19.html.

Hand hygiene: Follow pre-COVID protocols.

- Teach and reinforce the importance of washing hands, avoiding contact with one's eyes, nose, and mouth, and covering coughs and sneezes among children and staff.
- Promote hand washing throughout the day, especially before and after eating, after using the toilet, and after handling garbage, or removing gloves.
- Make sure that people have supplies to clean their hands, including soap, paper towels, and/or hand sanitizer with at least 60 percent ethyl alcohol for staff and children who can safely use hand sanitizer.
- Keep hand sanitizer out of the reach of young children and supervise use.
  - The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) does not recommend hand sanitizer for children under 24 months old.
  - Call Poison Control at 1 800- 222- 1222 if hand sanitizer is consumed.

Cleaning and disinfection: *Routine disinfection to prevent COVID-19 is no longer recommended for schools and programs. Surfaces are not a significant route of transmission.*

- Cleaning once a day is usually enough to remove potential virus that may be on surfaces.
- Paper-based materials like books and magazines do not need cleaning between uses.
- Outdoor playgrounds do not need cleaning and disinfection between groups.

For more information, see https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/disinfecting-building-facility.html

Cohorting is not required.

A cohort is a small, stable group with the same staff and children each day. Keeping people in cohorts lowers their exposure risk by limiting the number of people they interact with. It is less important when community transmission is low.

SFDPH does not recommend cohorting if it will limit full enrollment for in-person participation. Schools and programs should prioritize full enrollment over strict cohorting.

- Staff and volunteers may work with more than one group and there is no maximum group size.
- Children may participate in more than one group each day.
    - For example, a child can be with a regular group for most of the day, also attend a cooking elective and choose between arts and crafts, dance or sports activities in the afternoon.
- Single-day programs and drop-in programs are allowed. Programs can add new children and youth at any time.

Physical distancing is not required.

Physical distancing decreases the risk of COVID-19 from respiratory droplets. It is less important in settings where vaccination rates are high and spread of COVID-19 is low.

- **Physical distancing is no longer required.** Because of the importance of in-person learning, CDC, CDPH, and SFDPH do not recommend physical distancing if it will limit full enrollment.

Sports, dance, wind instruments, singing, and related activities

Sports, dance, and activities involving singing, chanting, shouting, and playing wind instruments are higher risk for COVID-19 because people breathe more air and breathe out more forcefully when doing these activities. ***The risk is much higher indoors than outdoors, and higher without face masks.***

- These activities are allowed outdoors without face masks.
- As for other school and program activities, individuals may wear well-fitted masks in indoor settings based on three factors: (1) their own risk tolerance, (2) the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur, and (3) whether the individual or someone they live or work with is at risk of severe disease.

Recommended testing for higher risk indoor activities

- It is strongly recommended that individuals who participate in indoor activities that are higher-risk for transmission due to heavy breathing or exertion undergo regular COVID-19 testing if masks are not worn, unless they had COVID-19 in the past 90 days (See Testing).

Reporting and notification of COVID-19 cases.

Schools, programs, and event organizers must:

1. Inform SFDPH of positive tests within 24 hours, whether detected during on-site testing or communicated to the team or organizer.
2. Identify and notify individuals with exposure to a COVID-19 case**, including other teams or referees**.
3. If informed by another team of a positive case, identify, and notify contacts on the team, and notify SFDPH of the exposure at cases.schools@sfdph.org.

4. Leagues and tournaments/multi-team events should establish procedures for notifying other teams and referees of a positive COVID-19 case that occurs during competition.

Additional steps to reduce the risk of COVID-19 with higher-risk activities.

Strongly encourage or require COVID-19 up-to-date vaccination.

COVID-19 vaccination is strongly recommended for all participants who are old enough to be eligible for vaccination, as well as coaches, staff and volunteers. Having everyone in your league "up to date" on vaccination will greatly decrease the risk of transmission of the virus among teammates and between teams, and will protect teams against severe illness, hospitalization, and death.

- Leagues, teams, and tournaments/events are encouraged to require that all eligible participants and personnel be up to date on vaccination for COVID-19.
- When transmission is high, consider cancelling high-risk sports and extracurricular activities unless all participants are up to date on vaccination, as recommended by CDC Guidance for COVID-19 Prevention in Schools.

Move higher-risk activities outdoors, when practical.

- Exercise, physical conditioning, and training, including practices and games.
- Cheer, stunt, drill team, etc.
- Wind instruments.
- Choir, or any singing.
- Drama and dance.

Prevent spread of COVID-19 off the field.

- Remind participants and families that COVID-19 often spreads off-the-field, especially in situations when groups let their guard down and eat or socialize together (post-game parties, locker rooms, carpools).
- Locker rooms are high-risk because they are often crowded and poorly ventilated.
    - Have players arrive dressed to play as much as possible.
    - Use locker rooms only to change or use the restroom. Don't use the locker room for coaching or pregame, halftime or postgame talks.
    - Avoid having different teams use a locker room at the same time.
- Follow guidance below for shared transportation.

Travel.

- When traveling overnight, team members not from the same household should sleep in separate rooms or in consistent groups when feasible.
- Socializing with other teams is strongly discouraged.
- Teams that travel out-of-state or outside the Bay Area are encouraged to follow CDC recommendations for quarantine after travel.

Specific Situations

Transportation.

Since vehicles are small, enclosed spaces are higher risk of COVID-19 transmission. Biking and walking are lower risk than shared vehicles.

- Carpools and shared rides
  - Tell staff and families to try to carpool with the same stable group of people.
  - Open windows. Turn the fan on high, set to outdoor air.
- School/Program Buses and Vans
  - Individuals may wear well-fitted masks on school or program buses based on three factors: (1) their own risk tolerance, (2) the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur, and (3) whether the individual or someone they live or work with is at risk of severe disease.
  - Keep vehicle windows open when weather and safety permit.
  - Turn the fan on high, set to outdoor air.
  - If more than one vehicle is used, for example, for a sports team, have the same people ride together each time, and try to assign groups that already interact with each other to the same vehicle (ex. varsity vs JV, offense vs defense).
  - You do not have to ask riders about symptoms and exposures before they board.
- Walking School Buses
  - Prioritize pedestrian safety.
  - Keep a record of staff and children on the walking school bus each day.
  - Outdoor equipment such as walking ropes do not need additional cleaning. Instead, have children and staff wash or sanitize their hands before touching the equipment.

Meals and snacks.

- Eat outdoors when space and weather allow.
- Meals do not need to be individually plated or bagged.
- For food service such as cafeterias, clean frequently touched surfaces. Surfaces that come in contact with food should be washed, rinsed, and sanitized before and after meals.

Children receiving special services.

- Do not exclude children because of medical conditions that may increase their risk of severe COVID-19. Let the child's medical team and family decide if it's safe for them to attend.
- Do not limit access to essential staff that are not school or program employees, such as direct service providers, occupational therapists or physical therapists. Provide accommodations and related services for special education, learning disabilities and medical conditions.

- Additional accommodations may be needed for children to safely attend . For example, children may need additional supervision and support around face masks or handwashing.
- When children are unable to attend due to COVID-19 infection or exposure, consider remote video sessions for therapy.

Frequently Asked Questions: What's allowed

- Parents and caregivers may enter the building for pick-up and drop-off, even if they are not vaccinated for COVID-19.
- Therapists who are not employees but provide direct services to children onsite, such as ABA providers, occupational therapists, and physical therapists should be allowed to provide services. Providers should also be allowed on-site for vision, hearing, and dental screening.
- Festivals, performances, and other events that involve families; tours; and open houses are allowed. Keep a log of all persons who attend. This will be helpful if someone at an event, tour or open house later tests positive for COVID-19.
- Drinking fountains can be used.
- Children can share toys, computers, books, games, play areas, and area rugs.
- All restrictions on field trips have been removed. You can go on field trips to outdoor or indoor destinations. You may use shared vehicles or public transportation following the guidance outlined in this document. Family-style meals are allowed.
- Brushing children's teeth is allowed. CDC recommends that staff involved in toothbrushing be fully vaccinated for COVID-19.
- You may conduct fire drills.
- If hosting large events, please follow CDPH recommendations for how to minimize risk of transmission; for example, by requiring vaccinations for all eligible attendees, holding events outdoors whenever possible, making a plan for how to identify close contacts, and so on.

What to do when someone has COVID-19 symptoms, infection, or exposure

When staff or children become sick at school or program

- If rapid antigen testing is available on-site, test the person with symptoms:
  - If the test is negative, the staff or child may remain at school or program if they feel well enough. A PCR/NAAT is not needed to confirm the result.
  - If the test is positive, follow the instructions in the Guide to COVID-19 Infections, Symptoms and Exposures at Schools and Programs for Children.
- If rapid antigen testing is not available at school or program:
  - Staff must inform their supervisor and leave work as soon as they can.
  - Send sick children home. Keep children who are waiting to be picked up in a designated isolation space. Children must be wearing masks while they are waiting to be picked up.

When someone reports a positive test or has symptoms of COVID-19.

- See the Guide to COVID-19 Infections, Symptoms and Exposures at Schools and Programs for Children for what to do if someone tests positive for COVID-19 or has symptoms of COVID-19.
- Schools and programs **must** report COVID-19 cases to SFDPH at **cases.schools@sfdph.org**. SFDPH staff will work with schools and programs on case management and provide input on next steps, including isolation, quarantine, and outbreak management.

When a child reports an exposure to COVID-19 outside of school or program.

- It is no longer necessary to require children exposed to COVID-19 outside of the school or program to quarantine at home. If they are asymptomatic, they may return immediately and recommend testing 3-5 days after the exposure.
- It is **strongly recommended** that exposed children over age 2 wear a well-fitting mask whenever feasible for 10 days after exposure and particularly when around others indoors.
- If children become symptomatic, they should isolate at home immediately until their symptoms start to improve and their test result is known.
- For continual exposures, such as those in the household where the child is not isolating away from the person with COVID-19, asymptomatic children are allowed to return to the program throughout the duration of exposure. It is reasonable to recommend testing once 3-5 after initial exposure and, if the test is negative, repeat testing again 3-5 days after the first test. If both tests are negative, no further testing is recommended as long as child remains asymptomatic.

Returning to school or program after COVID-19 symptoms or a positive test.

Refer to the Guide to Isolation and Quarantine for Schools and Programs for Children and COVID-19 Schools & Childcare Decision Tree.

Resources

San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH)

- **SFDPH Schools and Childcare Hub** for COVID-19 consultation and guidance
  (628) 217-7499 or cases.schools@sfdph.org
- COVID-19 guidance for the public, including employers
  https://www.sfcdcp.org/covid19
- COVID-19 guidance for schools at https://sfcdcp.org/school

  "Guide to COVID-19 Infections, Symptoms and Exposures at Schools and Programs for Children"

  "Parent Handout: Symptom and Exposure Check/Returning to School after Symptoms"

  COVID-19 Schools & Childcare Decision Tree
- Outreach Toolkit for Coronavirus. https://sf.gov/outreachtoolkitcoronavirusCOVID19

California Department of Public Health (CDPH).

- State of California Safe Schools for All Hub
  https://schools.covid19.ca.gov/
- COVID-19 Public Health Guidance for K-12 Schools, 2021-22 School Year
  https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/K-12-Guidance-2021-22-School-Year.aspx
- K-12 Schools Guidance FAQ https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Schools-FAQ.aspx
- K-12 School-Based COVID-19 Testing Strategies for School Year 2021-22
  https://testing.covid19.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/332/2021/07/School-Testing-Considerations.pdf
- Evidence Summary: TK-12 Schools and COVID-19 Transmission
  https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Safe-Schools-for-All-Plan-Science.aspx
- Guidance for Child Care Providers and Programs
  https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Child-Care-Guidance.aspx
- Guidance for the Use of Face Coverings
  https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/guidance-for-face-coverings.aspx

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

- Guidance for COVID-19 Prevention in K-12 Schools
  https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/k-12-guidance.html
- Schools and Child Care Programs
  https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/index.html
- Guidance for Operating Early Childhood Education/Child Care Programs
  https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/child-care-guidance.html

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Subject:	FW: SFDPH Covid Summary Report - Week of 6/13/22
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 8:20:00 PM
Attachments:	BOS COVID update 613.22.cleaned.pdf

From: Validzic, Ana (DPH) <ana.validzic@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 3:48 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFDPH Covid Summary Report - Week of 6/13/22

Good morning Honorable Supervisors and Staff -

Attached is DPH's weekly COVID-19 update as of June 13, 2022. As always, please let us know if you have any questions.

Best, Ana

****

Ana Validzic

Acting Government Affairs Liaison

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.

City and County of San Francisco **Department of Public Health**

London N. Breed
Mayor

Grant Colfax, MD
Director of Health

COVID-19 DPH Update to the SF Board of Supervisors: Omicron Variants, Vaccinations/Boosters, and Testing (6.13.22)

GENERAL UPDATES

For the past week, COVID-19 hospitalizations and case rates have slightly declined. SFDPH continues to focus efforts on improving vaccination/booster rates given that this is the best way for individuals to protect themselves from COVID-19. Overall testing supply is meeting demand. There are no recent changes to the Health Order.

Regarding **COVID-19 vaccines for children under 5 years old,** SFDPH has been working closely with health care systems, including Kaiser, UCSF, Sutter, and San Francisco Health Network (SFHN), and pediatric primary care providers to lay the foundation for COVID-19 vaccinations for children under age 5 when they receive authorization through state and federal agencies expected the week of June 21st. SFDPH expects parents or guardians will need to have one-on-one medical guidance and discussion with their pediatricians about the vaccine, which will be a special formulation for this age group. SFDPH knows that some parents and their children under age 5 are not linked to a pediatrician and will offer vaccines for children under age 5 in a limited capacity at our community clinics. Additionally, while California health regulations permit pharmacies to administer vaccines to children aged 3 and older, the list of participating pharmacy locations within San Francisco is still to be finalized.

City-wide issues include:

- Focus on equity
- Prevent hospitalizations & deaths
- Continue Vaccination & Booster Campaign
- Ensure adequate testing operations
- Keep economy & essential services open
- Layering strategies to reduce transmission
- Supporting K-12 schools and early childhood education as a special area of focus

VACCINATIONS (date as of 6/12/22)

SFDPH has built a robust infrastructure for vaccination efforts. The **Covid Response Call Center line (628-652-2700)** can help reach and schedule vulnerable individuals for vaccination appointments.

Vaccine Administration Totals:

Residents 5+ with at least one dose: > 90%	Total residents vaccinated: 797,970
Residents 5+ completed series: 88%	

Vaccine Administration by age group – 1st dose/complete vaccination:

All SF residents: >90% / 84%	All SF residents 65+: >90% / >90%
All SF residents 5+: >90% / 88%	

Vaccinations by Race/Ethnicity – 1st dose / completed vaccination:

American Indian or Alaskan Native: >90% / 84%	Asian: >90% / 86%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: >90% />90%	Black and African American: 83% / 77%
Hispanic or Latinx: >90% / 90%	White: 79% / 73%

BOOSTERS (date as of 6/12/22)

Boosters help boost COVID-19 immunity at least 4-6 months after an individual has completed the initial vaccine series. Children and youth ages 5-17 years old are now eligible for a 1st booster and people over 50 years old may receive a 2nd booster.

- Vaccinated residents ages 5+ with a Booster dose is **73%**

SF HOSPITAL CENSUS (date as of 6/9/22)

Hospitalizations include all hospital patients who have been diagnosed with COVID-19.

- Hospitalizations have declined in the past week
- Hospital census was **80** COVID+ patients with **9** in the ICU, **71** in acute care

CASES (date as of 6/5/22)

Due to the Omicron variants, there are increases of COVID-19 cases in San Francisco. Cases have decreased in the previous week.

- The 7-day average COVID-19 case rate per 100,000 has declined slightly to **51.7**
  - 7-day average case rate among unvaccinated residents is **106.2**
  - 7-day average case rate among fully vaccinated residents is **48.2**

NEIGHBORHOOD CASE RATES (date as of 6/8/22)

The neighborhood rate is the number of tests collected from that neighborhood's residents divided by the total number of residents in last 60 days.

- Mission Bay has the highest case rate at 364 per 10,000 residents
- Potrero Hill has 2nd highest case rate at 324 per 10,000 residents
- Bayview/Hunters Points has 3rd highest case rate at 308 per 10,000 residents

TESTING (date as of 6/5/22)

- The 7-day average test positivity has increased to **12.6%**
- The 7-day rolling average tests per day is **4,608**

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group: Crisis Stabilization Unit Recommendations
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 4:41:00 PM
Attachments:	Crisis Stabilization Unit (Approved Recommendations May 2022).pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached the Crisis Stabilization Unit Recommendations provided by the Office of the Controller.

Sincerely,

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

From: Shcherba, Oksana (CON) <oksana.shcherba@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2022 10:48 AM
To: Rana, Shalini (DPH) <shalini.rana@sfdph.org>; Power, Andres (MYR) <andres.power@sfgov.org>; Kunins, Hillary (DPH) <hillary.kunins@sfdph.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Colfax, Grant (DPH) <grant.colfax@sfdph.org>; Saini, Nikita (BOS) <nikita.saini@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>
Cc: Littleton, Heather (CON) <heather.littleton@sfgov.org>; Kirkpatrick, Kelly (DPH) <kelly.kirkpatrick@sfdph.org>; Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>; Simmons, Marlo (DPH) <marlo.simmons@sfdph.org>; DPH-mlesarre <mlesarre@rafikicoalition.org>; Beinart, Amy (BOS) <amy.beinart@sfgov.org>; Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org>; Lerma, Santiago (BOS) <santiago.lerma@sfgov.org>; Jennifer James <jjames@harderco.com>; Ashlyn Dadkhah <adadkhah@harderco.com>; Pating, David (DPH) <david.pating@sfdph.org>
Subject: Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group: Crisis Stabilization Unit Recommendations

Good Morning,

On behalf of the Mental Health San Francisco (MHSF) Implementation Working Group (IWG) and its Chair, Dr. Monique LeSarre, we are pleased to share the attached IWG-approved Crisis Stabilization Unit (CSU) recommendations. The Crisis Stabilization Unit is a sub-domain under the "Mental Health and Substance Use Treatment Expansion" (New Beds & Facilitates) domain in the MHSF Ordinance. These recommendations will assist with the planning, design, and implementation of the CSU, which is set to open in 2023.

Please note that we have also previously transmitted the MHSF IWG-approved recommendations for Street Crisis and Response Teams (SCRT), Drug Sobering Center, and the Office of Coordinated Care.

Thank you very much,

Oksana

Oksana Shcherba *(she/hers)*
City Performance Analyst
Office of the Controller | City & County of San Francisco
oksana.shcherba@sfgov.org

MHSF Crisis Stabilization Unit Recommendations (Approved 5.24.22)

Implementation Working Group

NOTE: The following recommendations were developed in alignment with specific parts of the MHSF ordinance. Associated language related to the recommendations is indicated in *italics*.

[*Section (iv) Mental Health Urgent Care. Mental Health SF shall include a Mental Health Urgent Care Unit that shall offer clinical intervention for individuals who are experiencing escalating psychiatric crisis and who require rapid engagement, assessment, and intervention to prevent further deterioration into an acute crisis or hospitalization. Such facility may, but shall not be required to be, located at the Mental Health Service Center.*]

Overarching Goals/Vision for the Crisis Stabilization Unit should include:

A) As described in the MHSF ordinance provision of short-term voluntary sub-acute crisis stabilization mental health services.

B) The program should align itself along the continuum of care with purpose of stabilization and abatement of symptoms for the purpose of readying an individual to engage in lower level of care treatment-the next step along the continuum of care the individual is ready to partake in for continued engagement in care, further stabilization and symptom management toward long term goal of health maintenance, maintenance of housing or linkage to stable permanent housing.

C) The program should utilize a strength based, client centered approach to engaging individuals in their care and maximizing individual agency in their treatment planning decisions no matter where they lie along the continuum of readiness to engage in services.

D) All individuals who wish to participate in an acute stabilization program, residential dual diagnosis or substance use residential treatment should be referred and linked to that program with no gaps in their treatment plan of care. If a program is not available, individuals will receive an interim residential solution where they can be maintained on the wait list and tracked until the program bed becomes available. Responsibility for tracking of these individuals' linkage to ongoing treatment should lie within the new Office of Coordinated Care.

E) CDU staff must collaborate with the individual's outpatient mental health provider to ensure current treatment plan goals are supported and continuity of care.

F) Initiate linkage to outpatient treatment if the individual is not already linked to a provider, be it a long-term provider or short-term linkage provider if there is no long-term outpatient treatment availability.

G) The program shall provide culturally relevant care, and language accessible services at minimum in Cantonese and Spanish.

In order to achieve the recommended vision and goals we assert the need for the following program objectives:

1. This is a 24/7 facility that is able to take individuals that self-present, that are referred by their mental health provider, or emergency personnel. Individuals should be treated at the facility through the duration of their acute crisis.

2. The facility will be staffed by nurses and prescribers at all times, including options for telehealth during off peak hours. For individuals not currently in the care of a prescriber they should obtain a psychiatric assessment and medication intervention initiated in a timely manner. For individuals already in the care of a prescriber with current medication orders there should be a mechanism to expediently obtain their medications. Medical staff should participate in the development of the treatment plan and strategy to engage in treatment.

3. The facility should be able to accept and treat individuals with complicated behavioral presentations, particularly those with co-occurring substance use disorders. As such there should be a high threshold for behaviors that occur in the context of emotional dysregulation. The program facility should be designed to accommodate individuals who need limited stimulation such as isolation rooms, and other quiet space for those who cannot tolerate much socialization.

4. Staff should be trained and competent in crisis management and de-escalation interventions, trauma informed care, harm reduction, and strength-based case management. In all instances where an individual desires, expresses willingness, or expressly requests further treatment or support in linking to resources for after care they should be referred and linked upon discharge to inpatient or outpatient services. Staff should utilize a client centered approach to collaboratively craft appropriate disposition plans for all individuals who enter the CDU regardless of where the individual is willing to engage along the spectrum of care that meets their2urrentt expressed interest and presenting needs. For example, if the individual wants to transition to residential treatment services they should be linked, if the individual does not want further structured treatment but does not want to return to the street discharge to Hummingbird or a shelter/ navigation center bed, if they want to return to their encampment provide a relevant resource list.

5. Participation in the CSU services are optional. Clients can exit the program at any time. Punitive measures should not be taken if the client refuses to engage in treatment. Individuals cannot be suspended from services unless they present a health or safety risk to other participants and staff. However, should a situation arise in which a person presents a danger to themselves or others staff are obligated to conduct a 5150 advisement and Tarasoff reporting as the particular situation warrants.

6. The program should be able to accept individuals regardless of justice system involvement particularly individuals with 290's.

7. The program should be able to accept individuals who will need medical care for withdraw management from alcohol and opiates while they are in the program.

8. Transportation should be provided to individuals who are leaving the CSU to the next point of their treatment or other stabilization services. We understand the intention of this clause to be that BHS create a transportation service to assure that BHS clients are successfully linked to any programs along the continuum of care.

   [*Specific associated ordinance language: Part One: Section (v) Transportation. Mental Health SF shall provide prompt, accompanied transportation from the Mental Health Service Center to off-site treatment programs. Mental Health SF shall also provide transportation to individuals released from San Francisco County Jail and General Hospital's PES unit to the Mental Health Service Center*]

9. We assert that it is in keeping with the above section and clause, and overall intent of the MHSF ordinance to more efficiently organize and provision services across the DPH spectrum of care that the CDU make available live bed availability in order to facilitate referrals from emergency responders and mental health providers.
   [*Specific associated ordinance language*: *SEC. 15.104. MENTAL HEALTH SF. (a) Findings (7) The inability to receive timely treatment has discouraged many people from accessing the services they need. Wait times for services are a major barrier to treatment, but the Department's BHS program as of 2019 lacks a systematic way to track the availability of spots in treatment programs in real time.* AND *Part Two: (A) Real-time Inventory of Program and Service Availability. The Office of Coordinated Care shall be responsible for conducting and maintaining an up-to-date inventory of available openings in all City-operated and City-funded mental health and substance use programs, and to the extent that data is practically available, in private, state, and federal facilities that offer mental health and substance use programs.*]

10. BHS/OCC should provide the following data, collect additional data and analyze this data to improve service provision at the CDU, and continue to develop programs to meet the diverse needs of individuals who utilize BHS services:
    a. A map/diagram of the entire system of care to demonstrate where the CSU and other programs created by MHSF meet the mandate of the MHSF ordinance to create a seamless system of care.
    b. An evaluation should be undertaken to understand the impact of the CSU on the mental health system of care flow with emphasis on impact to DUCC and PES that includes impact to bed availability on those units and linkage post discharge.
    c. In order to meet the standard of care outlined in MHSF, the CSU must maintain real time bed availability. This will facilitate the referral and linkage of individuals to the CSU by emergency responders and mental health treatment providers.
    d. Prior to the CSU opening performance objectives must be developed and submitted to the IWG for review in order to ensure that the program is aligned with the intent of MHSF in creating a coherent system of care that maximizes efficiency, and ensures accountability to consumers and the community.
    e. Data that must be collected that ensures the program is meeting performance objectives, measures program success and interconnection to the entire system of care includes:

1) Individual length of stay,
2) If a client leaves without linkage to further services or resources the reason why, for example not ready to engage, responsibilities to care for other individuals or pets, fearful, don't want to share a room with a stranger. This data should be collected and evaluated to determine future program design to address expressed needs of consumers. BHS can look to already existing program models to fill treatment gaps identified such partial hospitalization or intensive day treatment programs.
3) If individuals are linked to a residential program, which program
4) If individuals are linked to another community resource such as Hummingbird, navigation center, shelter and which program.
5) Recidivism should be tracked, and for those individuals that return multiple times over the course of a year identify what is preventing them from engaging in treatment post discharge.
6) If individuals are referred to an outpatient treatment clinic, which program. If they are already enrolled in an outpatient program what is the follow up plan with their provider.

[*Specific associated ordinance language: SEC. 15.104. MENTAL HEALTH SF. {13) A 2018 audit of BHS conducted by the San Francisco Budget and Legislative Analyst ("2018 BHS Audit") found that under the then-current system, which was still operative in 2019 BHS does not systematically track waitlist information for mental health and substance use services. Waitlists, when they are maintained, are generally kept by the individual service providers and not aggregated or evaluated by BHS. Because BHS does not compile and track waitlist data in a format that allows for analysis of point-in-time capacity or historical trends, there is limited information about BHS capacity across all mental health and substance use services.*
(16)To remedy many of the problems discussed above, Mental Health SF is intended to create a seamless system of care where no one will fall through the cracks.]

11. Should BHS seek to replicate the CSU model, in keeping with the vision of MHSF to improve equitable access to care, the site should be located in one of the traditionally underserved neighborhoods of the Bayview, Western Addition, Fillmore or Mission.

    [*Specific associated language: Sec.15.104 (5) African-Americans make up just 5% of the City's population, but 35% of the neary 4,000 people experiencing homelessness, mental illness, and substance use disorders. Investments should be targeted to better serve populations not well served by the existing system, and equity must be an organizing principle of any behavioral health initiative.*]

Broader issue areas outside the scope of the MHSF that are directly related to ordinance outcomes.

12. Given the stated intent of the MHSF legislation (see below in italics) it is imperative that the CSU and all programs created by the MHSF ordinance are situated along a spectrum of care with the vision of stabilization and long term housing placement. It is an undisputed fact that individuals require stable permanent housing if they are to effectively engage in healthcare. In 1998 DPH created the Direct Access to Housing Program, expressly to meet the need of unhoused individuals with complex medical needs: co-occurring mental health, substance use disorder and medical needs. As MHSF re-emphasizes this joint charge of DPH and HSH it is imperative that

there be greater coordination and collaboration between both departments and providers of said departments, and reporting to the MHSF Implementation Working Group and the Prop C Oversight Committee. Further, up to this juncture the MHSF programs being created appear to be thus far entirely funded by Prop C. There must therefore be greater coordination in the planning and implementation of new programs between MHSF IWG and OCOH oversight committee. As such it is necessary that a joint meeting be scheduled between the two bodies as soon as possible.
[*Specific associated* ordinance language: *SEC. 15.104. MENTAL HEALTH SF. (3) According to the City's Point-in-Time Count conducted in January 2019, there are about 8,000 people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco on any given night. But over the course of an entire year, many more people experience homelessness. According to the Department's records, in Fiscal Year 2018-2019, the Department and/or the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH") served about 18,000 people experiencing homelessness. Of those 18,000 people, 4,000 have a history of both mental health and substance use disorders. (4) These 4, 000 people are in critical need of help, as evidenced by their high use of urgent and emergency psychiatric services. They have the highest level of service needs and vulnerability, and require specialized solutions in order to reach stability and wellness. The Department and HSH agree that people experiencing homelessness with both mental health and substance use disorders are the most vulnerable members of our community and require immediate attention and care coordination. (15) To stop the cycle of people going from residential treatment programs back to the street, the City must create additional long-term housing options, including cooperative living opportunities and permanent supportive housing (or people living with mental illness and/or substance use. Studies have shown that providing patients with long-term housing options dramatically reduces substance use relapse and supports patients through continued recovery.]*

13. The IWG asks our local and state elected officials, in collaboration with DPH, to strongly consider re-initiating statewide legislation to reform existing state policy to expand Medi-Cal coverage for acute mental health crisis treatment beyond 23 hours. Mental health crisis cannot be stabilized within 23 hours and there are inadequate inpatient beds to meet the current needs necessitating longer stays in emergency units for stabilization and inpatient placement.

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: BART Election for District 8 - City and County of San Francisco
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 10:33:00 AM
Attachments:	image001.png Letter to City and County of San Francisco BOS Re Consolidation 06 16 2022.pdf
Importance:	High

From: April Quintanilla <AAndra2@bart.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 4:23 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: April Quintanilla <AAndra2@bart.gov>
Subject: BART Election for District 8 - City and County of San Francisco
Importance: High

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

Good Afternoon Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Attached please find a letter regarding San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District's (BART) request for consolidation with the General Election on November 8, 2022, for District 8. The original letter with enclosures will be mailed to you via certified mail.

Please contact me with any questions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

April B. A. Quintanilla, J.D.
Assistant District Secretary
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)
2150 Webster Street, 10th floor, Office 1004 | Oakland, CA 94612
P.O. Box 12688 | Oakland, CA 94604-2688
510.464.6082 office | 510.529.9785 cell
aandra2@bart.gov

BART OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT SECRETARY

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
2150 Webster Street, P.O. Box 12688
Oakland, CA 94604-2688
(510) 464-6000

2022

Rebecca Saltzman
PRESIDENT

Janice Li
VICE PRESIDENT

Robert Powers
GENERAL MANAGER

DIRECTORS

Debora Allen
1ST DISTRICT

Mark Foley
2ND DISTRICT

Rebecca Saltzman
3RD DISTRICT

Robert Raburn, Ph.D.
4TH DISTRICT

John McPartland
5TH DISTRICT

Elizabeth Ames
6TH DISTRICT

Lateefah Simon
7TH DISTRICT

Janice Li
8TH DISTRICT

Bevan Dufty
9TH DISTRICT

June 16, 2022

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

Dear Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

The purpose of this letter is to request that the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors consolidate the election for the Director's seat in District 8 of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District with the General Election of November 8, 2022.

The incumbent for District 8 is Janice Li.

Enclosed is Resolution No. 5518 adopted by the Board of Directors requesting consolidation of the District elections with the November 8, 2022, General Election.

Please contact me at (510) 464-6082 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

April B. A. Quintanilla
Acting District Secretary

Enclosures: Resolution Nos. 5518 and 4652

BEFORE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Resolution of the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District requesting the Boards of Supervisors of Alameda County, Contra Costa County, and the City and County of San Francisco to provide for the consolidation of a District election, electing members of the Board of Directors, with the State of California general election, to be held on November 8, 2022 /

Resolution No. 5518

WHEREAS, Section 28746.6 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California provides:

"A general district election for the election of directors whose terms are to expire in that year shall be held and conducted on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each even-numbered year and shall be consolidated, where possible, with the general election held on that date"; and

WHEREAS, Section 28746.8 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California provides:

"Except as otherwise provided in this article, candidates for the board shall be nominated, the election held and conducted, and the ballots canvassed in accordance with the provisions of the Uniform District Election Law"; and

WHEREAS, Section 28747.2 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California provides:

"A candidate for election from any of the election districts shall be nominated and elected by the voters residing within the election district from which he is elected"; and

WHEREAS, Section 28747.4 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California in part provides:

"The county elections official of each county within the boundaries of the district shall conduct the election and canvass the returns for those election districts or portions of election districts which are within the county of his or her jurisdiction as county elections official. After the official canvass has been taken, the county elections official shall report the returns, by election district number, to the board"; and

WHEREAS, a State of California general election will be held on Tuesday, November 8, 2022; and

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
CERTIFIED A TRUE COPY

April B. A. Quintanilla
Acting District Secretary

Adopted: May 26, 2022

5518



WHEREAS, the California State Legislature has established nine election districts within the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District as provided in Section 28745 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 10522 of the Elections Code and 28750.4 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California, the District has filed with the county elections official of each affected County a certified copy of Resolution No. 5509 of the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District which provides a map showing the boundaries of the District and the boundaries of the election districts and maps of the election districts prepared in accordance with Article 2.4 of Chapter 3 of Part 2 of Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, the territory in which said election is to be held is, to wit, all of the territory of said Districts Nos. 2, 4, 6, and 8 lying within the County of Alameda, the County of Contra Costa, and the City and County of San Francisco (hereinafter called the "Counties");

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, as follows:

Section 1.

That the Boards of Supervisors of the Counties are hereby requested to order the consolidation of said District elections with said State of California general election, which will be held on Tuesday, November 8, 2022, and to further provide that within the territory affected by said order of consolidation, to wit, the Counties, that except as otherwise provided in Article 2.2 of Chapter 3 of Part 2 of Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California, the election shall be held and conducted and the ballots canvassed in accordance with the provisions of said Uniform District Election Law.

Section 2.

That the Secretary of the District is hereby authorized and directed to certify the due adoption of this resolution and to file copies hereof, so certified, with the Board of Supervisors and with the county elections official of each of the Counties.

# # #

5518

BEFORE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Resolution of the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Establishing the District Rules Governing Candidates' Statement of Qualifications for District Elections /

Resolution No. 4652

WHEREAS, Section 13307 of the Elections Code of the State of California provides, among other things, that candidates for District office may prepare a candidate's Statement of Qualifications of up to 200 words; the Board may authorize an increase in the limitation on words for the statement from 200 to 400 words; the Board may require each candidate filing a statement to pay in advance his or her estimated pro rata share of the total cost of producing and mailing the candidate's statement; and that, before the nomination period opens, the Board shall determine whether a charge shall be levied against that candidate for the candidate's statement, and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to adopt rules governing candidates' Statements of Qualifications for District elections.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, as follows:

1. Each candidate for the BART Board of Directors who prepares a candidate's Statement of Qualifications pursuant to California Elections Code Section 13307 shall be required to pay a total election fee of $750 at the time of filing as part of the cost to the District of printing, handling, translating, and mailing the candidate's statement, including the cost of foreign language translations.

2. The limit on the length of the candidate's Statement of Qualifications shall be 200 words.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District Secretary is authorized to adopt procedures consistent with Section 13309 of the Elections Code for relieving indigent candidates from paying the requisite fee; and

Adopted March 27, 1997

465

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that each candidate filing as a candidate for BART Director must complete the State of California Fair Political Practices Commission's disclosure form entitled: "Statement of Economic Interests" and to file said form with the District Secretary of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provisions of this resolution shall govern the 1998 election and all subsequent elections for the District's Board of Directors unless otherwise modified by this Board.

Supersedes Resolution No. 4622, adopted June 27, 1996.

# # #

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	CA Fish and Game Commission Notice
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 2:03:00 PM
Attachments:	CA Fish and Game Commission Notice.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached a notice from the CA Fish and Game Commission regarding a proposed 90-day extension of Emergency Regulations.

Sincerely,

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

Commissioners
Samantha Murray, President
Del Mar
Erika Zavaleta, Vice President
Santa Cruz
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Eric Sklar, Member
Saint Helena
Vacant, Member

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission

Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

www.fgc.ca.gov

June 16, 2022

NOTICE OF PROPOSED 90-DAY EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY REGULATIONS

Recreational Sub-Bag Limits for Vermilion, Copper and Quillback Rockfishes

Pursuant to the requirements of Government Code Section 11346.1, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) is providing notice of proposed emergency action with regard to the above-entitled emergency regulation.

SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS

Government Code Section 11346.1 subdivision (a)(2) requires that, at least five working days prior to submission of the proposed emergency action to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the adopting agency provide a notice of the proposed emergency action to every person who has filed a request for notice of regulatory action with the agency. After submission of the proposed emergency to OAL, OAL shall allow interested persons five calendar days to submit comments on the proposed emergency regulations as set forth in Government Code Section 11349.6.

Any interested person may present statements, arguments, or contentions, in writing, submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail, relevant to the proposed emergency regulatory action. Written comments submitted via U.S. mail or e-mail must be received at OAL within five days after the Commission submits the emergency regulations to OAL for review.

Please reference submitted comments as regarding “Emergency Regulations: Recreational Sub-Bag Limits for Vermilion, Copper and Quillback Rockfishes,” addressed to:

Reference Attorney
Office of Administrative Law
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mail: staff@oal.ca.gov
Fax No.: 916-323-6826

California Fish and Game Commission
Attn: Sherrie Fonbuena
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

Email: fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Fax No.: n/a

The Commission anticipates it will submit the rulemaking to OAL between June 23 and June 27, 2022. For the status of the Commission's submittal to OAL for review, and the end of the five-day written submittal period, please consult OAL's website at http://www.oal.ca.gov under the heading “Emergency Regulations.”

CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION
FINDING OF EMERGENCY AND
STATEMENT OF PROPOSED EMERGENCY REGULATORY ACTION

Re-adoption of Emergency Action to
Amend Section 28.55
Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR)
Re: Recreational Sub-Bag Limits for Vermilion, Copper and Quillback Rockfishes

Date of Statement: May 19, 2022

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14, California Code of Regulations.

I. Emergency Regulations in Effect to Date

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) approved an emergency rulemaking amending Section 28.55 that became effective January 6, 2022. The emergency rulemaking reduced the vermilion rockfish (*Sebastes miniatus*) sub-bag limit within the daily 10-fish Rockfish, Cabezon, and Greenling (RCG) complex bag and possession limit from five to four fish, added a sub-bag limit for quillback rockfish (*Sebastes maliger*) of one fish within the daily 10-fish RCG bag and possession limit, and added a sub-bag limit for copper rockfish (*Sebastes caurinus*) of one fish within the daily 10-fish RCG bag and possession limit.

The rule was adopted in response to new information obtained in in 2021 which indicated significant declines in some rockfish stocks off California. On November 21, 2021, the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) recommended precautionary changes to reduce the then-current sub-bag limit for vermilion rockfish, and to implement new sub-bag limits for both quillback rockfish and copper rockfish, which went into effect in federal regulation on January 1, 2022. The objective of the emergency amendment was to adjust the sub-bag limits for these species to ensure the state regulations are consistent with PFMC recommendations and federal regulations.

II. Request for Approval of Re-adoption of Emergency Regulations

The current emergency rule, Section 28.55, will expire on July 6, 2022 unless it is readopted for an additional 90 days.

The Commission regularly adopts recreational groundfish fishing regulations for consistency with federal regulations. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) staff are currently developing such a regular rulemaking to adopt new management measures for groundfish species under joint federal/state management authority, and associated state managed species, that are congruent with PFMC actions. The regular rulemaking is set to be heard by the Commission at its June 15-16, 2022 meeting, and will incorporate the sub-bag limits currently addressed by the emergency rule.

In order to obtain the necessary information to inform that rulemaking and protect resources while it is promulgated, the current emergency rule will need to be extended.

III. Statement of Facts Constituting the Need for Re-adoption of Regulatory Action

Prior Commission Actions

On December 15, 2021, the Commission adopted the following emergency regulations amending Section 28.55 related to bag and possession limits for vermilion rockfish, quillback rockfish, and copper rockfish.

Emergency Regulations

- Amend subsection 28.55(b)(2)
    - Reduce the vermilion rockfish sub-bag limit within the daily 10-fish RCG bag and possession limit from five to four.
        - Recent vermilion rockfish catches have substantially exceeded federal guidelines, leading to the PFMC's recommendation to reduce the bag limit in 2022.
- Amend subsection 28.55(b)(3)
    - Add new subsection 28.55(b)(3) to include a sub-bag limit for quillback rockfish of one fish within the daily 10-fish RCG bag and possession limit.
        - New science suggests this stock is severely depleted off California, and reductions in catch are needed, leading to the PFMC's recommendation to reduce the bag limit in 2022.
- Add subsection 28.55(b)(4)
    - Add new subsection 28.55(b)(4) to include a sub-bag limit for copper rockfish of one fish within the daily 10-fish RCG bag and possession limit.
        - New science suggests this stock is severely depleted off California, and reductions in catch are needed, leading to the PFMC's recommendation to reduce the bag limit in 2022.
- Re-number subsection 28.55(b)(3) to (b)(5)
    - Re-number subsection 28.55(b)(3) for the Cowcod Conservation Area limit on slope rockfish to be 28.55(b)(5) to accommodate the above additions of subsections 28.55(b)(3) and (4).

Existence of an Emergency and Need for Immediate Action

Presently, the Commission considered the following factors in determining that an emergency does exist at this time:

The magnitude of potential harm:

The recreational groundfish fisheries are important ecological, cultural, and recreational resources in the State of California. It is important to have consistent state and federal regulations establishing harvest limits, season dates, depth constraints and other management measures, and it is also important that the state and federal regulations be effective concurrently. Inconsistency in state and federal rules hinders enforcement, increases angler confusion, and precludes a comprehensive approach to resource

management. Consistency with federal regulations is also necessary to maintain state authority over its recreational groundfish fishery and avoid federal preemption of management.

The existence of a crisis situation:

Emergency action is necessary now for conformance to PFMC actions and federal law and to increase protection of the stocks from catch levels that current information indicates are higher than can be sustainably supported.

The immediacy of the need:

The Commission routinely adopts regulations for recreational groundfish for consistency with federal regulations. On November 21, 2021, the PFMC approved recommended in-season adjustments to the recreational groundfish fisheries off California. The federal regulations adjusting the sub-bag limits for quillback rockfish, copper rockfish, and vermilion rockfish became effective on January 1, 2022.

Whether the anticipation of harm has a basis firmer than simple speculation:

PFMC action on November 21, 2021 recommended in-season adjustments to the recreational groundfish fisheries off California based on new stock assessment information and landings data indicating that recent and then-current harvest levels were higher than can be sustainably supported. While further assessment is needed to better understand the stock status, this new information is currently the best, readily available science. Regulations from the National Marine Fisheries Service became effective on January 1, 2022. If the Commission does not take conforming action, inconsistent state and federal regulations will lead to angler confusion and difficulty in enforcement. Furthermore, under federal law inconsistent state management schemes may lead to extension of federal jurisdiction into state waters. (16 U.S.C. subdivision 1856(b).)

V. Readoption Criteria

1) Same as or Substantially Equivalent

Pursuant to Government Code subdivision 11346.1(h), a readoption may be approved only if the text is “the same as or substantially equivalent to an emergency regulation previously adopted by that agency.” The language proposed for this rulemaking is the same as the language of the original emergency regulation.

2) Substantial Progress

Government Code subdivision 11346.1(h) specifies “Readoption shall be permitted only if the agency has made substantial progress and proceeded with diligence to comply with subdivision (e)” [sections 11346.2 through 11347.3, inclusive].

A rulemaking in compliance with these sections (certificate of compliance) is currently underway and is scheduled to be presented to the Commission for public notice in June of 2022.

Proposed Action by the Commission

The Commission proposes the readoption of amendments to Section 28.55 that is the same as previously effective.

IV. Impact of Regulatory Action

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

The Commission anticipates that there will be costs to the state, specifically the Department. Program implementation costs are estimated to be $20,484 over the proposed 90-day extension of the emergency regulation period. These additional costs will be absorbed within existing Department budgets. No effects on federal funding to the state are anticipated.

(b) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.

(c) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None***.***

(d) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.

(e) Effect on Housing Costs: None***.***

V. Technical, Theoretical, and/or Empirical Studies, Reports, or Documents Relied Upon:

Letter from Charles A. Tracy, Executive Director of Pacific Fishery Management Council to Barry Thom, Regional Administrator of National Marine Fisheries Service, West Coast Region RE: Council Recommendation for Groundfish Inseason Action in November 2021

- Tables 3-5 on page 2 describe the recommended 2022 management for quillback, copper, and vermilion/ sunset rockfish off California.

VI. Authority and Reference

Authority cited: Sections 200, 205, 265, 399, 702, 7071 and 8587.1, Fish and Game Code. Reference: Sections 200, 205, 265, 399, 1802, 7071 and 8585.5, Fish and Game Code; 50 CFR Part 660, Subpart G; and 14 CCR 27.20.

VII. Fish and Game Code Section 399 Finding

In accordance with Section 399 of the Fish and Game Code, the Commission finds that re-adopting this regulation is necessary for the immediate conservation, preservation or protection of birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, or reptiles, including, but not limited to, their nests or eggs, and for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, or general welfare to ensure conformance with federal laws.

Informative Digest (Policy Statement Overview)

Existence of an Emergency and Need for Immediate Action

On December 16, 2021, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) approved an emergency rulemaking, amending Section 28.55, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), that became effective January 6, 2022. The December 2021 emergency action reduced the then-current vermilion rockfish sub-bag limit from 5 fish to 4 fish within the daily 10-fish Rockfish, Cabezon, and Greenling (RCG) bag and possession limit and implemented new sub-bag limits of 1 fish for both quillback rockfish and copper rockfish within the daily 10-fish RCG bag and possession limit. The emergency was necessary for consistency with Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) actions and federal regulations.

New stock assessment information and landings data in 2021 indicated significant declines in some rockfish stocks off California. On November 21, 2021, PFMC approved recommended in-season adjustments to the recreational groundfish fisheries off California. The federal regulations adjusting the sub-bag limits for quillback rockfish, copper rockfish, and vermilion rockfish went into effect January 1, 2022.

Proposed Regulations

The proposed readoption would extend the emergency regulation in Section 28.55, Title 14, CCR. The emergency rule is due to expire on July 6, 2022 if a readoption is not filed. A readoption is necessary to ensure that resources are protected while the Department of Fish and Wildlife develops its biennial groundfish rulemaking to adopt new management measures for groundfish species under joint federal/state management authority, and associated state managed species, that are congruent with PFMC actions.

Benefits of the Proposed Regulations

The benefits of the proposed regulations are consistency with federal regulations, sustainable management of groundfish resources and promotion of businesses that rely on recreational groundfish fishing.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

The proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Legislature has delegated authority to the Commission to adopt recreational fishing regulations (Fish and Game Code, sections 200 and 205). The proposed regulations are consistent with the Commission’s regulations in Title 14, CCR. Commission staff has searched the California Code of Regulations and has found no other state regulations related to the take of groundfish.

BOS-11



Request for City Services - Clerk of the Board

Enter Personal Details > Enter Service Request Details > Review & Submit > Attach Photo(s) / File(s) > **Print & Track**

Successfully Submitted

Thank you for your submission. You will receive an email confirmation with a link to follow the progress of your submission.

If you have any additional requests or questions, you can call us 7 days a week, 24 hours a day at 311 (for calls outside of San Francisco please dial 415-701-2311).

Your Tracking Number is: 15477895
Jun 20 2022 4:57PM
Please print a copy for your records. You may close your browser when done.

Location Information:

Location Description: The entire city

Request Details:

Category: Complaint
Department: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Sub-Division: Clerk of the Board

Additional Information:

Additional Request Details: Hosting a parade for the warriors on a Monday is a poorly thought out and a terrible idea. Whoever approved this should be aware they have caused excessivly bad traffic around the whole city on a work day. This is an event that should have been done on on the weekend so people could be given the opportunity to plan for or avoid the event. Causing traffic and delays on this scale has made it extremely difficult for many essential services and workers to function. Plan better next time please.

Customer Contact Information:

First Name: Spencer
Last Name: winston
Primary Phone: 6197727424
Alternate Phone:
Address Number:
Street Name:
City, State: ,
ZIP Code:
Email: swinston1989@gmail.com

Customer requested to be contacted by the department servicing their request:

BACK OFFICE USE ONLY **********

Source Agency Request Number:

Responsible Agency Request Number:

Service Request Work Status:

Work Status Updated:

Print

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: RE City Ordinance 232-21 - Behested Payments
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 4:48:00 PM
Attachments:	SPWG-CYF Memo RE City Ordinance 232-21-Behested Payments.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Service Provider's Working Group for the Children and Youth Fund regarding File No. 201132.

File No. 201132 - Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code - Behested Payments

Sincerely,

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

From: Service Provider's Working Group CYF SF <sf.spwg.cyf@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 4:58 PM
Subject: RE City Ordinance 232-21 - Behested Payments

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

Dear Supervisor,

Hope this message finds you in the best of health. In reference to City Ordinance 232-21, the Service Provider's Working Group (SPWG) for the Children and Youth Fund (CYF) requests your attention to address its unintended implications which recently became a cause for concern to CBOs, due to an interpretation alternative to the intent of the ordinance. Please find attached a memo outlining our position along with requested actions to find resolution on this matter.

Please let us know if you have any questions or comments. We also welcome an opportunity to speak with you on this matter, virtually or in-person.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Best Regards,

SPWG-CYF

Date: 6/8/2022

To: David Chiu, San Francisco City Attorney

Cc: Board of Supervisors

Cc: Ethics Commission

From: Service Provider Working Group (SPWG)

Re: City Ordinance 232-21 - Behested Payments

Service Providers Working Group:

The Service Providers Working Group (SPWG) is made up of 70+ nonprofits serving youth and families in the City of San Francisco. Our primary goal is to elevate the needs of the youth and families we serve and to advocate on behalf of the organizations that serve them.

The following coalitions support this letter:

Juvenile Justice Providers Association (JJPA), MoMAGIC, BMAGIC, Budget Justice Coalition (BJC), San Francisco Human Services Network (HSN), Family Resource Center Alliance (FRC Alliance), Neighborhood Centers Together (NCT)

Overview:

The purpose of this memo is to request official clarification on the application of City Ordinance 232-21 in a manner that allows for City department officials to continue to raise funds for nonprofits by soliciting 'behested payments'. The official communication should also explain when City department officials are permitted to solicit from non-profit and private entities in the context of grants for City programs. Although we appreciate the decision to allow DCYF to receive and disburse Summer Together Funds, it is not sustainable to operate from a case-by-case basis regarding the interpretation of this legislation in order for departments to get approval to support fundraising efforts for nonprofits in the future.

Background:

The nonprofit sector of San Francisco relies heavily on City funding along with philanthropic funds to function and provide much-needed services to the City's residents. This is especially true for smaller nonprofits, which are more likely to be led by and serve BIPOC individuals, that often do not have the capaCity to raise funds on their own and therefore rely more heavily on City funding. Often, due to budgeting and allocation constraints, department heads and department officials solicit philanthropic funding for programs and services provided by their

respective departments to fill funding gaps without seeking and receiving personal benefits and/or favors. For example, at the height of the pandemic private philanthropy was able to provide unrestricted funds to youth-serving nonprofits through the Department of Children Youth and Their Families to address the heightened needs of our most vulnerable communities, in particular our Black and Brown families, through the 2021 Summer Together Initiative.

As it stands now, department officials have interpreted the ordinance to imply that they can no longer solicit for philanthropic funds in many cases and will be held liable, in civil or criminal court, if they do so. In order to determine compliance with the Ordinance, department officials must conduct a rigorous approval process on a case-by-case basis, exemplified by the exception made for the 2022 Summer Together Initiative funds. The vague interpretation of the ordinance could deter philanthropy from providing this type of assistance in the future due to the added layers of bureaucracy and uncertainty. The unintended implications of the ordinance have far-reaching consequences for the nonprofit sector, service delivery in the City, and a direct negative impact on the well-being of the City's residents, especially those that need them the most.

Additionally, this raises concerns for nonprofit representatives that serve on City Boards and Commissions. The ordinance also threatens them with liability and jeopardizes their ability to do their jobs in support of their organization. There needs to be clear guidance for nonprofit representatives serving on City Boards and Commission on what activities are permissible/impermissible as they balance the needs of their nonprofit with their City responsibilities.

Actions Requested:

- Official written clarification/a formal statement of interpretation of Ordinance 232-21 that allows for City/department officials to solicit and receive behested payments from non-City partners, including non-profit community benefits organizations and foundations and also to solicit behested payments to such entities.

- Provide explicit examples of cases that are allowable and not allowable under this legislation (this could be modeled similar to "Political Activity by City Officers and Employees" memo from the City Attorney's Office).

- Provide clear guidance for nonprofit representatives serving on City Boards and Commission on what activities are permissible/impermissible.

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Opposition to Fourplexes legislation from SF YIMBY
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 11:08:00 AM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY 6-14-22 Letter.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication regarding File No. 210866.

> **File No. 210866** - Planning, Administrative, Subdivision Codes; Zoning Map - Density Exception in Residential Districts

Sincerely,

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

From: Laura Foote <laura@yimbyaction.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 2:08 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Cc: wpfrankel@gmail.com; Rafa Sonnenfeld <rafa@yimbylaw.org>
Subject: Opposition to Fourplexes legislation from SF YIMBY

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please find our letter of opposition to the Fourplexes legislation.

Best,
Laura

Laura Foote
Executive Director
She/her
415-489-0197



SF YIMBY

Yes to People. Yes to Housing.
sfyimby.org

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA

June 14, 2022

Opposition to fake "fourplex" legislation

Dear Supervisors,

Today, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors considers two pieces of legislation that make it harder to ensure that everyone can have a home in San Francisco. What started as a win-win, capturing the enthusiasm voters have expressed for building a more inclusive city - a city in which homeowners could be empowered to build housing and help bring down rents - has become a legislative Frankenstein's monster.

It is with a heavy heart that we must oppose something being labeled as "legalizing fourplexes and more" in San Francisco, but the negotiation process has created a piece of legislation that no longer represents progress on housing. In fact, this Fake Fourplex legislation represents a step backwards, undermining state progress on legalizing duplexes. Lipstick on a pig is a generous metaphor for legislation that is watered down with onerous restrictions, including discretionary review requirements that give NIMBY interests the power to block any homes they don't like. As a result, the current proposal would actually be a step-back from California's Senate Bill 9, which sought to enable every single family homeowner throughout the state to split their lot into smaller, more affordable homes. Don't let false advertising gaslight you

about this legislation: it would make it harder, not easier, to convert single family lots into multifamily housing.

This faux upzoning is being used to justify a ban on new efficiency housing, which is often one of the only affordable options for low income renters, in Chinatown and the Tenderloin — two of the neighborhoods where deeply affordable housing units are most crucially needed. At a time when many San Francisco offices remain largely vacant, this legislation would decapitate the most cost-effective way to convert many of those buildings into much-needed housing.

This change will also result in San Francisco being in even hotter water with the state department of Housing and Community Development, who will be reviewing the city's Housing Element, required under state law, as a component of the city's general plan. HCD has already questioned the legality of the Board of Supervisors rejecting a 316-room, group housing project on O'Farrell Street, in the Tenderloin. This move by the city would make projects like this one illegal in Chinatown and throughout the Tenderloin. With only a fraction of approved housing projects being buildable, when a feasible option to build group housing is taken off the table, the city will have an even harder time meeting its obligations to produce housing.

This kind of downzoning proposal would be illegal under California's Senate Bill 330 but for the decision to attach it to the Fake Fourplexes legislation, which is an upzoning in name only.[1] We predict that this scheme will not pass the smell test with

[1] Group Housing may be built at a greater density than Dwelling Units. (Compare S.F. Planning Code, § 249.5, subd. (c)(4) [permitting one dwelling unit for each 125 square feet of lot area] with (c)(9) [incorporating density standards in § 209.3 that permit one group housing bedroom for every 70 square feet of lot area].) Group Housing is also subject to reduced Code requirements for open space (id. § 135, subd. (d)(2)) and exposure (id. § 140, subd. (b)).

the California Department of Housing and Community Development. It will likely be investigated by the State Attorney General and the Housing Accountability Unit.

Our Board of Supervisors must stop getting in the way of an affordable, sustainable, and inclusive San Francisco. They have a compliant housing element and zoned capacity for a minimum of 82,069 new housing units due on January 31, 2023.

The voters are telling us loud and clear that they want real action on housing. We applaud Supervisor Mandelman for putting forward legislation that could have done that; we're disappointed, but not surprised, that some of his colleagues could not support straightforward housing policy to make our city better. This legislation is worse than rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic: it has become a genuine step backwards for housing.

Please do not approve this Fake Fourplex legislation.

Best regards,

Will Frankel
Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Rafa Sonnenfeld
Director of Legal Advocacy, YIMBY Law

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: URGENT: Petition to Resolve Child Safety Concerns from Construction/Storage Expansion
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 10:37:00 AM

From: Ben Seisdedos <ben.seisdedos@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 3:36 PM
To: Summerville, Peter (ADM) <peter.summerville@sfgov.org>; Corvino, Denise (HSA) <denise.corvino@sfgov.org>; Mezquita, Ingrid (HSA) <ingrid.mezquita@sfgov.org>; Rovetti, Richard (ADM) <richard.rovetti@sfgov.org>; TIDA, (ADM) <tida@sfgov.org>; Beck, Bob (ADM) <bob.beck@sfgov.org>; Nella Goncalves <ngoncalves@onetreasureisland.org>; dstone@jsco.net; Haneystaff (BOS) <haneystaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lu, Susan (HSA) <susan.lu@sfgov.org>; Ellen Hammerle <ehammerle@catholiccharitiessf.org>; DPH-Ebrown <Ebrown@catholiccharitiessf.org>; dcartahena@catholiccharitiessf.org
Cc: Kathie Autumn <KAutumn@catholiccharitiessf.org>
Subject: URGENT: Petition to Resolve Child Safety Concerns from Construction/Storage Expansion

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

To whom it may concern:

I am reaching out to you today on behalf of a collection of concerned parents, caregivers, and teachers with regards to the substantial changes outside the Treasure Island Child Development Center at 850 Avenue D on Treasure Island. We are petitioning those with the ability to make a change and improve child safety to take action.

The issue began earlier this year with the expansion of the neighboring storage facility into the parking lot and grassy area that previously was used by Catholic Charities staff and parents for parking, and gave a buffer for the Center. As it currently stands, that open area has been replaced by a wall of shipping containers approximately 10-12 feet tall.

We request that commercial vehicle traffic bypass the entrance area of TICDC using alternative routes during drop-off and pick-up times, and one-way traffic be strictly enforced to reduce the risk of an avoidable tragedy.

These changes have caused reason for multiple concerns, including:

- Reckless driving of moving trucks that come through the now narrowed road that causes risk to children and parents getting in and out of cars as well as to pedestrians at the entrance street
- Large moving trucks (from Pure Moving and Hauling Moses) and other vehicles driving the

wrong direction on the road almost every day

- the impact on feeling of security and general mental impact it has on my child to be surrounded by big trucks and a wall of shipping containers
- The impact this same thing has on the teachers, staff and the fact that this is going to impact the center (which is already low on staff) from recruiting/hiring more teachers
- The ability to pick up and drop off my child in a timely manner when on my way to commute for work (see attached image of a parent's vehicle blocked in by trucks)
- Exhaust smoke near the building and outdoor toddler yard where kids are planing (some of whom already have lung conditions)
- Occurrences of swearing, loud music, and smoking of marijuiana and cigarettes now happening steps from the building and toddler play yard

Furthermore, as parents we were not notified of any changes or potential for construction. While as a Treasure Island resident I am aware that construction is inevitable and will continue—but to TIDA's credit I have also seen that when safety concerns are raised, there can be ways to accommodate. (For example: About 2 years ago a new cement pedestrian pathway was added that helped connect residents on the front of the island to the TICDC when the sidewalk was removed from 9th street due to development needs). I personally have witnessed many unsafe situations with large vehicles near the children multiple times as well as the inability for cars to exit due to being blocked in by larger trucks and the large trucks driving the wrong way down the now one way exit.

Attached you will find the signatures of over 30 community members for this issue, as well as photos demonstrating how close these trucks are and trucks driving the wrong way.

Respectfully,
Ben Seisdedos - on behalf of concerned community members impacted by the changes.

--


1PURE
MOVING
company
Catholic
Charities
Treasure Island Child
Developmental Center
850






1PURE
MOVING
company
Catholic
Charities
Treasure Island Child
Developmental Center
1PURE
MOVING
company

PETITION

To the San Francisco Treasure Island Development Authority:

We, the undersigned residents of Treasure Island and parents of children attending the Treasure Island Child Development Center at 850 Avenue D, San Francisco; petition the TIDA Board and ask that safety concerns for children, caregivers and families be heeded and restrict the frequent, dangerous vehicle traffic immediately in front of the Child Development Center.

The issue began earlier this year with the expansion of the neighboring storage facility into the parking lot and grassy area that previously was used by Catholic Charities staff and parents for parking, and gave a buffer for the Center. As it currently stands, that open area has been replaced by a wall of shipping containers approximately 12 feet tall.

The area for drop off and pickup has been dramatically narrowed, while the space is now being trafficked by construction vehicles and patrons of the storage company. These vehicles are consistently going against the direction of traffic and causing a constant risk of serious injury or worse in this new corridor where kids get dropped off, and big trucks enter and exit. The new 12' wall of metal shipping containers means there's nowhere for these vehicles to go to avoid a head-on collision aside from the sidewalk where children are entering and exiting the development center. This is unacceptable and we insist the traffic flow be enforced.

We request that commercial vehicle traffic bypass the entrance area of TICDC using alternative routes during dropoff and pickup areas, and one-way traffic be strictly enforced to reduce the risk of an avoidable tragedy.

The contact person for this petition is Ben Seisdedos, reachable at ben.seisdedos@gmail.com

	NAME	TI CDC CLASSROOM	SIGNATURE
1	Janie Romero	TODDLER	Jan R
2	Yanteng Xiong		Yanteng Xiang
3	Alina Redd		Alina Redd
4	Makhzuna Y.	TODDLER	
5	EKATERINA MOKLOKOVA	TODDLER	
6	Natalya Cakir	Todoler	
7	Natalia Wardecky	Toddler	
8	Elizabeth López	Toddler	Elizabeth.
9	Lidvina perez		
10	Rungiao Tan	Preschool	Rungiao Tan

PETITION

To the San Francisco Treasure Island Development Authority:

We, the undersigned residents of Treasure Island and parents of children attending the Treasure Island Child Development Center at 850 Avenue D, San Francisco; petition the TIDA Board and ask that safety concerns for children, caregivers and families be heeded and restrict the frequent, dangerous vehicle traffic immediately in front of the Child Development Center.

The issue began earlier this year with the expansion of the neighboring storage facility into the parking lot and grassy area that previously was used by Catholic Charities staff and parents for parking, and gave a buffer for the Center. As it currently stands, that open area has been replaced by a wall of shipping containers approximately 12 feet tall.

The area for drop off and pickup has been dramatically narrowed, while the space is now being trafficked by construction vehicles and patrons of the storage company. These vehicles are consistently going against the direction of traffic and causing a constant risk of serious injury or worse in this new corridor where kids get dropped off, and big trucks enter and exit. The new 12' wall of metal shipping containers means there's nowhere for these vehicles to go to avoid a head-on collision aside from the sidewalk where children are entering and exiting the development center. This is unacceptable and we insist the traffic flow be enforced.

We request that commercial vehicle traffic bypass the entrance area of TICDC using alternative routes during dropoff and pickup areas, and one-way traffic be strictly enforced to reduce the risk of an avoidable tragedy.

The contact person for this petition is Ben Seisdedos, reachable at ben.seisdedos@gmail.com

	NAME	TI CDC CLASSROOM	SIGNATURE
1	Afokwase Editor	Pre-School	Editor.
2	Gil Vera	Pre-school	
3	Clement Gabriel	Pre-School	
4	Deniz Reynoso	Pre. School	
5	ELENA CHERNOV		
6	Mayra Perez		
7	Felicia Foste		
8	Kathie Autumn		
9			Erkan Cakir
10	TIMOTHY MCCAIN	PRESchool	

PETITION

To the San Francisco Treasure Island Development Authority:

We, the undersigned residents of Treasure Island and parents of children attending the Treasure Island Child Development Center at 850 Avenue D, San Francisco; petition the TIDA Board and ask that safety concerns for children, caregivers and families be heeded and restrict the frequent, dangerous vehicle traffic immediately in front of the Child Development Center.

The issue began earlier this year with the expansion of the neighboring storage facility into the parking lot and grassy area that previously was used by Catholic Charities staff and parents for parking, and gave a buffer for the Center. As it currently stands, that open area has been replaced by a wall of shipping containers approximately 12 feet tall.

The area for drop off and pickup has been dramatically narrowed, while the space is now being trafficked by construction vehicles and patrons of the storage company. These vehicles are consistently going against the direction of traffic and causing a constant risk of serious injury or worse in this new corridor where kids get dropped off, and big trucks enter and exit. The new 12' wall of metal shipping containers means there's nowhere for these vehicles to go to avoid a head-on collision aside from the sidewalk where children are entering and exiting the development center. This is unacceptable and we insist the traffic flow be enforced.

We request that commercial vehicle traffic bypass the entrance area of TICDC using alternative routes during dropoff and pickup areas, and one-way traffic be strictly enforced to reduce the risk of an avoidable tragedy.

The contact person for this petition is Ben Seisdedos, reachable at ben.seisdedos@gmail.com

	NAME	TI CDC CLASSROOM	SIGNATURE
1	BRUNO Wanderley	Toddler	
2	LeChell Redd	Toddler	
3	SERGEI GORKHOVSKI	Toddler	
4	Lechae Redd		
5	RICARDO ORISPE		
6	MILAGROS CESPEDES		
7	JENNY TRAN	PRESCHOOL	
8	BEN SEISDEDOS	TODDLER	
9	Amanda Scharpf	Preschool	
10			

PETITION

To the San Francisco Treasure Island Development Authority:

We, the undersigned residents of Treasure Island and parents of children attending the Treasure Island Child Development Center at 850 Avenue D, San Francisco; petition the TIDA Board and ask that safety concerns for children, caregivers and families be heeded and restrict the frequent, dangerous vehicle traffic immediately in front of the Child Development Center.

The issue began earlier this year with the expansion of the neighboring storage facility into the parking lot and grassy area that previously was used by Catholic Charities staff and parents for parking, and gave a buffer for the Center. As it currently stands, that open area has been replaced by a wall of shipping containers approximately 12 feet tall.

The area for drop off and pickup has been dramatically narrowed, while the space is now being trafficked by construction vehicles and patrons of the storage company. These vehicles are consistently going against the direction of traffic and causing a constant risk of serious injury or worse in this new corridor where kids get dropped off, and big trucks enter and exit. The new 12' wall of metal shipping containers means there's nowhere for these vehicles to go to avoid a head-on collision aside from the sidewalk where children are entering and exiting the development center. This is unacceptable and we insist the traffic flow be enforced.

We request that commercial vehicle traffic bypass the entrance area of TICDC using alternative routes during dropoff and pickup areas, and one-way traffic be strictly enforced to reduce the risk of an avoidable tragedy.

The contact person for this petition is Ben Seisdedos, reachable at ben.seisdedos@gmail.com

	NAME	TI CDC CLASSROOM	SIGNATURE
1	MOLLY MCCALL	LIBRARIAN	
2	Aileen Mendez	TEC	
3	Kathy Lainfa		
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Market Street Linkage Center Letter
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 5:03:00 PM
Attachments:	Local 16 Linkage Center.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from IATSE Local 16 regarding the Market Street Linkage Center.

Sincerely,

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

From: Jeanine Williams <jwilliams@local16.org>
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2022 3:12 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Market Street Linkage Center Letter

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter regarding the movement of the Market Street Linkage Center.

Thank you,

Jeanine Williams
Administrative Assistant
IATSE Local 16
240 Second Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: 415-441-6400
www.local16.org

International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employes
Moving Picture Technicians, Artists and Allied Crafts
of the United States, Its Territories and Canada

Local No. 16
240 Second Street
San Francisco, California 94105

Affiliated With The
AFL-CIO
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
San Mateo Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
North Bay Labor Council, AFL-CIO

James Beaumonte
Business Agent - Secretary

Phone: (415) 441-6400
Fax: (415) 243-0179
www.local16.org

June 2, 2022

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

RE: UN Plaza Linkage Center

Dear Supervisors,

On behalf of I.A.T.S.E. Local 16 we write to express our deep concern about the continuation of the Linkage Center in United Nations Plaza. We represent the Theatrical Stage Employees working at the Orpheum Theater where the Linkage Center is located directly adjacent. **We urge the City to identify an alternate location, or at the very least move the entrance for the Linkage Center off Market Street which will improve community, worker, and patron safety and success.** The negative impacts of locating the Linkage Center in UN Plaza far outweigh the benefits.

- The Center is situated at the entrance to one of the City's busiest BART/MUNI stations creating unsafe conditions for our members working at the Orpheum Theater, and patrons who attend.
- Street conditions around the Linkage Center in Mid-Market have worsened significantly.
- Open air drug use and sales around the Center go unaddressed by outreach teams and law enforcement; drugs are being sold directly to clients through the Center's fence.
- Linkage Center hours of operation have not reached 24/7 as intended and clients are forced back onto the street at 8pm where they are met by drug dealers.
- Not all 7 floors leased for the Linkage Center are being used for client services.
- The Linkage Center has yet to achieve significant outcomes in the critical areas oflinkages to housing, mental health and drug treatment, per the City's own data.
- Access to shelter has significantly slowed due to availability constraints.

Now and until a new location is identified, we recommend:

- Relocating the Linkage center Entrance, away from the Patrons entering the Orpheum Theater and workers entering the Stage Door.
- Outreach teams and law enforcement must address the antisocial and illegal activity around the Linkage Center.
- Use all 7 available floors for client services 24/7 moving more outdoor activity inside.
- Continued management by the Department of Emergency management - No other City agency will have the breadth of knowledge, respect, and ability to manage such a complex and nuanced operation.

While we acknowledge the accessibility of the Linkage Center being in Mid-Market, theater patrons and workers need to be able to get in and out of the Orpheum Theater safely. There are far too many hazards and negative impacts of locating a drop-in center here. Please act now for the betterment of the community.

Sincerely,

Jim Beaumonte
Business Agent-Secretary
I.A.T.S.E. Local 16

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: World Migratory Bird Day, observed on Saturday, 14 May, under the theme “Dim the Lights for Birds at Night.”
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 10:09:00 AM

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: David Romano <droma4@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 6:34 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Cc: Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; SFUN - San Franciscans for Urban Nature <sfun---san-franciscans-for-urban-nature@googlegroups.com>
Subject: World Migratory Bird Day, observed on Saturday, 14 May, under the theme “Dim the Lights for Birds at Night.”

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

Dear Supervisors,

Light pollution is increasing around the globe. More than 80 per cent of the world's

population is currently estimated to live under a "lit sky", a figure closer to 99 per cent in Europe and North America. The amount of artificial light on the Earth's surface is increasing by at least two per cent each year and could be much greater,

Amy Fraenkel, executive secretary of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) said: "Natural darkness has a conservation value in the same way as clean water, air, and soil. A key goal of World Migratory Bird Day 2022 is to raise awareness of the issue of light pollution and its negative impacts on migratory birds. Solutions are readily available, and we hope to encourage key decision-makers to adopt measures to address light pollution."

The Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) is an environmental treaty of the United Nations and provides a global platform for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory animals and their habitats.

Light pollution is a significant and growing threat to wildlife, including many species of migratory birds. Every year, light pollution contributes to the death of millions of birds. It alters the natural patterns of light and dark in eco-systems. It can change birds' migration patterns, foraging behaviours, and vocal communication. - World Migratory Bird Day 2022: Explaining the Impact of Light Pollution on Bird Migration Patterns By IANS, 14 May, 2022, TWC India

---

Artificial light alters natural patterns of light and dark within ecosystems, and contributes to the deaths of millions of birds each year. Light pollution can cause birds to change their migration patterns, foraging behaviours and vocal communication, resulting in disorientation and collisions. Migrating birds are attracted to artificial light at night – particularly when there are low cloud conditions, fog, rain, or when flying at lower altitudes - luring them to dangers in cities.

Birds become disorientated and, as a result, may end up circling in illuminated areas. With their energy reserves depleted, they risk exhaustion, or worse. "Many nocturnally migrating birds such as ducks, geese, plovers, sandpipers and songbirds are affected by light pollution causing disorientation and collisions with fatal consequences," said Jacques Trouvilliez, Executive Secretary of the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA), another UN treaty. "Seabirds such as petrels and shearwaters are attracted by artificial lights on land and become prey for rats and cats." - World Migratory Bird Day illuminates the dark side of light pollution, UN News

David Romano

San Francisco

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Support a JFK Drive compromise!
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:21:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Glen Harvey regarding File No. 220339.

> **File No. 220339 -** Park Code - Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program - Slow Street Road Closures - Modified Configuration

Sincerely,

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

From: Glen Harvey <Glen.Harvey.496862915@p2a.co>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 5:30 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support a JFK Drive compromise!

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support a Golden Gate Park that is accessible to everyone. We all agree that bicyclists and pedestrians should have access to Golden Gate Park, but we need to balance that with access for everyone else.

I urge you to restore access to Golden Gate Park as it was before the pandemic.

As well, I had to go to Kaiser for a medical procedure last week. I left with time to spare under normal conditions at 10:00 AM. It took 45 minutes to get there from West Portal. If I went in the other direction I would have been in San Jose in another five minutes. This is ridicules.

Regards,

Glen Harvey
111 Wawona St
San Francisco, CA 94127

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Street trees and removing of concrete - minimal amount of green along many streets in sf
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:59:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Aaron Goodman regarding street trees.

Sincerely,

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 11:19 PM
To: jwolfrom@sfexaminer.com; Short, Carla (DPW) <Carla.Short@sfdpw.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; dan@fuf.net; CPC-CodeEnforcement <planning.codeenforcement@sfgov.org>
Subject: Street trees and removing of concrete - minimal amount of green along many streets in sf

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

Unfortunately we see it all the time a new flip of a home in SF and the front green strip is paved over while doing gas or water lines. Backyards are over as well as contractors pick up palettes of concrete to “modernize” backyards while ignoring the heat inversion being created.

SFDPW used to along with planning enforce the green strip, now individuals have to call or email in complaints (you can do it anonymous) or on 311 but it has to go through planning for “enforcement” and that does not always solve the issue when planters or green strips are replaced with pots for the owners $ savings.

The city should be addressing paved areas with legislation requiring opening of concrete areas in front of homes and plantings of green strips.

I called it in grad school in an article I wrote an “urban harvest” where food growth supplies and water trickle down could occur in a more efficient method if done along public routes in urban areas.

The real estate industry must also come on board support the SFPUC water barrel work in front yards, address inequities in areas where no trees exist and plan for a green future.

We had discussed back a couple years the need for spaces to grow trees and maintain and fix ones that are planted but not watered sufficiently or blown over in high winds or damaged due to lack of protection.

FUF agreed that a “tree hospital” concept was a great one at the sunnydale school site John mclaren school, with land to store their trees and a place to train youth conservation corps or city gardening programs to plant and maintain areas. Water will be critical but if grey water and other sources are implemented we can see an improved

situation citywide.

When projects are done without a green intervention it shows instantly. From the shopping corridor near union square to the new facility out at bayshore being completed to the new housing projects and sunset and side streets throughout the city it is incumbent when we discuss green infrastructure to enforce and ensure compliance citywide and balance where things are too hot today due to lacking shade and green medians. The plants the earth, birds and bees and insects will all appreciate the change if we start sooner vs later, including us humans!

A.Goodman D11

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Stopping the uncontrolled spread of Covid in San Francisco
Date:	Thursday, June 16, 2022 3:37:00 PM

From: Gabriel Desjardins <gabriel.desjardins@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 12:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Stopping the uncontrolled spread of Covid in San Francisco

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

I guess there's no shaming any of you into action.

I know that DPH is incredibly difficult to deal with and is unwilling to hold itself accountable even to any of you. But that's why you got elected (well, some of you got deposited there by the mayor, but that's another story; Dorsey, you've already disgraced yourself) - to change the city for the better and make sure that city agencies don't make bad decisions.

So hopefully some of you will step up. There's no reason to be giving our kids a disabling disease, right?!

On Tue, Jun 14, 2022 at 11:02 PM Gabriel Desjardins <gabriel.desjardins@gmail.com> wrote:

> Hello board,
>
> I am frustrated but not in the least bit surprised at your unwillingness to respond to me. It is well-known that the BOS refuses to be accountable to the people of the city.
>
> Just so I'm clear:
>
> Sup Walton - the school where the outbreak happened is in your district
> Sups Walton, Ronen, Melgar, Safai, Mandelman - the parents and children who got hit by this outbreak live in your districts
>
> Should I draw the conclusion from your lack of response that you are indifferent to Covid outbreaks among 0-5 year-olds?
>
> Thanks
>
> Gabe

On Mon, Jun 13, 2022 at 3:44 PM Gabriel Desjardins <gabriel.desjardins@gmail.com> wrote:

> Hello BOS,
>
> TL;DR: We have uncontrolled Covid spread including in schools. Who on the BOS is pushing DPH to bring back mask mandates?
>
> I can't believe you would all be ok with giving everyone in the city Covid multiple times and creating a generation of disabled children.
>
> ***
>
> Let me tell you a quick story:
>
> A couple of months ago, at the urging of DPH, our preschool dropped mandatory masks.
>
> Parents asked for outdoor meals, but because DPH refuses to mandate them, or mandate proper ventilation indoors, we had a perfect environment for Covid spread.
>
> It took a little while, but we got hit by a massive outbreak. By my count, 60+ children and parents got Covid between May 31-June 5.
>
> DPH took no action until everyone was sick, at which point they closed the school for 5 days.
>
> Someone from DPH called me on June 8 to offer "resources" and do contact tracing when it was pointless to do so.
>
> ****
> At this point, we have uncontrolled Covid spread in San Francisco. This didn't need to happen - it is a result of deliberate decisions taken by DPH. And now that most of the city has gotten sick, particularly its children, with a disease that causes immediate neurological and multi-organ damage, DPH is nowhere to be found.
>
> Some examples:
>
> 1) Grant Colfax's email address does not accept incoming emails
> 2) Susan Philip is on vacation for the next 2 weeks
> 3) DPH's phone system sends you to 311 if you have Covid questions
>
> You hear a lot about needing to "assess your own risk" and "do what you're comfortable with." Well, I've been vaxxed 5 times, I wear an N95 everywhere, never crack the seal indoors, only eat and drink outdoors outside of my own home, and do my best to make sure my wife and daughter do the same.

But when DPH encourages schools to drop masks and have kids eat 3 feet apart, it's a recipe for disaster. And it means I have no mechanism to assess and manage my own risk.

We need a return to mask mandates like other counties. Xavier Becerra just got Covid twice in 3 weeks. Vaccines might prevent death but that's a pretty low bar. You'll find that many businesses are running with skeleton staff right now because so many people are too sick to work.

Who among you is pushing DPH to do the right thing? When will mask mandates be back in force?

Thanks

Gabe

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	2 Letters regarding Covid-19 mandates
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:27:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding Covid 19 mandates.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding Covid-19 mandates.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Gabriel Desjardins
To:	Colfax, Grant (DPH); Tenner, Andrea (DPH); Philip, Susan (DPH); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	"San Franciscans Should Take Basic Actions to be Prepared for Future Changes in COVID-19"
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 12:31:53 PM

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

Hi there everyone,

I pulled this subject line from the last DPH statement on Covid, which was April 19:

https://sf.gov/news/san-franciscans-should-take-basic-actions-be-prepared-future-changes-covid-19

Talk about MIA!

You all seem paralyzed trying to figure out what to do as BA.4/5 are poised to rip through San Francisco in the upcoming months.

There are some basic actions that DPH and city government should take to prepare for this:

1) Re-institute the mask mandate
2) Mandate ventilation in spaces that are accessible to the public
3) Require all preschools and schools to move meals outdoors
4) Create a mechanism for reporting positive rapid tests so that you have actual disease surveillance.

I know you all know these are the right things to do.

And I know you all know that what you're currently doing, which is accelerating the progression of Covid throughout San Francisco's population, is the wrong thing to do.

I can't fathom why you'd be doing this, because most of the potential explanations - scared of right-wing nutjobs we don't even have here, no empathy for people who are at extreme risk from Covid, eugenics, pure nihilism - would mean you're pretty awful people.

Time to step up and do the right thing

Gabe

From: Gabriel Desjardins
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Stopping the uncontrolled spread of Covid in San Francisco
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 3:45:31 PM

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

Hello BOS,

TL;DR: We have uncontrolled Covid spread including in schools. Who on the BOS is pushing DPH to bring back mask mandates?

I can't believe you would all be ok with giving everyone in the city Covid multiple times and creating a generation of disabled children.

***

Let me tell you a quick story:

A couple of months ago, at the urging of DPH, our preschool dropped mandatory masks.

Parents asked for outdoor meals, but because DPH refuses to mandate them, or mandate proper ventilation indoors, we had a perfect environment for Covid spread.

It took a little while, but we got hit by a massive outbreak. By my count, 60+ children and parents got Covid between May 31-June 5.

DPH took no action until everyone was sick, at which point they closed the school for 5 days.

Someone from DPH called me on June 8 to offer "resources" and do contact tracing when it was pointless to do so.

****
At this point, we have uncontrolled Covid spread in San Francisco. This didn't need to happen - it is a result of deliberate decisions taken by DPH. And now that most of the city has gotten sick, particularly its children, with a disease that causes immediate neurological and multi-organ damage, DPH is nowhere to be found.

Some examples:

1) Grant Colfax's email address does not accept incoming emails
2) Susan Philip is on vacation for the next 2 weeks
3) DPH's phone system sends you to 311 if you have Covid questions

You hear a lot about needing to "assess your own risk" and "do what you're comfortable with." Well, I've been vaxxed 5 times, I wear an N95 everywhere, never crack the seal indoors, only eat and drink outdoors outside of my own home, and do my best to make sure my wife and daughter do the same.

But when DPH encourages schools to drop masks and have kids eat 3 feet apart, it's a recipe for disaster. And it means I have no mechanism to assess and manage my own risk.

We need a return to mask mandates like other counties. Xavier Becerra just got Covid twice in 3 weeks. Vaccines might prevent death but that's a pretty low bar. You'll find that many businesses are running with skeleton staff right now because so many people are too sick to work.

Who among you is pushing DPH to do the right thing? When will mask mandates be back in force?

Thanks

Gabe

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Sidewalk safety
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 10:20:00 AM

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: Wood Massi <wmassi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2022 11:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Sidewalk safety

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

I read an article about new technology to slow scooters on the sidewalk. I am a 76-year-old resident of SF who has walked our sidewalks for half a century now, and I have never been less relaxed or more terrified doing so than I am now. Walking now requires constant vigilance; no longer can it be leisurely. That is because of the scooters, bikes, and skate-boards, especially the electric ones, that go whizzing past me at great speeds every time I go for a walk. I could be killed, or almost certainly injured, if I am hit, since my bones are more fragile and my muscles weaker than those of younger people. I feel like I have to look behind me and both ways if I diverge even a few inches from an absolutely straight path or when I come to a corner. That is a great deal of work for my stiff neck which has a metal plate in it. I avoid the

yellow indentations at corners, even though they would be easier for me to step past than the curbs, because I never know when some sidewalk-travelling vehicle will come screaming through them. How I miss the old days when I didn't have to worry about dying every time I step out of my house. This is definitely a less friendly city for pedestrians than it was before.

I encourage you to support new laws and enforcement of the ones already on the books, so SF's view of itself as a city that supports walking and pedestrians is not a cruel joke. Thanks for listening.

Richard Wood Massi

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Rescinding the Mills Act contract for 714 Steiner (agenda item for 6/22)
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 6:11:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Leah Culver regarding File No. 220738.

File No. 220738 - Disapproval of Mills Act Historical Property Contract - 714 Steiner Street

Sincerely,

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

From: Leah Culver <leah.culver@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2022 3:24 PM
To: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Marstaff (BOS) <marstaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Ferguson, Shannon (CPC) <shannon.ferguson@sfgov.org>; Gordon-Jonckheer, Elizabeth (CPC) <elizabeth.gordon-jonckheer@sfgov.org>; Taylor, Michelle (CPC) <michelle.taylor@sfgov.org>
Subject: Rescinding the Mills Act contract for 714 Steiner (agenda item for 6/22)

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

Dear Supervisors,

I'm Leah Culver, the owner of 714 Steiner, one of the Painted Ladies of Alamo Square. I purchased this beautiful home in January 2020 (pre-pandemic) with the intention to restore it and live there with my future family. Two and a half years into the process, my life situation has changed and sadly I no longer have the time or energy to dedicate to restoring the home to the level of detail that it

deserves. I have listed the property for sale and hope to find a new owner who loves the home as much as I do.

To help with the significant cost of restoring the home, I applied for the Mills Act program last year (in 2021) but approval of my contract was delayed until this year (2022). Since I've now decided to sell the home, I have not signed the contract and it is not currently in effect.

As you may know, the Mills Act gives a tax break for the next ten years in exchange for following a specific restoration plan for the exterior of the home. The plan for 714 Steiner was enthusiastically approved by the Historical Preservation Commission and would restore the home to its original splendor and help keep it looking great for decades to come.

With a change in ownership, the Mills Act, if signed, would remain in effect for the new owners of 714 Steiner, guaranteeing that the restoration work would be done according to plan, with a significant penalty (12.5% of fair market value) for cancellation of the contract. Given that it is extremely likely that the new owners will want to move forward with a different restoration plan, I have not yet signed the contract and would only do so if they were enthusiastic to follow the plan outlined in the contract.

All this is to say that rescinding the contract approval isn't necessary. If signed, the contract could actually help the city of San Francisco preserve one of its most notable homes in a manner already reviewed and approved by the Historical Preservation Commission. If not signed, it would not need to be rescinded and as I understand it, would expire at the end of this calendar year, never having gone into effect. It is also worth noting, that regardless of when the contract is executed, the tax reduction would not be realized until 2023—so there is no practical difference if the contract is signed (or not signed) in the next few weeks, or at the end of the year.

I'm disappointed that Supervisor Peskin has put this on your agenda (File #220738), without providing me any notice whatsoever, as it appears to be political grandstanding for no real purpose or effect. I have given a personal tour of the home to Supervisor Peskin, at which time he explained his role in encouraging a friend to apply for the first Mills Act contract granted in San Francisco. I'm sad that I was mistaken in thinking that the Mills Act would continue to be applied in a consistent and fair manner to all residents of the city.

I encourage you all to support the restoration and preservation of historical homes in San Francisco. The Mills Act is an important tool to help make restoration financially feasible for local businesses and homeowners and I would love to see it fairly and reasonably applied in the future.

Thank you,
Leah Culver
714 Steiner (The Pink Painted Lady)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject: FW: Please read SFBOSS Academia, displacement, and the dorm-industrial complex - 48 hills
Date: Wednesday, June 22, 2022 4:38:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Aaron Goodman regarding SFSU/CSU growth and housing.

Sincerely,

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2022 1:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please read SFBOSS Academia, displacement, and the dorm-industrial complex - 48 hills

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

U should all be reminded of this due to SFSU-CSU growth and land grab of stonestown and parkmerced blocks by the sfsu-foundation now U.Corp / Tim Redmond hits the nail on this as it's a known profit for schools and universities to pirate the local housing stock.

Buy the sites back for essential rent controlled fixed housing for students families staff teachers etc don't let the U.Corp profit more off of adjacent housing and their exponential growth without paying more up front for their impacts on housing.

"Student living redefined" was how they advertised parkmerced prior by stellar management in the process denying families the ability to rent town homes and instead forced families and seniors out of multiple rent controlled housing blocks in SF!!! and families and seniors displaced and now more students and staff living in RVs

U cannot build your way out of a housing crisis but you sure can buy those buildings back.

Ag D11

https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://48hills.org/2022/06/academia-displacement-and-the-dorm-industrial-complex/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyZjdlNGRkNTYyMTdjYjgyNjk5OTdiZjgxNGZhNTc5Mzo2OjM2YWM6YWZkMWIzNzAxM2VlNTE4OTY2NDAwNjIzMGZhMzVhZDc4NGE4ZTFlMWFkNTVmNjcyZGMwZWNiYTI0MGVjNjJkNzpwOlQ

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Letter of Support
Date:	Thursday, June 16, 2022 1:54:00 PM
Attachments:	Sheriff letter support_BofSups_case management_6_16_22.docx

---

From: Roma Guy <romapguy@gmail.com>
Date: June 16, 2022 at 1:01:41 PM PDT
To: Hillary Ronen <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>
Cc: Gordon Mar <gordonmar@yahoo.com>, Ahsha Safai <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>, Shamann Walton <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>, ChanStaff@sfgov.org
Subject: Letter of Support

Dear Supervisor Ronen, Chair of Budget & Appropriations and Budget & Finance Committee:

Please find attached a letter Supporting the Sheriff budget request for new case management system for incarcerated in SF.

Modernizing the Sheriff's case management system's need is a key public investment and has been strongly recommended for almost a decade. I have been in support since I was a Co-Chair of Work Group to Re-Envision the Jail Replacement Project (JRP), 2016.

Thank you for your consideration and bringing forth this critical function to improvements in transparency and accountability of Criminal Justice System.

Sincerely,

Roma Guy
romapguy@gmail.com
415-652-2710

CC: members of both Budget & Appropriations and Budget & Finance Committees

Roma Guy, MSW Consultant
2768 - 22nd Street San Francisco, CA
94110-3446 romapguy@gmail.com
415.652-2710

June 16, 2022

Supervisor Hillary Ronen
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Request to Support Case Management System for Incarcerated Persons with Funding Already Approved by the Committee on Information Technology (COIT)

Dear Supervisor Ronen:

As one of the three Co-Chairs of Work Group to Re-Envision the Jail Replacement Project (JRP) with then Sheriff Vicki Hennessey and Director of Public Health, Barbara Garcia, approved by Board of Supervisors, 2016 the Committee recommended public investment to modernize Sheriff's case management system. The Working Group made this recommendation because the current jail management system is expensive to manage and has limited to no ability to modernize, expand, or provide opportunity to provide needed transparency and on-going public accountability.

I am writing to strongly encourage your leadership, as Chair of both Budget & Appropriations and Budget & Finance Committee, to support the current Sheriff's budget request to finally modernized Sheriff's new case management system for justice involved prisoners in San Francisco. Key is that this budget request has been approved for $2.8 million dollars by Committee on Information Technology.

The jail case management system will allow for data integration **across justice agencies including the Courts, Public Defender, and District Attorney**. Additionally, this public investment will qualitatively improve, at long last, transparent sharing across the silos within the Criminal Justice System. Importantly, this technology will also provide data resources to support of better outcomes for justice-involved persons currently jailed and their reentry into community.

Critically, this investment will support transparency for loved ones of the justice involved and will be a useful tool for the new Sheriff oversight committee.

I believe in my role as a community activist I realize that supporting this public investment is essential to establishing today's public safety and creating alternatives to public safety. Please

support the Sheriff's this recommendation of $2.8 million in funding for FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 Budget.

Thank you for considering this recommendation and please do not hesitate to contact me with any concerns or questions.

Sincerely



Roma Guy, MSW,

Former Co-Chair of JRP Committee, Member of San Francisco Jail Justice Coalition & Taxpayers for Public Safety

CC: Members of Budget and Finance Committee and Budget and Appropriations, SF Board of Supervisors

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Increasing Rates
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 4:51:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Jim Bowlby regarding draught surcharges.

Sincerely,

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

From: Jim Bowlby <jbowlby00@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2022 5:40 PM
To: MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Increasing Rates

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

Dear Supervisor Melgar (and other Board members) -

I am writing to you as my supervisor about the recent drought surcharge which has appeared on our water bills for the past few months. I sent the email below to the SFPUC, and received nothing in return - not even an acknowledgement. Not the best customer service.

I am extremely unhappy about the way this surcharge is being implemented. As someone who is very conscientious about water usage, and who supports all sorts of conservation measures, I feel particularly penalized by being charged anything more as a surcharge when I've been doing everything I can to use as little water as possible. In fact, I use less than half the target amount per person per day! It seems then, that a policy to base a surcharge on how much less a customer uses compared to last year has an inherent flaw if it does not exempt those at an already low use level. Why not go after those who use well more than the target to make up any financial shortfalls?

Though I'm sure it is unintentional, this short-sighted decision has made someone who has been 100% for water conservation and regulation angry at the SFPUC - the organization responsible for

making wise utility policy. Some may argue that we all need to do our share in bearing this burden. I have been doing more than my share. So any extra charges on my water bill feel like punishment for enthusiastically doing what I was asked (and more). It seems that many areas of SF government have been failing its citizens lately. It is a shame that the SFPUC is joining this notorious company. I hear much talk of people feeling driven out of SF, and who have plans to move elsewhere. I've lived here for 27 years, and as much as I love the city, I must admit this adds just one more straw to the many already on the camel's back. A policy correction would be in order.

Thanks for listening.

Jim Bowlby

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Jim Bowlby** <jbowlby00@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2022 at 2:15 PM
Subject: Increasing Rates
To: <customerservice@sfwater.org>

To the members of the SF Public Utilities Commission -

I read recently of the plan to add a "drought surcharge" of 5% to all SF Water bills starting in April 2022. This is the first I am hearing of this, and I would like to express my extreme disappointment. First, I'd like to state that I am 100% in favor of water conservation and incentives to encourage it.

My issue is this: some of us have been conserving water for ***many*** years. In fact, I use approximately 25 gallons per day in my household. (I live alone.) This is HALF the recommended target for per person water usage. There is not much lower that I could go. With the surcharge being based on a comparison to last year's usage, I am being penalized for being a conscientious water saver over the long term. Admittedly, the dollar amount for me will be relatively small. However, I would argue that such a policy, without an exemption for those with a use rate below some target, is highly unfair. The surcharge incentive should be aimed at those who are not doing enough to save water, and not punish those who already go above and beyond.

It is without question that we live in the most expensive region in the country, and taxes are high on everything. Inflation has caused the cost of the goods and services I regularly use to recently increase by 10% or more. An additional "tax" in the form of this surcharge for those of us who have done the right thing for years, as requested, is both unkind and unwise.

I appreciate your consideration of this perspective.

Jim Bowlby

p.s. You have my permission to review my water bill for however many years as you'd like. I've been living at my current address for more than 10 years. For part of that time, there has been a second

resident in my home, which I reflected in my online account.

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: GAO 061622_File No. 220649 || RE: Letter for file 220649
Date:	Tuesday, June 14, 2022 1:25:00 PM
Attachments:	Letter for file 220649.pdf

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: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 12:24 PM
To: DPH - cassandra <cassandra@sftravel.com>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: GAO 061622_File No. 220649 || RE: Letter for file 220649

Apologies, please find the attached referenced letter. Thank you.

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
San Francisco Board of Supervisors | Office of the Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

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: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS)
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 3:50 PM
To: Cassandra Costello <cassandra@sftravel.com>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <Jacob.Bintliff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: GAO 061622_File No. 220649 || RE: Letter for file 220649

Greetings Cassandra Costello,
Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
San Francisco Board of Supervisors | Office of the Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

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: Cassandra Costello <cassandra@sftravel.com>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 2:46 PM
To: Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter for file 220649

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

Hi Jessica,
Can you please include the attached letter into file 220649 for the GAO hearing this Thursday?
Thanks,
Cassandra



Cassandra Costello | EVP, Public Policy & Executive Programs
E cassandra@sftravel.com **| T** 415.227.2655

San Francisco Travel | One Front Street, Suite 2900 | San Francisco, CA 94111
sftravel.com | Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

San Francisco Named the "World's Best City" by Time Out Magazine



From:	Cassandra Costello
To:	Perkinson, Jessica (BOS)
Subject:	Letter for file 220649
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 2:47:07 PM
Attachments:	BOS - TID 5-17-22.pdf

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

Hi Jessica,
Can you please include the attached letter into file 220649 for the GAO hearing this Thursday?
Thanks,
Cassandra

Cassandra Costello | EVP, Public Policy & Executive Programs
E cassandra@sftravel.com **| T** 415.227.2655

San Francisco Travel | One Front Street, Suite 2900 **|** San Francisco, CA 94111
sftravel.com **|** Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

San Francisco Named the "World's Best City" by Time Out Magazine

UNITE HERE!

May 17, 2022

To: Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
From: Anand Singh, President, UNITE HERE Local 2

Dear Honorable members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing you today on behalf of the membership of UNITE HERE Local 2 to support the renewal of the Tourism Improvement District (TID). The TID has transformed how San Francisco competes against comparable destinations for leisure and business travel. Since the TID went into effect in 2009, it has generated over $20 million each year prior to the pandemic that is used to market and sell San Francisco attracting leisure and business visitors globally. This has meant that job growth in the hospitality sector also grew.

After the launch of the TID, San Francisco led the top 25 markets from 2009-2018. In 2019, San Francisco welcomed over 26 million visitors who spent over $10.2 billion in our local economy. This spending generated over $819 million in taxes and fees for the City's General Fund.

It is more important than ever to ensure we are using every tool at our disposal to bring back the jobs in the hospitality industry, the hardest hit and slowest to recover due to the effects of the COVID 19 pandemic. The membership of Unite HERE Local 2 are ready to come back to work and support our economic recovery. Absent robust sales and marketing efforts to tell the world that San Francisco is open for business and ready to welcome visitors from every corner of the world, we will continue to struggle to bring back these important jobs.

Please join me in supporting the renewal of the TID.

Thank you,

Anand Singh
President

opeiu-29-afl-cio(51)mds

Anand Singh
President

Chito Cuéllar
Vice-President

Tina Chen
Secretary-Treasurer

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

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: EBT,GA and Inflatiion
Date:	Tuesday, June 14, 2022 10:06:00 AM

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: Shaun Soares Evans <tushaunaz@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 8:57 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: EBT,GA and Inflatiion

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

To the City Leaders of San Francisco,

Hello my name is Shaun Evans,I am writing you in a urgent manner about the pace that EBT, and GA isn't keeping current with the times.

Let me start with GA. I lived in this city for almost 20 years, lot of the time homeless. That changed for me being housed again thanks to GA. I was able to find someone willing to lose money

renting out a room to me at a really great rate in a house. That right there got me on the right track to sober up and try to work again. Well back on the streets again applied for GA again and this time I am aware of the rigid rules that someone really diidn't stop to think about the possible ramifications that could and do happen. For starters taking all but 95.00 for assistance is far from helpful considering what the rest goes for. I have stayed in a shelter a few times, never again, forcing someone to pay that amount for a place that is not safe in any shaper way or form is screwed up beyond. Considering how many homeless that are on GA and the amount that goes to the "shelters" and what is given for in ways of harassment, theft, and the times to get in and out is a joke.

Mind you I know I am not making my case to implore the City and County of San Francisco to revamp the policy here. Believe it or not there is a majority of homeless that would and do what would be smart moves with the aid. All though 619.00 in San Francisco does not even cover a weeks worth of rent (unless you find people that are what I think show true San Francisco values; charm wit and personality with love)

To add even more insane logic to this my eligibility worker tells me the whopping 300.00 I made in May will be deducted in July. So now my plans to move back to where I was at for 600.00 is now on hold because of this? How do you expect anyone to even get out of homelessness in the first place? I think you guys keep appointing someone that is completely out of tune with what happens to be a serious issue. I mean come one how is someone going to be in charge of housing homeless or help reduce it if the person never went through the flaming high hoops the city places or shelters and meals? If you are not convinced think about our last election. Someone that has no experiences with politics, businesss, ;let alone telliing the truth became president. Chew on that We keep get Trumps to fix homelessness..

Finally to really kick someone struggling back down to what feels like never ending struggle to get going, EBT benefits are subtracted for receiving EBT? During a pandemic that I will concede is fading but inflation? I have purchased the same iitems every montrh like a creature of habit. Use to be I was able to make everything stretch the month on 250.00 now the same iitems bought. Benefits are depleted by haflway through the month. So if I go back on GA a temporary stop gap until I am on disability due to medical issues and deteriorates my life I am limited on options here.

1. Work under the table
2. Work and not report it and be penalized later
3. Starve because no EBT is left because I used the money to stay housed
4. Stay homeless and continue with the rat race that some reason someone like Trump deems it okay.

I really tried to not sound ungrateful and bitter. I really love this city I moved here to be myself during the days of gays covered in glitter glitter, I was sold. My ancestors moved here from Azores long ago before I ever knew it. I even tried moving back to San Diego and I did not belong there and came back despite knowing I would be on the streets again. That should say something about the awesome city. Please fix this messy system so someone like me is not discouraged and if just if the next homeless czar of the city is up try to go for someone that has been there got the t shirt and only thing they won was missing teeth. I realize politics is a popularity contest and we all wanna be liked, somewhere somehow it would be nice to see someone do something that is selfless not selfish.

Thank you for your time.

Shaun Evans

Sent from Mail for Windows

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	FW: City College of San Francisco running a debt collection scam on students
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 4:54:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Marlon Lee regarding a CCSF tuition collection.

Sincerely,

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

From: M Lee <lee.marlon.2.0@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2022 8:35 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: City College of San Francisco running a debt collection scam on students

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

Hello Board of Supervisors
I am seeking help and I am not sure where to turn. Yesterday I received a letter from the tuition office of City College of San Francisco. They are saying that I did not drop a class from 2018 and now I owe them $368. I have 30 days to pay or they will submit my info as a debt to the Franchise tax board. I have contacted Lorenzo Gastinell tuition@ccsf.edu the Tuition and Fees Coordinator of City College, and let him know this is the first I have heard of it, but he has not given me much information.

I have taken many classes at city college years ago and always pre paid for classes. I feel like this is setup to scam students and sell a debt to the tax board so I will have no recourse . The first time that I have heard of this is 4 years later and now in under 20 days they will transfer the debt and then I will not be able to do anything about it as it will be with the franchise tax board. I am hoping you can help investigate how many other students this is now happening to and help me also clear this debt.
Thank you for your time.

Marlon Lee

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); PEARSON, ANNE (CAT)
Subject:	FW: Board of Supervisors - HCD Application Notification, TNDC/CCDC
Date:	Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:43:00 PM
Attachments:	image003.png image004.png image005.png image006.png image008.png

---

From: Lex Gelb <lgelb@tndc.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 3:01:59 PM
To: Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Cc: Nusser, Sarah (MYR) <sarah.nusser@sfgov.org>; Masry, Omar (MYR) <omar.masry@sfgov.org>; Hermandeep Kaur <hkaur@tndc.org>; Jackson Rabinowitsh <jrabinowitsh@tndc.org>; Bo Han <Bo.Han@chinatowncdc.org>; Lagi Tevaseu <lagi.tevaseu@chinatowncdc.org>
Subject: Board of Supervisors - HCD Application Notification, TNDC/CCDC

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

Supervisor Walton,

This email serves as confirmation that San Francisco projects 2550 Irving (developed by Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation) and 730 Stanyan (co-developed by TNDC and Chinatown Community Development Center) will be applying for financing in the 2022 HCD SuperNOFA due June 28th. Informing the Board of Supervisors of our intention to apply is a regulatory mandate. Per Health & Safety Code §50675.7(e), Sponsor/Applicant must notify their local legislative body (City Council or County Board of Supervisors) of the Sponsor's loan/grant application prior to application submission.

Attached, please find signed letters confirming our application submissions and providing additional details on each project. We plan to submit these signed letters, along with proof of this email, as part of each project's application.

Please reach out with any questions.

Thank you,
Lex

Lex Gelb
Assistant Project Manager
lgelb@tndc.org
c 310.367.7271

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
201 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94709

tndc.org

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Bailout of PRC Resources and Baker Places
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 10:29:00 AM

From: Fred Wise <fredwise113@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 10:20 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Bailout of PRC Resources and Baker Places

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

Hello Supervisors, especially Rafael Mandelbaum who is my supe:

Shouldn't you look at the extraordinary salary that gets paid out to the PRC CEO, Brett Andrews, who orchestrated this merger of these 2 nonprofits and now requests this huge multimillion dollar bump to his spending, just to provide the services that the City has already given him grants do just that? Please be good stewards of taxpayer dollars.

Thanks,
Fred Wise
1289,Dolores St.
San Francisco

Get Outlook for Android

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Baby Prop C Funds
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 9:03:00 AM

From: Emily Bugos <bugos.emily@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 8:57 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Subject: Baby Prop C Funds

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

To the Board of Supervisors:

I write to you with serious concerns regarding the June proposed budget and Baby Prop C funding. Baby Prop C, passed by the voters of San Francisco, has defined parameters for how the funds it collects should be spent. Mayor Breed's budget proposes uses outside the scope of what the electorate approved. Sadly, this is not the first time it has been proposed that Baby Prop C funds be spent against the voters' intent.

Parents & families need stable, high quality early care and education services for our children 0-5, at the most critical point of their learning & development. We must ensure Baby Prop C funds are spent in line with what voters approved to get us there—while finding additional funds for other important family and child services.

I worked as an early childhood teacher in San Francisco for almost 10 years and continue to work in the field as an early childhood college instructor at San Francisco State and advocate with Early Care Educators of San Francisco. I was a direct recipient of the Baby Prop C funds through the CARES 2.0 stipend. As someone who was making well below what is considered low-income in San Francisco, this money made a significant impact on my life. ECE workers are some of the lowest paid in the nation and are predominantly women, largely women of color. Deviating from Baby Prop C's intended purpose to fund other resources continues to perpetuate our society's view that childcare work is not important, that the women doing the work are not important, and that there is always something worthy of more funding than childcare. This would be a great detriment to our ECE workforce in San Francisco, a workforce that provides an economic resource that is already underfunded, unrecognized, and deeply impacted by the pandemic. This in turn, negatively impacts children and families who already struggle to access affordable, high-quality care. When we do not have qualified educators to do the work because of the lack of funding and historically low wages, we are not able to provide the care that families need.
I now work as a Child Development Program Manager in Marin County and regularly

reference San Francisco as a model for innovative programs and policies that support and shape quality early childhood education. Thank you for considering this matter.

Sincerely,
Emily Bugos

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Artificial turf is contributing to micro-plastic pollution
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 10:10:00 AM
Attachments:	image.png image.png

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: David Romano <droma4@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2022 7:55 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; myrna Melgar <melgarsf@gmail.com>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; commission@sfwater.org
Cc: Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>
Subject: Artificial turf is contributing to micro-plastic pollution

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

To: The Board of Supervisors and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Dear Supervisors and Commissioners,

Artificial turf is contributing to micro-plastic pollution of the environment, has a limited lifespan, and can't be recycled (https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2019/12/artificial-turf-fields-are-piling-no-recycling-fix/603874/). Plastic grass and products made with ground-up tires are still being installed in San Francisco on playgrounds, dog runs and in school yards. The renovated Golden Gate Park Dog Training Area is a recent example; there's over an acre of artificial turf installed. The long-term health of the Park, and the planet, is not best served by plastic grass. The dog run at the newly opened Francisco Park is another example of how grass is being replaced by plastic.

Parents and communities have long worried about the health risks of chemicals in synthetic turf made from rubber tires, which can be contaminated with heavy metals and chemicals linked to increased risk of cancer. Now lab tests by the Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, or PEER, and the Ecology Center show that both the grass-like blades and the backing of artificial turf contain the highly toxic fluorinated chemicals known as PFAS. Children may be exposed to chemicals in turf either from touching or swallowing the crumbled rubber pellets that make up the backing, or possibly from breathing chemicals that off-gas into the air, according to the Children's Environmental Health Center of the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai . The pellets also get into shoes and clothing and end up in cars and homes. The Mt. Sinai center has urged a moratorium on the installation of new fields with artificial turf. - New Studies Show PFAS in Artificial Grass Blades and Backing, by Ketura Persellin, the Environmental Working Group.

Unfortunately, rubberized surfaces have already been installed in playgrounds and schoolyards in San Francisco. The materials are mostly recycled tire rubber. We rarely have high temperatures in San Francisco, but plastic grass and rubberized surfaces heat up well above the ambient air temperature. Even in San Francisco, temperatures are more than hot enough to "facilitate the release of chemicals … linked to numerous negative health effects."

Children are especially vulnerable to harm from PFAS because of their developing bodies and the chemicals' persistence in the body. In a recent

New York Times Op Ed piece (What Are Sperm Telling Us?), we read that 'Chemical companies are as reckless as tobacco companies were a generation ago, or as opioid manufacturers were a decade ago. They lobby against even safety testing of endocrine disruptors, so that we have little idea if products we use each day are damaging our bodies or our children. We're all guinea pigs.' Most people think manufacturers must prove that chemicals are safe before they put them on the market. They are wrong. Weak and outdated federal law presumes that most chemicals are safe until proven toxic. – Real Grass for Healthy Kids! greenwichfreepress March 12, 2021

We should use natural grass turf. San Francisco cannot afford the liability and environmental consequences of plastic grass. Plastic grass (synthetic turf) is subject to high temperatures, it is scratched (think of dogs playing on it), degrades from use and it deteriorates over time due to exposure to the elements. Micro-particles of plastic are constantly being released into the environment.

Is the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department somehow exempt from the responsibility of not letting plastic pollute our environment? Artificial turf has a limited life and then it has to be ripped out and becomes toxic waste that can't be recycled.

"A garbage truck worth of plastic empties into the ocean every minute. Worldwide, humankind produces over 300 million tons of plastic each year, and this is increasing. Researchers believe as many as 51 trillion fragments of plastic - known as microplastic (characterized as pieces under 5 mm) - are polluting waterways and marine environments." Author: Lucy Siegle, printed in the Huffington Post

Plastic grass requires regular washing and, if tire crumb is present, the run-off from the washing, or from rain, has to be treated as sewerage. The run-off is toxic and can't be allowed to enter the ground. Toxic tire crumb is spreading from the Beach Chalet Soccer Fields (BCSF) into the surrounding Park. It can't be contained within the soccer fields and is an environmental hazard that urgently needs to be cleaned up.

Grass fields use recycled groundwater for irrigation and that water, and the rain that falls on grass fields, goes to replenish the aquifer under the Park. This ground water reservoir is also being tapped for drinking water for the first time. The issue of groundwater is important. San Francisco has a campaign to replace paved over front lawns in the Sunset and Richmond

districts so that rainwater will go into the ground, replenish the aquifer and not become run-off that pollutes the ocean. Another reason to avoid artificial turf.

The City has banned single use plastic bags. The State has banned single use plastic bags. Environmental organizations everywhere are in a campaign to lessen our use of plastics. San Francisco should ban the installation of artificial turf in our parks and playgrounds as an environmental hazard and the SFPUC should oppose any further installation of artificial turf in our parks.

The photos below show the continuing migration of toxic tire crumb from the BCSF and Sunnyside Park Playground

David Romano

San Francisco CA



BCSF July 2020



BCSF May 2022

Below: photos of Sunnyside Park playground





From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Article on west side density - where are the proposed density height changes at sloat ? Where is the equitable investment in transit on the west side is planning blind to the traffic and transit lag?
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 11:51:00 AM
Attachments:	What would San Francisco look like with 80,000 more homes Fixes sfexaminer.com.png

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Aaron Goodman regarding density on the West side of San Francisco.

Sincerely,

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

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2022 9:40 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Article on west side density - where are the proposed density height changes at sloat ? Where is the equitable investment in transit on the west side is planning blind to the traffic and transit lag?

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

Wake up planners this ain't a pony show

Put the damn horse in front of the cart and get the LRV lines linked north to south on sunset Blvd up to california and over to the F-line ft funston and Chrissy field areas. Get people out of cars or the density will block any sensible future light rail changes. The subway costs will never allow a system to be built quickly and efficiently

Plan now and get it implemented prior to the density you seek in these plans…

Ag D11



A map showing proposed changes for zoning with increased height and density limits on the west side of San Francisco under the Housing Element.

San Francisco Planning Department

Sent from my iPhone

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Support for Appeal of Planning Commission Approval of Case No. 2019-016230CUA
Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 10:17:00 AM

From: Jon Lishawa (jlishawa@gmail.com)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 10:17:00 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors (@sfgov.org)
Cc: Jon Lishawa (jlishawa@gmail.com); Peskin, Aaron (BOS)
Subject: Re: Support for Appeal of Planning Case No. 2019-016230CUA (1700 Mission Street)

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please find, in the email draft and also attached, as a PDF, a letter signed by a diverse environmental organization in urging you not to ignore the case in reviewing Phase 2 of Climate Change and Mr. Farrell's Most Implementation of the Policy Climate Action Plan. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jon Lishawa
For Climate Emergency Coalition
[redacted]

[redacted]

Subject(s) of the text below

[redacted]

June 23, 2020
Board of Supervisors, Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Re: Case No. 2019-016230CUA

We urge you to support the Requirement of the Environment's Short Seated Proof request of $1M that now Lives in the additional process. We desire this funding to be mirrored underscore for Commission on the Environment's amended title "The Requirement (of the Environment), and My a mandate like City, a LARC set Them fully equipped to tackle the enormity of climate change." With the Mayor handing over dollars to the Requirement of the Environment (SPE) at the "Just Ledger, as viewers even begin to take the critical actions required by the Climate Action Plan (CAP) introduced last Resolution

1. The Terabytes of the Requirement of the Environment's request to on behalf have votes to

Where Every Fourth Dollar is Building a "Climate Whopping
$4 out of $1 The Whole $1M of Cuts - $4 Bil
Where Every Fourth Dollar is Building Legislative Sector
The Whole $1M Of $4 - $4 Bil
Where Every Fourth Dollar is Building Transportation
$4 out of $1 - The Whole $1M Of Cuts - $4 Bil
Where Every Fourth Dollar is Building Natural Territories
$4 out of $1 - The Whole $1M Of Cuts - $4 Bil
Where Every Fourth Dollar is Building Climate Action Plan
$4 out of $1 - The Whole $1M Of Cuts - $4 Bil
$4 Bil - $4 Bil

The economic requirement for the Environment's Short Seated Proof request of $1M does not Lives in the additional process. We desire this funding to be mirrored underscore for Commission on the Environment's amended title "The Requirement (of the Environment), and My a mandate like City, a LARC set Them fully equipped to tackle the enormity of climate change." With the Mayor handing over dollars to the Requirement of the Environment (SPE) at the "Just Ledger, as viewers even begin to take the critical actions required by the Climate Action Plan (CAP) introduced last Resolution

- Mission Street Playground Planning needs to Accommodate for the Next 1st Of Environ(Tax) Legacy
- Affordable Housing Climate Disaster Plans - $4Bil
- Public Transportation Climate Disaster Plans - $4Bil
- Environmental Justice Climate Disaster Plans - $4Bil
- Parks and Recreation Climate Disaster Plans - $4Bil
- Friendliness Of Bicycles and Awesome Programs - $1Bil - $4Bil

I am calling on the Board of Supervisors to uphold the Appeal and modify and/or overturn the Action. We cannot fully condone the Action. We cannot fully condone the Mission Street Playground Project and Community Activity from the Mission Street Office Workers and Workers Committee. We Need to Environment Commissions, Inc., and Community Work for Health and Environmental Action to urgently you immediately to Address the recommendations in the 72nd Grand Jury Report released June 1st, 1999 " Rental Profiteers and a Wasted Process: The Western Shore Plan of Mega and is a Treat. of Climate Change."
Each year, the Board of Supervisors' votes has affected Action in the Mission Street Office Workers and Workers Committee. We Need to Environment Commissions, Inc., and Community Work for Health and Environmental Action to urgently you immediately to Address the recommendations in the 72nd Grand Jury Report released June 1st, 1999 " Rental Profiteers and a Wasted Process: The Western Shore Plan of Mega and is a Treat. of Climate Change." Each year, the Board of Supervisors' votes has affected Action in the Mission Street Office Workers and Workers Committee. We Need to Environment Commissions, Inc., and Community Work for Health and Environmental Action to urgently you immediately to Address the recommendations in the 72nd Grand Jury Report released June 1st, 1999 " Rental Profiteers and a Wasted Process: The Western Shore Plan of Mega and is a Treat. of Climate Change."
Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Yvette Cruz, Planning Commission
Climate Emergency Coalition, Chairman
Yvette Smith, Permanent Planning
Yvette Smith
Climate Emergency Commission
Yvette Smith, Environmental Planning Commission
Yvette Smith, Environmental Planning Commission

























































June 14, 2022

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

Dear Supervisors,

We urge you to support the Department of the Environment's direct General Fund request of $11M over two years in the add-back process. We deem this funding to be vital and underscore the Commission on the Environment's statement that "the Department [of the Environment], and by extension the City, is still not financially equipped to tackle the enormity of climate change." With the Mayor funding zero dollars to the Department of the Environment (SFE) in this year's budget, we cannot even begin to take the critical actions required by the Climate Action Plan (CAP) introduced last December.

The breakdown of the Department of the Environment's request is to fund focus areas in

- **Eliminating Fossil-Fuels in Buildings & Climate Planning**
  FY 22-23 - $3.3M & FY 23-24 - $3.9M
- **Eliminating Fossil-Fuels in the Transportation Sector**
  FY 22-23 – $289K & FY 23-24 – $732K
- **Capturing Carbon through Healthy Ecosystems**
  FY 22-23 – $343K & FY 23-24 – $673K
- **Delivering Equity-Centered Environment Solutions**
  FY 22-23 – $414K & FY 23-24 – $478K
- **Scaling Administrative Support for Climate Action**
  FY 22-23 – $363K & FY 23-24 – $477K

Total FY 22-23: $4.74 M
FY 23-24: $6.26 M

The resources requested are for short and medium-term steps needed by the Department of the Environment to begin to implement the CAP and will also be used to promote climate equity, apply for and issue grants, backfill reduced department work orders, and implement adopted ordinances with no dedicated funding.

No one imagines that the General Fund could finance the entire implementation of the CAP. Having a dedicated staff for the above sectors will finally enable SFE to identify and access *additional* funding from state and federal grants - money that they've been unable to pursue effectively because of understaffing!

In addition to the Department of the Environment's General Fund request of $11M, we ask that the following items be allocated to the relevant departments during the add-back process. These funds are meant to jump-start critical areas of the CAP and will help move the city closer to meeting our climate action goals in an equitable manner:

- Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup study as recommended by the June 1st Civil Grand Jury report
- Affordable Housing Electrification Pilot - $2M
- Street Tree Planting - $5M + $5M
- Commercial Kitchen Electrification Pilot - $2M
- District Energy Study - $250K
- CleanPowerSf Electrification Incentive Program - $1M + $1M

Let us be clear: these funds are only a tiny downpayment on the actions that urgently need to be taken. We particularly emphasize the Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup risks and join residents and community leaders from the Bayview Hunters Point Mothers and Fathers Committee, the Marie Harrison Community Foundation, Inc, and Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice in urging you immediately to follow the recommendations in the Civil Grand Jury Report released June 1st, 2022: "Buried Problems and a Buried Process: The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change."

Last year the Board of Supervisors' allocation of General Funds to SFE financed research on how a building electrification equity hub should be structured, as well as a study to analyze and determine possible long-term funding solutions for the CAP. While these things are getting underway, SFE and other relevant departments need *further* funding to begin actual implementation of the CAP.

Adequately and equitably funding climate action is crucial. Recent and ever-increasing wildfires, dirty air, drought, heat and other climate-related disasters hit the least-resourced and historically marginalized communities the hardest and have shown that significantly investing in the climate is something that cannot wait. Time is running out.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Audrey Liu, Steering Committee
San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition

Laura Neish, Executive Director
350 Bay Area

Elena Engel, Coordinating Committee
350 San Francisco

Kat Broomall, Transitional Coordinating Committee
1000 Grandmothers for Future Generations

Lauren Weston, Executive Director
Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet

Ben Schleifer, Food Program Coordinator
Center for Environmental Health

Maureen Blanc, Director
Charge Across Town

Deanna Schallau, San Francisco Chapter Co-Lead
Citizens' Climate Lobby

Amanda Millstein, MD, Co-Founder
Climate Health Now

Paul Wermer on behalf of
Climate Reality Project San Francisco Policy Action

Carleen Cullen, Co-Founder/Executive Director
Cool the Earth

Matthew Vespa, Senior Attorney
Earthjustice

Avni Jamdar, Bay Area Regional Director
Emerald Cities San Francisco Bay Area

Brian Wiedenmeier, Executive Director
Friends of the Urban Forest

Maggie Marks, Director
Garden for the Environment

Bradley Angel, Executive Director
Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice

Arieann Harrison, Founder
Marie Harrison Community Foundation

Maia Piccagli, Co-Founder
Mothers Out Front San Francisco

Elizabeth Stampe. City Strategist, American Cities Climate Challenge
Natural Resources Defense Council

Amber Hasselbring, Executive Director
Nature in the City

Eva Holman, Executive Director & Board Member
Plastic Free Fridays & Plastic Free Future

Antonio Díaz, Organizational Director
PODER

Shirley Golub, Chair, San Francisco and Oakland Chapters
Progressive Democrats of America

Robert M. Gould, MD, President
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility

Kristina Pappas, President
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Jennifer Clary, President
San Francisco Tomorrow

Ildiko Polony, Executive Director
Sutro Stewards

Miriam Gordon, Policy Director
Upstream

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Perkinson, Jessica (BOS)
Subject:	Communication from the Ingleside Merchants Association regarding File No. 211014
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 12:03:00 PM
Attachments:	Communication from the Ingleside Merchants Association regarding File No. 211014.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached communication from the Ingleside Merchants Association regarding File No. 211014.

File No. 211014 - Ocean Avenue Community Benefit District - Annual Report - FY2019-2020

Sincerely,

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

From:	Perkinson, Jessica (BOS)
To:	Peter Tham; Preston, Dean (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS)
Cc:	Miles Escobedo; Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Chung, Lauren (BOS); Kate Sofis (ECN); Ponce De Leon, Diana (ECN); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	GAO File No. 211014. || RE: Letter from the Ingleside Merchants Association to the GAO Committee
Date:	Wednesday, June 15, 2022 8:33:52 AM
Attachments:	6.3.2022 Supervisors Letter.pdf

Greetings Peter Tham,
Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
San Francisco Board of Supervisors | Office of the Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

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: Peter Tham <peter.tham@ltgroupre.com>

Sent: Friday, June 10, 2022 3:09 PM
To: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Kate Sofis (ECN) <kate.sofis@sfgov.org>; Ponce De Leon, Diana (ECN) <diana.poncedeleon@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org>; Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Miles Escobedo <oceanalehouse@gmail.com>
Subject: Letter from the Ingleside Merchants Association to the GAO Committee

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

Dear Members of the Board and Esteemed Directors and Staff Members,

Happy Friday. I hope everyone is enjoying the weather.

On behalf of the Ingleside Merchants Association, I am delivering this letter regarding the Ocean Avenue Association Strategic Plan that was adopted in February 2021. I thank all of you kindly for reviewing the letter. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you again and have a great weekend!

Regards,

Peter Tham
Realtor | DRE 01965347
C. 415.606.8210 | F. 415.366.1689
Peter.Tham@LTGroupRE.com
| Top Agent Network Verified Member |
LTGroupRE.com | Facebook | Zillow | Trulia

CHAIR
Miles Escobedo
Ocean Ale House

VICE CHAIR
Peter Tham
LT Group Real Estate

SECRETARY-TREASURER
Michelle Saadeh
The Pawber Shop

June 3, 2022

Board of Supervisors, Government Audit & Oversight Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

To: Supervisors Dean Preston, Connie Chan, Rafael Mandelman, Myrna Melgar, Ahsha Safai
CC: Director Kate Sofis, Deputy Director Diana Ponce De Leon

Dear Supervisors Preston, Chan, and Mandelman,

It's been five months since the Ocean Avenue Association appeared before the Government Audit & Oversight Committee. Before the organization makes its next appearance soon, we must share our deep concern and observations about its continued performance problems.

The OAA has not taken the Office of Economic and Workforce Development's recommendations presented at the January GAO Committee meeting, a review of its website and meeting minutes show. In the past five months, the OAA has not

- Finished executing the $65,000 strategic plan
- Developed ladders to elevate board members into leadership positions
- Installed term limits to the bylaws
- Organized an annual board retreat
- Gotten full participation from all board members during meetings
- Established rules for the awarding of subcontracts and proper fiduciary management
- Created an annual work plan

Despite the lack of performance and accountability, OEWD is giving OAA an additional $10,000 for board member training in the hopes that it will assist District 7's economic recovery.

The neighborhood is still reeling from the pandemic, gentrification, and crime waves, all while OAA and OEWD confer about the district's renewal and expansion.

We ask that the city hold the CBD accountable and compel its compliance with the strategic and management plans this summer. If it cannot, the city ought to take it over so that the neighborhood can flourish again.

Sincerely,
Miles Escobedo

From:	Perkinson, Jessica (BOS)
To:	Peter Tham; Preston, Dean (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS)
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Kate Sofis (ECN); Ponce De Leon, Diana (ECN); Chung, Lauren (BOS); Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Hsieh, Frances (BOS); Bintliff, Jacob (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	GAO File No. 211014 || RE: Letter from the Ingleside Merchants Association to the GAO Committee
Date:	Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:48:29 PM
Attachments:	6.15.2022 Ocean Avenue Letter.pdf

Greetings Peter Tham,
Thank you for comments. I will send your comments to all Government Audit and Oversight Committee Members and a copy will be included in the official file. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns. Thank you.

Jessica Perkinson
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Assistant Clerk
San Francisco Board of Supervisors | Office of the Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Jessica.Perkinson@sfgov.org | (415) 554-7722

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

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: Peter Tham <peter.tham@ltgroupre.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:35 PM

To: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Kate Sofis (ECN) <kate.sofis@sfgov.org>; Ponce De Leon, Diana (ECN) <diana.poncedeleon@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org>; Perkinson, Jessica (BOS) <jessica.perkinson@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Miles Escobedo <oceanalehouse@gmail.com>
Subject: Letter from the Ingleside Merchants Association to the GAO Committee

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

Dear Members of the Board and Esteemed Directors and Staff Members,

I hope everyone is having a good week so far.

On behalf of the Ingleside Merchants Association, I am delivering this letter regarding the Ocean Avenue Association Strategic Plan that was adopted in February 2021. I thank all of you kindly for reviewing the letter. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you and have a wonderful day.

Regards,

Peter Tham
Realtor | DRE 01965347
C. 415.606.8210 | F. 415.366.1689
Peter.Tham@LTGroupRE.com
| Top Agent Network Verified Member |
LTGroupRE.com | Facebook | Zillow | Trulia

CHAIR
Miles Escobedo
Ocean Ale House

VICE CHAIR
Peter Tham
LT Group Real Estate

SECRETARY-TREASURER
Michelle Saadeh
The Pawber Shop

June 15, 2022

Board of Supervisors, Government Audit & Oversight Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

To: Supervisors Dean Preston, Connie Chan, Rafael Mandelman, Myrna Melgar, and Ahsha Safai
CC Director Kate Sofis, Deputy Director Diana Ponce De Leon, Melissa G. Hernandez

Dear Supervisors Preston, Chan, and Mandelman,

Before the Ocean Avenue Association appears before the Government Audit & Oversight Committee soon, we would like to share our deep concerns about the current oversight of the nonprofit.

In February 2021, the OAA adopted a $65,000 strategic plan that has not been fully implemented to this day. Here's a breakdown of the outstanding to-dos nearly 18-months later:

30-to-60 day Recommendations
- Agree to develop of a marketing and communication plan
- Create a $25,000 communication and marketing budget
- Adopt a financial policy

60-to-120 day Recommendations
- Develop a work plan for 2021/22 fiscal year

Internal Recommendations
- Make the board handbook and financial policy part of each member's orientation
- Develop an annual work plan for the coming fiscal year in May
- Receive annual work plan progress reports and hold staff accountable
- Operate committees and Task Forces, ad-hoc committees with limited life and narrow focus around specific issues.

External Recommendations
- Develop a consistent communication strategy that targets the community and hold staff accountable for implementing it

Operational Recommendations
- Fund an office where business owners, property owners and the community can interface with OAA staff

Sincerely,
Miles Escobedo

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: SF Board of Supervisors Meeting June 14, 2022. •••• agenda 62 ••Board File 220619 ••• Lagune Honda Hospital
Date:	Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:28:00 PM

From: m. cleary Monley <mcmonley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 11:09 PM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Board of Supervisors Meeting June 14, 2022. •••• agenda 62 ••Board File 220619 ••• Lagune Honda Hospital

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

SF Board of Supervisors Meeting June 14, 2022. •••• agenda 62 ••Board File 220619 ••• Lagune Honda Hospital

Save Laguna Honda Hospital

Our son is a resident at Laguna Honda Hospital - since September 2019. He is a quadriplegic who had been living on his own at Serra House - run by Mercy housing - since 1987 as the result of gun violence. It has been a struggle, but he has weathered many crises and challenges. As his health has been deteriorating after 34 years in a wheelchair, and with the problems inherent in the securing attendant help though the IHHS system in this difficult economy in this expensive city, there is no way he could have survived the pandemic and the its disruptions. Getting into Laguna Honda was a life-saver. We are forever grateful for the care he continues to receive at this wonderful institution and for the dedication of the staff. But now with Laguna Honda being threatened with closure because of the loss of funding from Medicare and HHS his safety and security and health are threatened.

The federal government's mandate that a plan be put in place to move nearly 700 residents to non-existent care facilities is unreasonable, even impossible. Other appropriate facilities are just not to be found in the Bay Area, state or country. The distant government auditors have no idea of what a service Laguna Honda provides for the community and what an amazing institution it is. I visit Laguna Honda regularly and see it as a well-organized, well-run, caring institution that provides for the health and emotional needs of a fragile population in a clean modern - even beautiful - facility. Our son is safe and well-cared for at Laguna Honda. He can even thrive there. Cruel threats to forcibly remove these residents because of infractions by a few residents are beyond belief.

Those who decide the fate of Laguna Honda must not ignore the success of this nursing home - one of the largest in the nation - in fighting the Covid -19 crisis with low infection/death rates that have been a

model for the nation.

The supervisors and the other elected city officials are surely aware of the situation faced by this major San Francisco institution and of its vital importance to the residents and their families, not to mention the livelihoods of up to over 1000 dedicated employees. It is now time for action by our elected officials to convince Medicare, Medicaid and HHS Secretary Becerra to proceed with the recertification of Laguna Honda - to keep it open as a safe home for 700 San Franciscans. Thank you.

Michael and Karen Monley
Glen Park

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Laguna Honda: correcting the record about the current troubles
Date:	Thursday, June 16, 2022 2:03:00 PM

From: Teresa Palmer <teresapalmer2014@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 9:32 AM
To: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Laguna Honda: correcting the record about the current troubles

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

Ms. Calvillo and Ms. Somera:

Please post this testimony in the ***Public Correspondence*** for Board file # 220619 where background documents are posted on-line.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Teresa Palmer** <teresapalmer2014@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jun 16, 2022 at 9:21 AM
Subject: Laguna Honda: correcting the record about the current troubles
To: <Connie.Chan@sfgov.org>, Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>, Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, Mar, Gordon (BOS) <Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org>, Dean Preston <Dean.Preston@sfgov.org>, <Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org>, <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>, Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org>, Ronen, Hillary <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>, <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>

From:

Teresa Palmer M.D.
Family Medicine/Geriatrics
1845 Hayes St.

San Francisco, California 94117
Phone:415-260-8446
Fax: 415-292-7738
Email: Teresapalmer2014@gmail.com
Date: June 16 2022

I was an attending physician at Laguna Honda from 1989-2004.
The discussion about Laguna Honda at the June 14 BOS hearing was not an honest one by SFDPH and Laguna Honda officials:

Two points that were obfuscated by Health officials at the recent meeting:

1.The current problems threatening Laguna Honda are entirely predictable due to a decision made by the Mayor and SFDPH after the bond issue for the rebuild won in 1999:

In the early 2000s San Francisco Department of Health (SFDPH) gave priority at Laguna Honda to SFGH patients with behavioral and substance use issues - who are hard to discharge from San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH).

This plan was supposed to save money for the General Fund which must pay for out-of-county specialized facilities for behaviorally complex patients. So it had the support of successive Mayors and heads of SFDPH, who serve at the pleasure of the Mayor.

However care of these complicated patients was not adequately funded and specialized staffing and cohorting did not occur----repeated problems with violating nursing home regulations/human rights ensued. Laguna Honda is not "just" being persecuted by CMS---there is a real danger there that must be corrected.

2.Evicting people from Laguna Honda at this time is illegal. Involuntary evictions may jeopardize its licensure further!

Laguna Honda is supposed to make closing plans, but that is different than actual discharge/eviction of patients at this time.
See the link below from California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform:

"Under federal law, the only possible reasons for eviction in this situation would
be 1) failure to pay or 2) the facility is “ceasing to operate.” Neither of these reasons apply at this time. If a resident pays through Medi-Cal, for example,

Medi-Cal can pay Laguna Honda the same way that it always has. And the facility is not “ceasing to operate” — for now it is paid by Medicare and Medi-Cal for current residents."

http://canhr.org/factsheets/misc_fs/PDFs/FS_LagunaHonda.pdf

Thank you for listening,
Teresa Palmer MD

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Board File #220619 Laguna Honda Recertification
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 8:59:00 PM

From: VIVIAN IMPERIALE <zizivaga@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 11:01 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Board File #220619 Laguna Honda Recertification

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

Good morning--

Please post my testimony in the Public Correspondence for Board file #220619.

Thank you.

Vivian Imperiale MA

---------- Original Message ----------
From: VIVIAN IMPERIALE <zizivaga@comcast.net>
To: "Connie.Chan@sfgov.org" <Connie.Chan@sfgov.org>, "Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org" <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>, "Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org" <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, "Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org" <Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org>, "Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org" <Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org>, "Dean.Preston@sfgov.org" <Dean.Preston@sfgov.org>, "Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org" <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>, "Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org" <Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org>, "Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org" <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>, "Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org" <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, "Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org" <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: "DorseyStaff@sfgov.org" <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>
Date: 06/13/2022 10:58 AM
Subject: Board File #220619 Laguna Honda Recertification

Honorable Supervisors:

I am submitting this written testimony in anticipation of the June 14 hearing about the impending closure and Laguna Honda's strategy for recertification.

I worked at LHH for over 10 years where I started and ran a vocational rehabilitation program. I saw what the facility meant to those who live there.To uproot these people is cruel. It is also unrealistic as there are no beds nearby and out-of-state placements are isolating and likely unavailable or inappropriate.

It is very significant that the people receiving care there are not called "patients"; they are called "residents." This says a lot about the setting. It is far more than a hospital to those living there. It is their home. It provides them with more than shelter but with camaraderie with other residents, staff and volunteers, They get meals, activities and medical care for complex needs.

San Francisco must do whatever it can to advocate with the powers-that-be to keep Laguna Honda open long-term.

Sincerely,

Vivian Imperiale MA

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: EV Charging Support
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 3:42:00 PM
Attachments:	File# 220036 - Zoox EV Charging Support .pdf

John Bullock
Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-7706

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: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 1:55 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: EV Charging Support

C pages 220036

ERICA MAJOR
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click **HERE** to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

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: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 1:27 PM
To: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: EV Charging Support

From: Phil Pierce <ppierce@zoox.com>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 1:22 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Cc: Bert Kaufman <bert@zoox.com>
Subject: EV Charging Support

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

Dear Supervisor Peskin,

Attached please find Zoox's letter of support for the electric vehicle charging legislation that will be heard in the Land Use and Transportation Committee today. We appreciate the committee taking the time to review this legislation and look forward to working with city leaders to reach San Francisco's carbon neutral goals.

Thank you,
Phil

--
Phillip Pierce (he/him) / Senior Public Policy & Safety Strategy Manager / Zoox / +1 720 261 1151 (m)

ZOOX

ZOOX INC 1149 CHESS DR
FOSTER CITY, CA 94404

DATE:
6.13.2022

TO:
The Honorable Mayor London Breed and San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94012

RE: Support of File# 220036 - Electric Vehicle Charging Locations

Dear Honorable Mayor and Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for considering legislation that would improve San Francisco's electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Electric vehicles will play an important role in meeting San Francisco's goal of carbon neutrality by 2040, and a reliable charging infrastructure is key to reducing reliance on gas vehicles.

We support this legislation and believe it is a good first step toward a comprehensive electric vehicle charging infrastructure in our City. We look forward to continuing to work with the City of San Francisco to create a clear path to replacing all gas-powered vehicles with electric vehicles for every use case, especially for fleet operations.

Thank you,
Phillip Pierce,
Senior Public Policy & Safety Strategy Manager

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	53 Letters regarding the Welcome Ambassador Program
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:39:00 PM
Attachments:	53 Letters regarding the Welcome Ambassador Program.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 53 letters regarding the Welcome Ambassador Program.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Mariam Aminy
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Please do not cut tenderloins ambassador program budget
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 12:27:01 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that you not cut the $4.5 million dollars from OEWD's budget that funds the innovative community-based safety program in the Tenderloin/Mid-Market. These cuts would immediately remove 40-50 Urban Alchemy Practitioners from Tenderloin sidewalks, as well as some of the Park Captains at Boeddeker, Turk-Hyde and Macaulay and other community ambassadors on Larkin Street.

The Tenderloin relies on these ambassadors to calm the sidewalks and parks for the small businesses, children, families, and seniors there. Where the TL has these ambassadors, people are able to go about their daily lives - walking their children to school, commuting to work, visiting the corner store or going the park with their families - without the constant threat of violence created by the concentration of the City's deadly drug market in the Tenderloin. The Tenderloin wants more community-based safety NOT a dramatic cut!

Please do not cut OEWD's budget for community-based safety in the Tenderloin.

Thank you for your time and consideration, Mariam

Sent from my iPhone

From: Pat Gallagher
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Support our Ambassadors please!
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2022 11:54:35 AM

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

To: Chair Ronen and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee:

I urge you to support the increased funding for the successful Welcome Ambassadors program being contemplated. These friendly and helpful members of our hospitality corps are vital to San Francisco's tourism recovery. They provide directions, recommendations and a friendly, neighborly voice to assist the many visitors we have returning to our City. They can and do make a huge difference in the experience of travelers unfamiliar with San Francisco as they navigate the City.

As you probably know, tourism is our biggest industry and revenue generator in San Francisco and making a positive experience for visitors is more important now than ever as we do our best to recover. At the peak, 26 million people from all over the globe came to SF which represented over $10 billion in revenue and over $800 million in taxes. These Ambassadors are not only the first line of assistance for visitors, but play a vital, cost effective legion of help for anyone trying to navigate the streets and neighborhoods in our City.

We usually don't get a second chance to make a good first impression! Welcome Ambassadors can make all the difference in a great or terrible visit.

I'm a proud senior longtime resident of San Francisco's Cow Hollow neighborhood, doing what I can to help our City recover. Please help us!

Thanks for your consideration in supporting more Welcome Ambassadors! They make a HUGE difference.

Sincerely,

Pat Gallagher
1990 Green Street #101
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 672-1925 voice/text

From: Greg Moore
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: proposed $4.5 million Budget Cut for Community Ambassadors - TL/Mid-Maret
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2022 8:19:10 AM

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

I strongly urge the Board to NOT cut funding for Community Ambassadors in the Tenderloin & Mid-Market. A $4.5 million cut, indeed ANY cut whatsoever, would have a negative impact on the dramatic improvement in safety & clean conditions of areas where these various ambassador groups have been working over the past 1+ years.

LEAD US FORWARD, NOT BACKWARD by supporting this critically important resource!

Thank you.
Greg Moore (TL worker for over 20 yrs)

From:	Corinna Luebbe
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 6:55:11 PM

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 Budget and Finance Sub Committee,
I am writing on behalf of Taj Campton Place to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program.

San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Corinna Luebbe
General Manager
Taj Campton Place

T +1 415 955 5532
Corinna.Luebbe@tajhotels.com

DISCLAIMER: This email (including any attachments) is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient/s and may contain material that is CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVATE COMPANY INFORMATION. Any review or reliance by others or copying or distribution or forwarding of any or all of the contents in this message is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. The opinions expressed are those of the sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Company. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email and delete all copies; your cooperation in this regard is appreciated.

From:	Terry Lewis
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Welcome Ambassador Program support
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 8:41:27 AM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png image006.png image007.png image008.png image009.png image010.png

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,

I am writing on behalf of the Hiltons of Union Square to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Conference and group, tour and leisure visitors are not back to levels prior to the pandemic.

Truly, one of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall. Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco. Their smiles and caring go a long way in making our visitors feel welcomed.

Sincerely,
Terry Lewis

Terry Lewis |Complex General Manager
REPRESENTING THE HILTON HOTELS OF SAN FRANCISCO UNION SQUARE
t: +1 415-202-7096 | m: +1 415-203-7260 | terry.lewis@hilton.com

HILTON SAN FRANCISCO UNION SQUARE & HILTON PARC 55 SAN FRANCISCO
333 O'Farrell Street | San Francisco CA 94102 | USA

Hilton EventReady with CleanStay

Hilton EventReady Hybrid Solutions

Flexible & Ready

Contact me to learn more.



Let's Get Social! @HiltonSFUnionSquare | @Parc55Hotel

This transmission is not a digital or electronic signature and cannot be used to form, document, or authenticate a contract. Hilton and its affiliates accept no liability arising in connection with this transmission. Copyright 2022 Hilton Proprietary and Confidential

From: Ben Ayariga a.
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: SF Welcome Ambassadors Program
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 2:31:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Azumah Ayariga and I am proud to be a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador/Team Leader since the beginning of the program in early October 2021.

I was born and raised in Ghana before moving to San Francisco Bay Area in March, 2011. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing about my job is that, I am able to showcase the beautiful city I love, and also help create positive lasting memories for both our Tourists and local Residents.

This job is important to me personally because it helps pay for my bills and provides for my family who depends on me for most of their daily needs. I am also able to showcase and project my city in a positive way to the world.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: the appreciation of what we do from people, welcoming our morning commuters to work, helping people with walkers/wheelchairs cross some of our busy streets, welcoming our international and local tourists with a smile and helping them navigate the city with ease, helping our older folks carry their groceries, calling on city and federal services to get help for some of our homeless population and people with mental health issues, serving as a security layer on our streets, and being the face of San Francisco and what it stands for.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe and welcome.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation of** our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Your respectfully

Azumah Ayariga
Team Leader,

Block By Block

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From: Dylan Pemberton
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: [Block by Block] Funding Renewal
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 12:53:20 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Dylan Pemberton and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since May 2022.

I grew up in Vacaville and moved to the San Francisco Bay Area in 2016. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing about my job is helping tourists, usually international, that would otherwise not receive the same urgent help and details that they need.

This job is important to me personally because the routine and habits necessary to perform well on the job have reinforced healthy behaviors when I'm off-duty. I am so, so grateful for this job. My depression, anxiety, and stress have decreased significantly. This job has made me happier and more stable than I have been in a long time.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are:

-Escorting a South American couple to the F line stop by Pier 35. They spoke very little English and needed to get to Oracle Park. No one was helping them and they were very appreciative that someone was not only willing to write them directions, but also walk them to their bus stop. So appreciative that they insisted that they give me a big tip. They were disappointed that I legally could not accept tips.

-Gave written directions to a woman who needed to leave her living situation. She was being vague, but I interpreted what she said as meaning she escaped an abusive relationship. She needed to get to a hotel in San Bruno, but didn't know the Bay Area or its public transport at all. I gave her written directions, including the two BART lines that would take her to the same stop in San Bruno, the bus to look for in San Bruno, and where to find Muni employees that could answer any specific questions. I gave a quick explanation as to what BART was and walked her through the visual route on Google Maps.

-Any time I say "also, this is where the nearest public restroom is" to a family with kids when I'm giving them directions.

We get compliments from visitors, locals, and business owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully,
Dylan Pemberton

From: Carlos Andrade
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: SF Ambassadors
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 12:53:03 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Carlos Antonio Andrade Deodanes and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since

I grew up in/was born in El Salvador I moved to San Francisco Bay Area in 1990) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are because I held my family with the salary and I can spend money in the local business with the salary I have .and help the people tourists to come back

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully.
Carlos Antonio Andrade Deodanes.

From: Teto Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: SF Ambassadors
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 11:41:00 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors

My name is ROBERTO DIAZ and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since MAY 2022

I moved to San Francisco Bay in 2015. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is that I get to meet new people and in the pressies I get to help out and be Abel to have them enjoy the city the same way I have and I also love to work with my coworkers because we are a team with value

This job is important to me personally because I'm financially stable and one day would like the opportunity to move up in the company and be Abel to build a career with block by block

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: that I'm Abel to put a smile on people's faces, and make there vist wonderful it also helps me to know my city even better

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that the funding for this program continues so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to help to improve the image and reputation of our great city and help with our economic recovery.

Yours respectfully

From: Darlene Langston
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: SF Ambassadors
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 10:46:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Darlene Langston and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since March of this year.

I grew up in San Francisco. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing about my job is how happy we make people with just being there.

This job is important to me personally because I love being in the city and helping people get to where they have to go and hoping they have a beautiful day.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: Being thanked constantly for just smiling, or when I show somebody directions and they start telling me where they're from and give me their back story on why they are here .

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
Darlene Langston

From: Aja Cayetano
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: SF AMBASSADORS
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 10:52:12 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors

My name is Aja Cayetano and I am proud to be a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador/Team Lead since November 2021.

I was born and raised a native of San Francisco. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing about my job is being able to help others learn and experience what I love so much about my home town.

This job is important to me personally because it has given the opportunity to move forward in life in ways I could never imagine. I am able to see a bigger and brighter future for myself and it has been amazing. working with the variety of people we have here.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: That we get compliments from visitors, locals and business owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Your respectfully,

Aja Cayetano

From: Marc Zwissler
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Sf ambassadors
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 10:49:07 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Marc Zwissler and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since

I grew up in/was born in Germany and lived in Los Angeles (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area in 2004) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are assisting locals and visitors
I have great responses from people all over the world
I love my job every day helping people and being in all the great locations San Francisco has to offer and share my knowledge of this great city with everyone
Everybody loves our ambassador services have only positive feed back from all over the world
And wishing there would have a ambassador program in there city or country
My team and management are all great and exited to work here and serve the great city of San Francisco
I personal think this is the best city in America
And all the people in this city and Travelers alike think so too

This job is important to me personally because
I enjoy every day it's a positive and stress free enviroment
I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are:
Guiding assisting people who are welcoming my assistance

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

Thank you so much

Best
Marc Zwissler

Sent from my iPhone

From: Cuddy Keyz
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Thank you
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 12:52:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Roderick Tannehill and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since April 2022.

I grew up in/was born in San Francisco Bay Area in Bayview Hunters Point district. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are meeting new people from everywhere.

This job is important to me personally because it keeps me busy and engaging with people local or tourist.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are learning new things about my city and sharing them with others.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
Roderick L Tannehill
Sent from my iPhone

From: e s
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: at ambassador
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 12:42:21 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Evan Seronello and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since 12/2021

I grew up in the East Bay Area and was born in Walnut creek (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area in) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are The opportunity to help others in both serious and no serious situations. From something as little as directions, to calling 911 or non emergency line when needed.

This job is important to me personally because, the feeling i get from helping others and being the one people look to for guidance is extremely rewarding.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: When you i have turned a negative expirence to a positive and watching the change in the persons face.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From: Lexi Carlin-Henry
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Thank you!
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 12:39:25 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Lexi Carlin-Henry and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since April 2022. I was born and raised in San Francisco, I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best part about my job is that I get to encounter all different types of people, coming from all over the world. This job is important to me personally because I enjoy helping others. I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: seeing performers at the pier, trying diverse restaurants in my allocation for the day, and helping tourist see the beauty of San Francisco.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully,

Lexi

From: Zo Stickybih
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Hello
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 12:37:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Larenzo Carter and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since

I grew up in/was born in Sacramento California (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area in 11/17/2011) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are making sure people get to point A to point B. An to make sure that the visitors or tourist are leaving with a smile & wanting to come back to san fracisco

This job is important to me personally because I love to help the people & the atmosphere of san francisco

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: Being able to travel through san francicso getting to know all the good places to be at or eat. An seeing all the new people who come from different cities & states faces finding out the new places to visit

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

From: Fernandez, Christigale
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 11:52:46 AM

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

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee
CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of **The Marriott International Citywide Cluster of Hotels in San Francisco** *(including SF Marriott Marquis, Westin St. Francis, W San Francisco, The Clancy Autograph Collection, JW Marriott Union Square, and Marriott San Francisco Union Square)* to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco

Thank you,

Christigale Fernandez
Citywide Sales Executive, San Francisco
Western Mountain Pacific Region
415-758-8019 (M)

Marriott INTERNATIONAL | United States & Canada

MARRIOTT BONVOY

Explore Endless Opportunities

FIND YOUR DREAM CAREER

This communication contains information from Marriott International, Inc. that may be confidential. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

From: Cekova, Tatyana
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 12:01:40 PM

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 Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of **The Westin St. Francis** to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Tatyana

Tatyana Cekova
Senior Catering Sales Executive

THE WESTIN ST. FRANCIS SAN FRANCISCO ON UNION SQUARE
335 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
United States
www.westinstfrancis.com
T +1 415 725 1068 E tatyana.cekova@westin.com
Marriott Bonvoy | Facebook | Instagram | Hotel Video | Virtual Tour



-

From: Hom, Wendy
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 11:49:38 AM

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

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee
CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of **The Westin St. Francis** to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Wendy

Wendy Hom, CMP
Senior Event Manager

THE WESTIN ST. FRANCIS SAN FRANCISCO ON UNION SQUARE
335 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
United States
www.westinstfrancis.com
T +1 415 774 0284 F +1 415 403 6891 M +1 415 243 7426 E: wendy.hom@westin.com
Marriott Bonvoy | Facebook | Instagram | Hotel Video | Virtual Tour



From: Terry, Ryan
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 11:31:08 AM
Attachments: image001.png

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

June 20, 2022

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee
CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of The Westin St. Francis San Francisco on Union Square to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall. Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers. Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Ryan Terry
Senior Sales Executive

THE WESTIN ST. FRANCIS SAN FRANCISCO ON UNION SQUARE
335 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
United States
www.westinstfrancis.com
M 415 725 1087 E ryan.terry@westin.com
Marriott Bonvoy | Facebook | Instagram | Hotel Video | Virtual Tour



From:	Kimball, Jon
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Welcome Ambassador Program
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 3:14:35 AM
Attachments:	image002.png

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

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee
CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of our 700 associates at **The Westin St. Francis** to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. We are working so hard to bring business back.

One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco. It is just so critical to our continued growth and our ability to welcome guests to our city every day.

Sincerely,

Jon Kimball
Area General Manager

THE WESTIN ST. FRANCIS SAN FRANCISCO ON UNION SQUARE
335 Powell Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.774.0101 M 415.725.1089

www.westinstfrancis.com

Marriott Bonvoy > Facebook > Instagram > Hotel Video > Virtual Tour

THE WESTIN
ST. FRANCIS
SAN FRANCISCO
ON UNION SQUARE

Leave Your Heart in San Francisco

Stay golden in the heart of the city and explore endless adventures.

LEARN MORE



From: Puccinelli, Daniela
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Sunday, June 19, 2022 7:22:53 AM

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 Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of **The Westin St. Francis** to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Daniela Puccinelli
Director of Event Management

THE WESTIN ST. FRANCIS SAN FRANCISCO ON UNION SQUARE
335 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
United States
www.westinstfrancis.com
T +1 415 774 0337 F +1 415 403 6891 M +1 415 418 8531 E Daniela.puccinelli@westin.com
Marriott Bonvoy | Facebook | Instagram | Hotel Video | Virtual Tour



From: Smutzer, Michael
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Saturday, June 18, 2022 5:04:49 PM

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

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee
CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committee:

I am writing on behalf of The Westin St. Francis to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Michael

Michael Smutzer
Hotel Manager

THE WESTIN ST. FRANCIS SAN FRANCISCO ON UNION SQUARE
335 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
United States
www.westinstfrancis.com
T +1 415 774 0156 E michael.smutzer@westin.com
Marriott Bonvoy | Facebook | Instagram | Hotel Video | Virtual Tour

THE WESTIN
ST. FRANCIS
SAN FRANCISCO
ON UNION SQUARE

Leave Your Heart in San Francisco

Stay golden in the heart of the city and explore endless adventures.

LEARN MORE



From: Huldi, Roger
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 4:40:16 PM
Attachments: image001.png

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

Dear Members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

The Mayor, through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development's budget, has proposed to add additional funding to our wildly successful Welcome Ambassador program. The program has been a positive tool to make our streets feel safer, and provide services such as directions and restaurant recommendations for business and leisure visitors. Funding for the Welcome Ambassador program is being discussed in the budget process at the Board of Supervisors and I kindly ask you to support this important program.

Warm regards & Live Exquisite

Roger Huldi
General Manager
he/him/his

The St. Regis San Francisco
125 Third Street San Francisco, California 94103
o. +1 415 284 4050
m. +1 415 846 0941
stregissanfrancisco.com



From: Love King
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Sf Ambassador
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 10:45:42 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Love King and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since April 2022

I moved to the San Francisco Bay Area 3 years ago from Boston, MA) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing about my job is to help people out, showing them the way around the city and doing it with a smile.

This job is important to me personally because I love to help people and put smiles on my face.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: greeting the public with a smile which we all need at this moment. showing visitors how to get to where they are going and more

We get compliments from visitors, locals and business owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully,

Love King

From: Shailendra Singh
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: SF Ambassador
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 10:41:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Shailendra Singh and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since

I grew up in/was born in (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area in I was born in San Francisco) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are

This job is important to me personally because

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: Tourist compliment the city for having us as a helper and the residents love it too. The elderly people love they always say thank you for being out here and they feel safe.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

Shailendra Singh
Sent from my iPhone

From: lonnie george
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Sf Ambassador
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 1:22:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Lonnie George and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since march of 2022 and i absolutely love everything about my job. I enjoy providing friendly hospitality to the many tourist and residents who all find a place in there heart to cherish everlasting memories Of what San Francisco has to offer
Having spent much of my early life in Sacramento i relocated to the bay area for the vast job opportunities in late July of 2019.I have been living in san francisco for about two years and i love my job as a welcome ambassador for sf travel everyday I am able to discover and create new everlasting memories engaging with tourists who want to have an amazing time in San francisco enjoy sharing my favorite spots I personally believe that my position as a welcome ambassador is very important helpful for sf travel being that their is always so much going on in the city having ambassadors scattered throughout the city really gives the many tourist with assistance with their travel questions.
We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

Lonnie george

From: Omri Walker
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: sf ambassador
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 10:53:52 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is omri walker and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since moved to the Bay Area in 2005 and I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing about my job is how I get to help people all day

i personally think this program is vary important to the city because sadly it can be highly confusing.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best parts of my job is seeing people enjoying the city.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
omri walker

From:	COLDSHOWDA7 Phillips
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	sf ambassador
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 10:52:38 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Robert Phillips and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since April 2021.

I grew up in/was born in Dayton ,Ohio (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area in 2001). I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing about my job is sight seeing and engaging with different walks of life.

This job is important to me personally because I have become a resource for local international travelers to feel free to explore new adventures in S.F.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are:
Being a solid resource for people and developing trust. Also meeting professional athletes and entertainers to most interesting people.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

Robert Phillips

From: ronald minolli
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 10:37:58 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since Ron Minolli

I grew up in/was born in SF (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area in) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are

This job is important to me personally because

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are:
Giving information about SF to tourists from all over the world and making everyone feel comfortable.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
Ron Minolli

Sent from my iPhone

From: Vidal Rodriguez.Jr.
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 4:32:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Vidal Rodriguez Jr and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since

I moved to San Francisco Bay Area in December of last year) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are I get to help people from all over the world and learn about their country and culture most importantly I make them feel welcome as if they were at home and they get more time to enjoy their vacation exploring our city than looking for a place to go to

This job is important to me personally because it helps me to communicate with others and not take things personal it teaches me to have a better life and acknowledge the other side of the world as well as this country.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are:

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

From: Elizabeth Smith
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 4:28:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors

My name is Elizabeth Smith and I am proud to be a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador, I have been a Welcome Ambassador since February 2022. I was born in San Francisco, CA. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best things about my job are being able to work with the public and promote this beautiful city that I call home. Working at this job I learn new things about SF. Like street events/parade and local businesses. This job is important to me personally because without this job I don't know how I would survive in SF with the cost of living.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are:
For starters Block By Block has Great Team! They're super supportive and we have a positive atmospheres at work. I appreciate our morning stretches and preparing us to get started for the day. I enjoy being useful and helping out our local residents and tourist by providing information.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

All the best

Liz Smith

From: Emmanuel Auelua
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 3:54:07 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Emmanuel Auelua and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since January 11, 2022.

I grew up in South San Francisco. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing about this is that I get the opportunity to meet new people everyday and I get to learn more and more about the city of San Francisco.

This job is important to me personally because it allows me to make a name for myself.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are telling people and the famous cable cars and also walking throughout the beautiful places of Chinatown.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and business owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
Emmanuel Auelua

From: William Garlock
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: SF Ambassadors
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 10:28:24 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is William Garlock and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since April 2021

I moved to San Francisco Bay Area in I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is meeting people

This job is important to me personally because it's fun

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are helping people

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
William

Sent from my iPhone

From: marco lopez
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: welcome ambassador
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 4:18:32 PM

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

Dear board of supervisors my name is Marco Lopez i have been an ambassador since March of 2022 this job is very important to me because i love helping people and this job lets me help people a lot i've been in san francisco for 23 years i love this city and this job lets me help out the city that i love i love helping out tourist and people and i feel so good that i can put a smile on everyone face and even if its a little help for some people i love making there experience in san francisco feel better and i love when alot of people say thank you for doing this job to me also i love the feeling about my group members is great love this group and my managers i worked in alot of places but i never had so much appreciation for a job like i do for block by block thank you so much

From:	Greg Hansen
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	San Francisco Ambassador Program
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 4:10:17 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors

My name is Greg Hansen and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since Dec 7th, 2021.

I grew up in/was born in Sacramento and moved to the San Francisco Bay Area in 1992 I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are helping all of the tourists to enjoy their visit, by giving them all the information I can about taking the cable cars, visiting all of the attractions, and generally getting the most out of their visit, so they will return again, and again!! As I believe every tourist counts, and subsequently every dollar they bring to our economy counts!!

This job is important to me personally because I really enjoy the personal interactions, and the positive feedback we hear all the time. To be able to make someones day, by explaining how the cable car/bus system works, or where to find a restaurant that's off the beaten path means the world to me, and is why I enjoy and look forward to coming to work everyday!

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: Seeing the look of relief and gratitude people have after you explain how the cable cars, and all days passes work, which happens all the time when I work at the cable cars! I also really enjoy all the times I have used Google Translate to communicate with people from around the world! I really enjoy helping each person in line waiting for the cable car to make sure they understand the different routes, and have signed up with Muni Mobile to get their all day passes. I could talk all day about the positive influece all of the ambassadors are making each day. Even today when I escorted numerous people thru the Warriors parade crowd to make sure they reach the BART entrance, the list of achievements we make every day goes on, and on....

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

Greg Hansen

From: Daniel Ortiz
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Ambassador Program
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 4:08:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name Daniel and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since February 8 2022
I grew up in/was born this very beautiful city of San Francisco (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are that i get to work outside the city I love.This job is important to me personally because it helps me feed my family and I help people see the city in a different aspect! I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: seeing people so happy after I recommend restaurants or experience they would otherwise look over.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
Daniel Ortiz

From: Kimberly Tien
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Ambassador Program
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 12:31:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Kimberly Tien and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since April of this year, 2022.

I grew up in various parts of the Bay Area and I frequent San Francisco. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back.

The best thing about my job is being able to help people and making them feel welcome. Not everyone is used to being helped and acknowledged, especially by strangers. My goal every shift is to be a friendly, reliable person that both locals and tourists are comfortable interacting with.

This job is important to me personally because I believe in making a positive impact no matter how small. What may seem trivial to me is what will make somebody else's day.

I have had many positive experiences at my job. Some of the best experiences are the interactions I have with the Block by Block team. It is an immensely supportive work environment that strives for quality and mutual understanding.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully,

Kimberly Tien

From: houshmand azadganian
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Houshmand Azadganian
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 1:05:36 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Houshmand Azadganian and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since April 2022.

I moved to San Francisco Bay Area in 1979. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best things, about my job is, that I get to help people, and direct them, where they want to go. Have a positive attitude, make them smile and welcome them to, SF. Tell them , all the wonderful , and exciting places San Francisco has to offer. Make sure they have a beautiful experience.

This job is important to me personally because, it is important to me, people enjoy their stay at SF.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
Houshmand Azadganian

From: Zach Watson
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: SF Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 1:03:12 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Zach Watson and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since January 5, 2022.

I was born & raised in South San Francisco. I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best things about my job are getting to know more about this beautiful city so that I can share that knowledge with the people I interact with & feel that I am having a direct influence on improving the communities that I am in.

This job is important to me personally because I have a strong desire to serve & leave places better than I found them. Having the opportunity to directly serve in communities to help make them cleaner, safer, & friendlier places has been an amazing, fulfilling experience.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are:
meeting friendly locals who share their stories & histories of the communities they're ingrained in,
hearing visitors express how grateful they are for having someone readily available to offer them direction & assistance,
& having been available to offer medical & psychiatric resources to a man when he was in need.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully
Zach Watson

From: Bryant Wallace
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Bryant Wallace Welcome Ambassador
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 1:02:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors
My name is Bryant Wallace and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since 04/29/2022

I grew up in/was born in (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area in 03/05/2000) I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are I get to have the opportunity to put smiles on peoples faces from all walks of life. Interact with people making them feel at home away from home. This job is important to me personally because bringing the City back to its prior prominence before the pandemic is essential because the City relies so much on tourism as one of its main economic base and I want to be a part of making that happen.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: Giving homeless people resources to better their life and get them shelter. Giving lost people directions. Escorting tourists to their desired destinations and getting to know them along the way.

We get compliments from visitors, locals and businesses owners whenever we are out working. I know this program is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. We give them great information and make them feel safe.

It is very important that **the funding for** this program continues **so that we can provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to** help to improve the image **and reputation** of our great city **and help with our economic recovery**.

Yours respectfully

From: Marcio Ramirez
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Marcio Ramirez Lopez
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 12:52:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors

My name is Marcio Ramirez Lopez and I am proud to have been a San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since

I grew up in/was born in San Francisco's Mission District (or moved to San Francisco Bay Area in). I love this city and feel it is very important to help bring people back. The best thing/s about my job is/are that I get to help locals and tourist with getting to where they need to go, whether it's for a fun event happening in North Beach, reminding people where Dragons Gate is, and just giving people a reason to smile when I say hi to them.

This job is important to me personally because I'm being developed into the team leader that can confidently do the job that is required of me, plus more. This job is also helping me grow outside of work by learning to be patience during difficult situations and using the tools I learn on the field to help me through your my own exploration.

I have had many positive experiences in my job. Some of the best are: Making new friends and memories here at work, being promoted, and meeting Dave Chappelle at the ferry building.

From: Chris Hoffman
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Chris Hoffman - SF Welcome Ambassador - Letter to Board of Supervisors
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 11:24:06 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Chris Hoffman and I have been a proud San Francisco Welcome Ambassador since April 2022.

I was born and raised in San Francisco and went to pre-school at Children's Day School across from Mission Dolores, grade school at Cathedral School for Boys atop Nob Hill, and high school in the sunset at St. Ignatius College Preparatory.

I spent seven years in New York City having gone to film school at New York University and then moved to Los Angeles furthering my career in film and television entertainment working on both Academy Award winning films Birdman and The Revenant.

I moved back to San Francisco in November 2020 to support my father as a caregiver after he had a life-altering stroke. I am an only child and my mother passed away when I was in high school.

I have always wanted to work out in the field and out from behind a desk, which film productions very much offered me, so being back in San Francisco during the pandemic I was eager to find a new work opportunity that offered the ability to connect with human beings with sincerity and compassion and at a company with a positive mission that resonated with my personal morals and heart.

When I saw a flyer for the SF Welcome Ambassadorship on the community bulletin board in the Philz Coffee Castro location, I knew that it was my opportunity to channel my intrinsic passionate desire to bring my own personal light and love of San Francisco to those who visit the city and/or local residents whom are in need of additional care and support.

San Francisco holds a deep emotional and special place in my heart and personal identity. I have always been so grateful to have been raised in such a diverse, inclusive, passionate, and beautiful city.

Witnessing the barrage of negative national press about San Francisco and the desperation of the "native" local marginalized population exacerbated by the pandemic, I am grateful to be a part of the SF Welcome Ambassadorship whose mission it is to reinvigorate the positive emotional connection between San Francisco and those who visit. I know that this positive connection is possible because I genuinely understand it.

During my time as an ambassador I have been told by multiple SF guests that I have made their day, that my suggestion of a restaurant or destination was excellent, and that they wish they could bring me with them throughout the day as their guide to San Francisco. The

positive difference I may be able to make in someone's experience of the city I love so dearly - is worth it every time I put on my ambassador uniform with pride and go forth into the city ready and excited to be the positive difference in the city that I feel needs it so desperately right now.

I know that the SF Welcome Ambassadorship is making a positive difference to people's experience in San Francisco. I have been told repeatedly by guests that they think the ambassadors are a real benefit to their experience of San Francisco in their feeling supported to navigate the public transportation system with confidence and to be given local guidance on where to spend their time/money, and that their own cities would benefit from a similar program.

It is very important that the funding for this program continues so that I, and all us Ambassadors, may provide this important service to visitors and the general public. Supporting our work will continue to help to improve the image and reputation of our great city and help with our economic recovery.

Respectfully,

Chris Hoffman
San Francisco Welcome Ambassador
m 415-710-3499
rchfilms@gmail.com

From: Wawa, Chris
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Welcome Ambassadors
Date: Saturday, June 18, 2022 2:47:03 PM

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

June 18, 2022

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee
CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of The Westin St. Francis to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program.

San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the city, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Chris Wawa
Director of Revenue Management

THE WESTIN ST. FRANCIS SAN FRANCISCO ON UNION SQUARE
335 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
United States
www.westinstfrancis.com
T +1 415 733 1276 M +1 248 321 6202 E chris.wawa@westin.com

Marriott Bonvoy | Facebook | Instagram | Hotel Video | Virtual Tour



From:	Heiko Novak
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 7:49:37 PM

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, Budget and Finance Sub Committee,

I am writing on behalf of Axiom Hotel San Francisco, an independent hotel located in Union Square, to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program.

San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program, which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers. This program is also a critical tool to continue to build back business at Moscone Center, which brings in billions of dollars annually.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Heiko Novak, GTP Director of Sales & Marketing
E-Mail: heiko.novak@axiomhotel.com
Main: 415.39AXIOM (415.392.9466) Direct: 628.242.0304
28 Cyril Magnin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102


STAY AT
THE CENTER OF NEXT
AXIOM
HOTEL
SAN FRANCISCO

From:	Stefan Muhle
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program
Date:	Thursday, June 16, 2022 6:35:29 PM
Attachments:	ATT00001.png ATT00002.png ATT00003.png ATT00004.png ATT00005.png

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 Budget and Finance Subcommittee,

I am writing on behalf of Noble House Hotels & Resorts to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program.

San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Stefan Muhle
VP, Regional Managing Director
NOBLE HOUSE
HOTELS & RESORTS
Argonaut Hotel
Hotel Zoe Fisherman's Wharf
495 Jefferson Street, San Francisco, CA 94109
(o) 415-345-5505 | (f) 415-563-2800
smuhle@noblehousehotels.com



From: Taylor Safford
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Welcome Ambassadors Program
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 12:47:50 PM

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 Budget and Finance Subcommittee, I am writing on behalf of PIER 39 to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. I also sit on the Board of the Tourism Improvement District which was awarded the grant last year to administer the Welcome Ambassador Program.

An independent survey found that nearly 80% of visitors said the Welcome Ambassadors made them feel more welcome in San Francisco, and more than 90% of visitors indicated that they were likely or certain to recommend San Francisco as a place to visit because of their interaction with an Ambassador. In short, the Ambassadors have been a smashing success and they are helping to retore and burnish the city's reputation as an international destination.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. We all know that the pandemic was devastating for our visitor industry. And one of the most impactful and positive investments that the city made to help the recovery is the Welcome Ambassador Program which was launched last fall.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Thank you,

Taylor

Taylor Safford | President & CEO
E taylor@pier39.com | **T** 415.705.5500 | **F** 415.705.5521
PIER 39 | P.O. Box 193730 | San Francisco, CA 94119-3730
www.pier39.com | Follow us: Facebook + Twitter + Instagram

A Visit to San Francisco Starts at The PIER

From:	Ashesh Manandhar
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Welcome Ambassador Funding
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 12:40:30 PM
Attachments:	ATT00001.png ATT00002.png ATT00003.png ATT00004.png ATT00005.png

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 Budget and Finance Sub Committee,

I am writing on behalf of The Argonaut Hotel to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program.

San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Ashesh Manandhar
Revenue Analyst

NOBLE HOUSE
HOTELS & RESORTS

Argonaut Hotel
Hotel Zoe Fisherman's Wharf
495 Jefferson Street, San Francisco, CA 94109
(o) 415-345-5516
AManandhar@noblehousehotels.com

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Welcome Ambassador Program Funding
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 10:03:00 AM

From: Vermolen, Raymond <Raymond.Vermolen@ihg.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 8:23 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Welcome Ambassador Program Funding

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

June 17, 2022

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee
CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of the InterContinental San Francisco to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program.

San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Raymond Vermolen

Area General Manager
INTERCONTINENTAL SAN FRANCISCO HOTEL

Tel: +1 415 616 6532
Fax: +1 415 616 6531
Email: raymond.vermolen@ihg.com

Live the InterContinental life



INTERCONTINENTAL® SAN FRANCISCO

888 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Tel: +1 415 616 6500 Fax: +1 415 616 6581

From: Susanna Flores
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: support of welcome ambassador program
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 10:02:22 AM
Attachments: Welcome Ambassador General Membership Communication.docx

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

I am writing to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program. Please find attached.

June 16, 2022

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee
CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program.

San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,



Susanna Flores
917 743 7833
susannacf@gmail.com

From: Amy Cacho
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Support of Welcome Ambassador Program
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 11:10:48 AM
Attachments: ATT00001.png
ATT00002.png
ATT00003.png
ATT00004.png
ATT00005.png

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

TO: Members of the San Francisco Budget and Finance Subcommittee

CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committee

I am writing on behalf of the Argonaut Hotel and Hotel Zoe to support funding for the Welcome Ambassador Program.

San Francisco has been disproportionately impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the most impactful and positive investments that has helped us welcome back business and leisure visitors is the Welcome Ambassador Program which launched last fall.

Prior to the pandemic, tourism was San Francisco's number one industry welcoming over 26 million visitors who spent over $10 billion in our city. Tourism employs over 86,000 individuals supporting our small businesses, restaurants, accommodations, transportation and tours, attractions and arts and cultural institutions. Additionally, tourism brought in over $800 million in taxes to the City, which helps to provide essential services and employ essential workers.

Please support the funding for the Welcome Ambassadors so that this innovative program can continue to welcome back and enhance the visitor experience in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Amy Cacho
Regional Director of Sales & Marketing, Northern California

NOBLE HOUSE
HOTELS & RESORTS

600 6th Street S, Kirkland, WA 98033
(o) 415-345-5515 | (c) 415-846-6373
ACacho@noblehousehotels.com

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	25 Letters regarding Homelessness
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:18:00 PM
Attachments:	25 Letters regarding Homelessness.pdf

Hello,

Please find attached 25 letters regarding homelessness.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Marlayne Morgan
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 2:41:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:

The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):

Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our Supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Marlayne Morgan, President
Cathedral Hill Neighborhood Association
Districts 2 and 5

From:	Barbara Bella
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 10:42:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:

The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9- April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100during the week of March 20from fewer than 30weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):

Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place

Solving homelessness is hard and we need serious attention to make progress. Meanwhile, what is the excuse for our filthy streets. Blaming that on the unhoused is a cop-out. Tourists and residence are responsible for the vast amount of garbage I routinely pick up in my neighborhood. Adequate funds need to be allocated to this!! I am ashamed of all of us for allowing this world class city to fall into such slovenly state.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bella

2111 Hyde Street, SF, 94109, 415 640-2060

From:	Peter Fortune
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 8:00:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Peter Fortune
3579 Pierce St.
D2

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Michael Seiler
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 4:29:58 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

[Your Name]
[Your address or supervisorial district]

From:	Fran Palumbo
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 3:49:00 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Fran Palumbo
1154 Eddy St,
94109

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Miles Anderson
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 1:40:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Miles Anderson
101 Lombard St APT 103E
SF CA 94111

From:	Karen
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 1:33:36 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed, With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider: Department of Public Health: The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue? Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH): Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping. I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.
Thank you, Karen Schwartz, D8

From:	Aideen Murphy
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 1:01:45 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Aideen Murphy
District 8

From:	Ryan Powell
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); MelgarStaff (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); info@rescuesf.org; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 12:42:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider: Department of Public Health: The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue? Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH): Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping. I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you,

Ryan Powell
District 8

From:	José Capó
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Cc:	info@rescuesf.org; Brian Key
Subject:	Re: 2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 11:30:48 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

José Capó
72 Prosper St
District 8

From:	Jennifer Laska
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 10:51:49 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Jennifer Laska
District 5

From:	Tiff Ting
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 10:28:42 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Tiffany Ting
District 3

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 10:15:45 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services.

I additionally urge you to address encampments, bike chop shop, in plain sight drug dealing, trash/filth, and other related issues as soon as they occur. As they are destroying our neighborhoods and making them unlivable for us residents and tax payers funding your pay checks.

These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Julien DeFrance
District 3

From:	Aisling Ferguson
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); MelgarStaff (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); info@rescuesf.org; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 10:05:39 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you
Aisling Ferguson
1448 Valencia Street
SF, CA 94110

--



Email: **Aferguson@guaranteemortgage.com**
Website: **www.guaranteemortgage.com**
To begin your application: **Apply with Aisling**
See what my customers are saying about me online

From:	Kathleen Hallinan
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 9:45:35 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

[Your Name]
[Your address or supervisorial district]

From:	Ann Arora
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 9:37:45 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Ann Arora
740 Euclid Ave
San francisco, CA 94118

Ann Arora, MFT
Bringing Mindfulness to Work

ann@annarora.com
C: 415-939-4728

O: 415-255-3221

In compliance with HIPPA and other federal and state statutes, certain types of electronic data transmissions must conform to internal and external format requirements. This transmission may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient please do not read, copy, use, or disclose this communication to others; also please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system
Sent from my iPhone

From:	Joe Laska
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 9:30:56 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Joe Laska
District 5
San Francisco, CA 94102

From:	C Tucker
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 9:03:25 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.
Christina Tucker
670 Eddy St Apt 320
SF, CA 94109
District 6

From:	Kate Connally
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); MelgarStaff (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); info@rescuesf.org; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 9:00:36 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed, With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider: Department of Public Health: The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue? Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH): Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping. I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently. Thank you. [Your Name] [Your address or supervisorial district]

From:	james skolaut
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 8:54:05 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed, With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider: Department of Public Health: The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue? Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH): Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping. I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently. Thank you. James Skolaut 15 Prosper St District 8

From:	Peter DiGiammarino
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 8:49:59 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Peter DiGiammarino
District 1

From:	David Lehr
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 8:45:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

[Your Name]
[Your address or supervisorial district]

From:	Gordon Wintrob
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 8:44:10 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you,
Gordon

Gordon Wintrob
310-980-5887
gwintrob@gmail.com

From:	Vickrum Singh
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@rescuesf.org
Subject:	2022-23 Budget - unfunded critical health and safety issues on homelessness
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 8:41:54 AM

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

Dear Supervisors and Mayor Breed,

With the City's 2022-23 Budget Hearings underway, how will San Francisco invest in street health and safety issues among the unhoused? As you, our City Supervisors, review the budget please consider:

Department of Public Health:
The Department of Public Health is failing to connect people with services and it's resulting in more deaths and overdoses. From January 9 - April 25, the Tenderloin Linkage Center only made 257 referrals to behavioral health services out of a total of 35,108 visits. Overdose reversals in the Tenderloin, skyrocketed to over 100 during the week of March 20 from fewer than 30 weekly during January. Since the Tenderloin Initiative began in January 2022, the TL has averaged ten accidental overdose deaths per month - up from nine average per month during the last quarter of 2021. How long is DPH going to tacitly permit this major health emergency to continue?

Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH):
Prop C funding is enabling more housing placements during 2022-23. That is laudable. However, you, our supervisors, approved "A Place for All" on June 14 - calling for more shelter beds with services to help those suffering from chronic homelessness. Yet the 2022-23 City Budget has no meaningful increase in shelter funding. This funding gap drastically slows recent progress in ending street sleeping.

I urge you to allocate funds for shelter and treatment beds and for supportive services. These are policy issues that the Mayor and you, our supervisors, need to address forcefully and consistently.

Thank you.

Vickrum Singh
2905 Van Ness Ave

Sent from my mobile device

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	23 Letters regarding funding in the Tenderloin
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:57:00 PM
Attachments:	23 Letters regarding funding in the Tenderloin.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see attached 23 letters regarding funding in the Tenderloin.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Pratibha Tekkey
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS)
Cc:	Simon Bertrang; kconry@tenderloinmuseum.org; Emma Jarvis; Michael Vuong; Gloria Del Mar Garcia Lemus
Subject:	FW: Please approve $4M for the Tenderloin Community
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 3:41:30 PM
Attachments:	$4 mil budget letter.docx

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

Dear Board of Supervisors , The Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston :
We at La Voz Latina and Central City SRO Collaborative(programs of Tenderloin Housing Clinic) worked with other community partners including TLCBD to present a Tenderloin Community Budget to the Mayor's Office . This was a community lead effort that reflects many of the priorities that we at La Voz and CCSRO has been talking about and hopes for the future of the Tenderloin. This Community budget priorities were shared with Planning department by TLCBD when we all recently learned that they will be leading the sustained operations in the Tenderloin . The $4 Million to planning Department for safe passage , community activations , cultural activations , open space activations and other events in the Tenderloin would be great and will build amazing partnership with residents and other community stakeholders .

We are asking that Money $4Million not be out in reserve as recommended by the Budget and Legislative Analyst . It is imperative to our community and to sustained operations in Tenderloin that funds are easily accessible .

Looking forward to more positive activation and support for Tenderloin Community .

Thanking you

Pratibha Tekkey
Community Organizing Manger
La voz Latina , CCSRO Programs of THC
472 &456 Ellis ,
510-333-2170(cell)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This document is intended for the use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee, or a person authorized to accept documents on behalf of the addressee, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, dissemination, copying, or other action based on the content of this communication is not authorized. If you have received this document in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete or shred all copies.

472 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 775-7110
Fax: (415) 775-7170
www.ccsro.net

456 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 983-3970
Fax: (415) 292-4365
www.lavozlatinasf.org

Thursday, June 16, 2022

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We at La Voz Latina and Central City SRO Collaborative (programs of Tenderloin Housing Clinic) worked with other community partners including TLCBD to present a Tenderloin Community Budget to the Mayor's Office. This was a community lead effort that reflects many of the priorities that we at La Voz and CCSROC have been talking about and hope for the future of the Tenderloin. These community budget priorities were shared with the Planning Department by TLCBD when we all recently learned that they will be leading the sustained operations in the Tenderloin. The $4 million going to the Planning Department for Safe Passage, community activations, cultural activations, open space activations and other events in the Tenderloin would be great and will help build amazing partnerships with residents and other community stakeholders.

We are asking that the $4 million allotment not be placed in reserve, as recommended by the budget and legislative analyst. It is imperative to our community and sustained operations in the Tenderloin that these funds are easily accessible.

We are looking forward to providing more positive contributions and support for the Tenderloin Community.

Respectfully,

Pratibha Tekkey
Community Organizing Manager
CCSROC & La Voz Latina, THC Programs
456 & 472 Ellis Street, SF CA, 94102
Cell: (510) 333-2170
pratibha@thclinic.org

From:	Susie McKinnon
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Cc:	Simon Sin
Subject:	For hearings Thurs/Fri Agenda item 1 - Budget and Appropriation Ordinance for Departments - FYs 2022-23 and 2023-24
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 4:27:49 PM
Attachments:	Cova Hotel_BOS letter 6.2022.pdf

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

Dear Supervisors and Budget Committee,

Please accept the attached letter regarding the request to allocate the $4M funding to support improvements to the Tenderloin on behalf of the residents, small businesses, and CBOs.

We offer our full support of this request from the entire community.

Thank you,

Susie McKinnon . Community Relations, Cova Hotel

655 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109 . www.covahotel.com **.** 415-756-9450 **.** *comfort - value - service - design*

COVA
HOTEL

June 18, 2022

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents, businesses and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The Cova Hotel has been serving thousands of visitors and tourists worldwide for many years. We have been proud to call the Tenderloin our place of business, bringing so many here to have a comfortable stay during their business or vacation travel. Yet, in the last few years, even prior to the pandemic, we've been experiencing more and more troubling and illegal behavior near and around our business. This makes operating a tourist hotel extremely challenging. Many of our client ratings of the past few years show many comments of visitor issues with the conditions in the neighborhood and that they experienced distressed, unsafe, or uncomfortable situations. We want to make sure visitors have a first-rate experience. We have been deeply involved in the community for years and will do all we can to support the improvement of the neighborhood for all – but we need the City's support as well.

The people who live, work and run businesses in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Simon Sin



Owner & President

655 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109 T:415-771-3000 F:415-474-2871 E:contact@covahotel.com
www.covahotel.com

WORLDHOTELS COLLECTION

Managed by Anugrah, Inc

COVA
HOTEL

655 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109 T:415-771-3000 F:415-474-2871 E:contact@covahotel.com
www.covahotel.com

WORLDHOTELS
COLLECTION

From:	Adama Bryant
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Preston, Dean (BOS)
Subject:	Tenderloin budget- ITS URGENT
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 3:16:48 PM

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

Supervisors and Budget Committee:

I am the founding director at Weekend-Adventures, a youth servign program of the Social Good Fund serving kids in the Tenderloin. I also have lived in the Tenderloin for 12 years, and am a board member at the TLCBD.

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Adama Bryant

--
Kindly,
Adama Bryant,
Founding Executive Director and CEO
---
www.Weekend-Adventures.org
Facebook
Instagram

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This document is intended for the use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee, or a person authorized to accept

documents on behalf of the addressee, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, dissemination, copying, or other action based on the content of this communication is not authorized. If you have received this document in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete or shred all copies.

From:	Kelly Lindberg
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Tenderloin Funding
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 2:48:13 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Kelly

From:	Jennifer Kiss
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Funding for Tenderloin Community Priorities
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 1:12:43 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

I am writing to request that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department **NOT** be put on reserve, but be accessible to deploy to the safety and community serving programs the funds are intended to support.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) built consensus on budget priorities that were presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

This is exactly how the city can work successfully WITH the community supporting community-informed priorities to create the change we all want to see in the neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jennifer Kiss

Member-at-Large
Board of Directors
Tenderloin Community Benefit District

Board of Governors
Boys and Girls Clubs of San Francisco

Executive Director
R&D Impact Foundation

From:	Iris Lee
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Tenderloin Community Budget
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 1:10:52 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
IL
--
--
Iris Lee
Pronouns: she/her | they/them | why pronouns matter
Broker & Small Business Consultant
DRE #01957294
Tenderloin Community Benefit District
iris@tlcbd.org
(c) 908.938.8806
. . . a Vibrant Community for ALL.

From:	Valdeck
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); connie.chan@sfgov.org; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Funds Dedicated to the TL
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 9:56:35 AM

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

Supervisors and Budget Committee:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Valdeck Ribeiro
378 Golden Gate Avenue
Hampton Court Apts.

From: Adam Tetenbaum
Subject: Tenderloin Budget Allocation
Date: Friday, June 17, 2022 9:24:45 AM
Attachments: image001.png

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Adam Tetenbaum

Olympic Residential Group

Adam Tetenbaum | Olympic Residential Group| 235 Montgomery Street, Suite 960, San Francisco, CA 94104
D 415-947-7884 | M 917-626-1780 | adam@olympicrg.com
www.olympicrg.com

From:	John Mello - BBB
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS)
Subject:	Tenderloin NO to $4 Million on Reserve
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 8:28:52 AM
Attachments:	Outlook-http___ima.png Outlook-cid_image0.png Outlook-cid_image0.png Outlook-cid_image0.png Outlook-cid_image0.png Outlook-pkng2cit.png

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Thanks,

John Mello IV
Operations Manager
Tenderloin CBD Clean Team
518 Ellis St. San Francisco, CA 94102
Mobile: 415.385.9832
Connect with Block by Block:


BLOCK by
BLOCK
AN SMS HOLDINGS COMPANY

From:	Himalayan Pizza
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Christy Shirilla
Subject:	Budget To Tenderloin Community
Date:	Thursday, June 16, 2022 11:01:36 PM

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

Supervisors and Budget Committee:

Through the Planning Department, we are asking that the $4 million dollars allocated to the Tenderloin NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin depend on these funds being available in the next budget. Please, don't put them aside in reserves! We are being given a chance to shape our own future in Tenderloin. We deserve to have the resources that the Planning Department needs to meet the needs of our community.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Team Himalayan Pizza & Momo

From: Lorenzo Listana
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Re: Proposed $4 budget allocation for TL programs
Date: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 5:04:36 PM

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

Hi, Board of Supervisors,

I have lived and worked in the Tenderloin for over ten years now. I co-founded a Filipino resident-based organization in the TL called the "Tenderloin Filipino-American Community Association" in 2010.

I also co-founded the Tenderloin People's Congress (TPC) with Sharen Hewitt, one of the most venerable community organizers and activists in San Francisco during her lifetime. Sharen's vision of organizing a resident-led coalition in the TL is now becoming a reality. This idea of creating change in the Tenderloin coming from the collective voice of the residents is now bearing fruit.

I urge the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to support the Mayor's proposed $4 million budget for TL investment and programming, as this is one way of helping nurture the effort of residents. I believe the real experts in solving the problems of their community are its people, especially in the Tenderloin.

The $4M proposed budget of the Mayor, which is dedicated solely to Tenderloin community-led investments and programming for FY22-23 be approved, and this should be available as soon as possible.

The Planning Department will have a dedicated staff that will coordinate those investments and programming conversations and makes sure that implementation happens. A community plan, led by the community, with the city departments as partners to support implementation is the goal.

Now is the time to make real change in the Tenderloin that has been long overdue. I believe with your support, change in the Tenderloin will not be a dream anymore. Please approve the Tenderloin budget and ensure that this will be available immediately.

Thank you,

_____

Lorenzo Listana
Lead Community Organizer
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

201 Eddy Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 358-3925
Fax: (415) 776-3952

Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu said that “A leader is best when people barely know he exists, when his work is done, his aim fulfilled, they will say: we did it ourselves.” -

From:	Katie Conry
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Please approve $4M for the Tenderloin Community
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 3:55:50 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

In 2022, the TLCBD worked with several other community partners (St. Anthony's, La Cocina, Tenderloin Museum, Weekend Adventures, Kroc Center, La Voz Latina, and Boys & Girls Club) to present a Tenderloin Community Budget to the Mayor's Office. This was a community-led effort that reflects many of our priorities and hopes for the future of the Tenderloin, and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year’s budget. Please do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

--
Katie Conry
Executive Director
Tenderloin Museum

My pronouns: *She/Her/Hers*

From:	pamela smith
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Tenderloin Budget
Date:	Saturday, June 18, 2022 3:30:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Pamela D. Smith
50 Golden Gate Ave.

From:	Michael Vuong
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Cc:	Madison Holland; Harold Love; Maxine Wilson; Connolly, Rob
Subject:	Budget Considerations
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 4:22:30 PM

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

Supervisors and Budget Committee:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Boys & Girls Clubs of San Francisco

Check Out Our YouTube Channel!

Michael Vuong
Clubhouse Director

Boys & Girls Clubs of San Francisco
Tenderloin Clubhouse
201 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
p: 415.516.2320 **e:** mvuong@kidsclub.org

From:	Kara Wright
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS)
Subject:	Tenderloin funding - please DO NOT put in reserve
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 12:43:31 PM

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

Supervisors and Budget Committee:

I write to request that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community including families that I work with and serve at Tenderloin Community School, created a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office. We are all excited to have a budget for the community, informed by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to provide our families and residents with the resources they need and deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Kara Wright

--
Kara Wright, MD, MPH
Family Advocate Project,
Tenderloin Community School
A project of Bay Area Women's and Children's Center
Associate Clinical Professor - Volunteer,
UCSF Department of Pediatrics
(415)680-0376 phone

From:	Nikki Gunn
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	TL budget allocation - do not put into "reserve" account
Date:	Sunday, June 19, 2022 7:20:40 AM

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

Hello,

I am a mother, resident and home owner in the Tenderloin. If our neighborhood was given $4 million to do all the things we've been working on with the planning department and our community organizations, then please DO NOT move monies to a reserve account. We worked hard to get approval for this money in the first place. Please do not disturb our momentum or progress. Let us continue to create our own solutions and responses in partnership with the planning department, so that we may break out of the cycle of civic and humanitarian trauma that plagues our streets.

Please let us recover!

Nikki Gunn Rodenbeck + Hugo Rodenbeck (age 10)

--
Nikki Gunn Rodenbeck
Chief Creative Strategist

GUNN FOR HIRE
Business Services for Creatives, Makers, and Small Businesses
http://nikkigunn.com or Check my schedule!
415-518-7543

From:	Autumn Adamme
To:	Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS)
Subject:	Tenderloin funds
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 1:32:39 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee, and Supervisor Preston:

As a long time resident of San Francisco, small business owner of a Legacy Business, and member of the MOCAC Committee and Hayes Valley Merchant and Neighborhood Associations, I stand with members of the Tenderloin community in asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and they are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. They also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape their own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that they deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Autumn Adamme
VP Hayes valley Merchants Association
Founder Dark Garden

--
Autumn Adamme
Founder, Executive Creative Director
Dark Garden Corsetry
Supporting uncommon beauty...
(415)431-7684
321 Linden Street, San Francisco 94102

Follow us on
• Facebook • Pinterest • Flickr •
•Instagram: @DarkGardenCorsetry •
•Twitter: @Dark_Garden •
•www.darkgarden.com•

From: Harold
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Cc: janet@sfcdma.org; Simon Bertrang
Subject: Tenderloin Funds
Date: Wednesday, June 22, 2022 1:11:30 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor?s office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year?s budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

As a member of the board of the SoMa West CBD, I am especially aware of the need for access to these funds.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Harold M. Hoogasian, President OF Somba
(South of Market Business Association)

Hoogasian Flowers, Inc.
615 Seventh Street
San Francisco, California 94103-5691
415-229-2732 or 1(800) BAY-AREA
fax 415-229-2700
harold@hoogasian.com

This is The Day that The Lord Hath Made.
Let us Rejoice and Be glad in it!

The Four Way Test
of the Things We Think Say or Do:
Is It The Truth?
Is It Fair To All Concerned?
Will It Build Goodwill and Better Friendships?
Will It Be Beneficial To All Concerned?

Find Out More About Rotary:
https://url.avanan.click/v2/___www.sfrotary.com___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo5MjZjMDcwYTExY2ljN2RlOGViZmJlYWE2NWFiMDFkNTo2OjE2Yjk6MjkzYWY5MDZmZjIxZTI4NzQxYmQwM2E1ZTEyN2E2MjgwYTc3Nzc2NzA1OTFkMWQ4YjQ1MjllNzA1NGQ5MDk0YjpwOkY or
https://url.avanan.click/v2/___www.rotary.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo5MjZjMDcwYTExY2ljN2RlOGViZmJlYWE2NWFiMDFkNTo2OjgyM2U6MzZjOWUwNTg3MTY0YzI4MjMyYWZhNjIwYmY4YWQxM2NhOTM0ZmEyNzQ4MTBmZjA0ZGI3ZWY5YTI4ZmI1NDNhYTpwOkY

Positive Thoughts and Peace, Always!

From: Hanna Rose Stangebye
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS)
Subject: Request to NOT hold funds
Date: Wednesday, June 22, 2022 1:21:00 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that the $4 million dollars in funds dedicated to the Tenderloin through the Planning Department NOT be put on reserve.

The Tenderloin Community (residents and CBOs together) worked on a budget priority sheet that was presented to the Mayor's office and we are excited to have a budget for the community that was created by the community. We also have a commitment from the Planning Department to work with the Tenderloin community to bring the resources to implement these priorities.

The people who live and work in the Tenderloin are depending on these funds being available in next year's budget. Do not put them on reserve! The Tenderloin community is being given a chance to shape our own future. Please fund the Planning Department to meet the community with the resources that we deserve.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

--
Hanna Rose Stangebye (she/her)
Director of Operations
SAFEhouse for the Performing Arts
574.298.9079
My working hours and yours may be different. Please do not feel obligated to reply outside your normal working hours.

From:	Matthew B.
To:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	MID-MARKET & TENDERLOIN COMMUNITY SAFETY PROGRAM
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 10:50:16 AM

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

Hello,

I am a resident in the mid-market/SoMa neighborhood, and I have seen the immense impact Urban Alchemy has had on this neighborhood.

For the first time since I moved here, I feel safe walking down the street. If the funding cuts are allowed, and we return to the way things were before, I will move out of this neighborhood. I have spoken to at least two dozen other people that feel the same way.

I know you don't want to lose good residents in the community and active voters. Please think before you vote to cut funding. It's NOT a good idea.

This program is essential now and in the future. I don't see any other way given what has been permitted by this city to happen on our streets.

Thank you,

Matthew Binczek
1188 Mission St, #1114
San Francisco, CA 94103

From:	Jennifer Kiss
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS)
Cc:	Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	Please do NOT cut Community-based Safety in the Tenderloin
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 10:05:56 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

We are asking that you not cut the $4.5 million dollars from OEWD's budget that funds the innovative community-based safety program in the Tenderloin/Mid-Market. These cuts would immediately remove 40-50 Urban Alchemy Practitioners from Tenderloin sidewalks, as well as some of the Park Captains at Boeddeker, Turk-Hyde and Macaulay and other community ambassadors on Larkin Street.

The Tenderloin relies on these ambassadors to calm the sidewalks and parks for the children, families, seniors and small businesses there. Where the TL has these ambassadors, people are able to go about their daily lives - walking their children to school, commuting to work, visiting the corner store or going the park with their families - without the constant threat of violence created by the concentration of the City's deadly drug market in the Tenderloin. The Tenderloin wants more community-based safety NOT a dramatic cut!

Please do not cut OEWD's budget for community-based safety in the Tenderloin.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jennifer Kiss
TLCBD Board

From:	Eric Rodenbeck
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	We need to keep Urban Alchemy in the Tenderloin
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 9:21:49 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

I am a 20 year resident of the Tenderloin and a Board Member of the Tenderloin Community Benefit District. As a father and property owner in the neighborhood, I am asking that you not cut the $4.5 million dollars from OEWD's budget that funds the innovative community-based safety program in the Tenderloin/Mid-Market. These cuts would immediately remove 40-50 Urban Alchemy Practitioners from Tenderloin sidewalks, as well as some of the Park Captains at Boeddeker, Turk-Hyde and Macaulay and other community ambassadors on Larkin Street.

The Tenderloin relies on these ambassadors to calm the sidewalks and parks for the children, families, seniors and small businesses there. Where the TL has these ambassadors, people are able to go about their daily lives - walking their children to school, commuting to work, visiting the corner store or going the park with their families - without the constant threat of violence created by the concentration of the City's deadly drug market in the Tenderloin. The Tenderloin wants more community-based safety NOT a dramatic cut!

Please do not cut OEWD's budget for community-based safety in the Tenderloin.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Eric
--

Eric Rodenbeck
Founding Partner, Stamen Design
415.558.1610
http://stamen.com/
http://hi.stamen.com/

We won the National Design Award!

"One can easily imagine Sisyphus happy" - Kim Stanley Robinson

From:	Simon Bertrang
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Cc:	Nils Behnke; Emma Jarvis; Katie Conry; DPH-naomi-laco; Adama Bryant; Pratibha Tekkey; Michael Vuong; Katherine Au; Gloria
Subject:	Please approve $4M for the Tenderloin Community
Date:	Thursday, June 16, 2022 6:06:14 PM
Attachments:	TLCBD letter to preserve $4M for the TL.pdf

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

Dear Board of Supervisors, the Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

In March and April of 2022, the TLCBD worked with several other community partners (St. Anthony's, La Cocina, Tenderloin Museum, Weekend Adventures, Kroc Center, La Voz Latina, and Boys & Girls Club) to present a Tenderloin Community Budget to the Mayor's Office. This was a community-led effort that reflects many of our priorities and hopes for the future of the Tenderloin.

We shared our community budget priorities with the Planning Department as soon as we heard they would be leading sustained operations in the neighborhood. We recently learned that the Mayor's office has allocated about $4 million to the Planning Department for safe passage, community activations, cultural parties, open space, and other events in the Tenderloin and we are confident in and excited about partnership with them.

We are asking that money NOT be put in a reserve as recommended by the Budget and Legislative Analyst. It is imperative to our community and to sustained operations in the Tenderloin that these funds are easily accessible.

If you have any questions about the priorities or would like more information about who we worked with to develop them, please don't hesitate to call.

Yours,
Simon Bertrang
Executive Director
917-548-3682
--

Tenderloin Community Benefit District
512 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
simon@tlcbd.org
www.tlcbd.org | (o) 415-292-4812 x101 | (c) 917-548-3682
. . . a Vibrant Community for ALL.

Subscribe to Tenderloin Talk, a twice monthly e-newsletter of TLCBD's work and other neighborhood happenings.

TENDERLOIN COMMUNITY BENEFIT DISTRICT

16 June 2022

Dear Board of Supervisors, the Budget Committee and Supervisor Preston:

In March and April of 2022, the TLCBD worked with several other community partners (St. Anthony's, La Cocina, Tenderloin Museum, Weekend Adventures, Kroc Center, La Voz Latina, and Boys & Girls Club) to present a Tenderloin Community Budget to the Mayor's Office. This was a community-led effort that reflects many of our priorities and hopes for the future of the Tenderloin.

We shared our community budget priorities with the Planning Department as soon as we heard they would be leading sustained operations in the neighborhood. We recently learned that the Mayor's office has allocated about $4 million to the Planning Department for safe passage, community activations, cultural parties, open space, and other events in the Tenderloin and we are confident in and excited about partnership with them.

We are asking that money NOT be put in a reserve as recommended by the Budget and Legislative Analyst. It is imperative to our community and to sustained operations in the Tenderloin that these funds are easily accessible.

If you have any questions about the priorities or would like more information about who we worked with to develop them, please don't hesitate to call.

Yours,



Simon Bertrang
Executive Director
917-548-3682

cc: St Anthony's
La Cocina
Tenderloin Museum
Weekend Adventures
Kroc Center
La Voz Latina
Boys & Girls Club, Tenderloin Clubhouse

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS)
Subject:	14 Letters regarding SFPD funding
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:44:00 PM
Attachments:	14 Letters regarding SFPD funding.pdf

Hello,

Please find attached 14 letters regarding SFPD funding.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Kevin Carroll
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Anand Singh (asingh@unitehere2.org); Rudy Gonzalez; STEVE LUTGE; Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Scott, William (POL); Kelly Powers; Joanne Desmond
Subject:	Hotel Council-Unite Here Local 2-Trades Council-Local 16 Letter of Support SF Police Full Budget Request FY2022-23, 2023-24 (#220669)
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 2:34:12 PM
Attachments:	Hotel Council UNITE HERE-Trades Council- I.A.T.S.E Support Letter SFPD Budget 2022-23 6-22-22.pdf

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

Hello Board of Supervisors,

Attached find a joint letter from the Hotel Council, Unite Here Local 2, the Trades Council and I.A.T.S.E Local 16 requesting you approve the full requested budget from the SFPD.

Thank you

Kevin

Kevin Carroll
President & CEO
Hotel Council of San Francisco
323 Geary Street, Suite 405
San Francisco, CA 94102
P (415) 391-5197 | F (415) 391-6070
Follow us on twitter | Connect on LinkedIn
Please consider the environment before printing this email.
To donate supplies to the city during COVID-19: Give2SF@sfgov.org

June 22, 2022

Board of Supervisors
City & County San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Support for San Francisco Police Department Full Budget Request FY 2022-23, 2023-24 (#220669)

Dear Supervisors,

On behalf of the Hotel Council of San Francisco, UNITE Here Local 2, Trades Council, and I.A.T.S.E Local 16 we are requesting your support to approve the SFPD full budget, as presented, for FY 2022-23, 2023-24. Your approval will allow the SFPD the staffing levels and resources needed across the department that will ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city.

Our employees, many of whom live in San Francisco, continue to experience acts of violence while traveling on our streets to and from work. Our employees and our industry rely on our police department having the full support they need to protect our city. It is imperative for the recovery of our industry that the City of San Francisco is safe, and employees, residents, and visitors
feel protected.

Again, we are requesting your support by approving the SFPD's full budget request for the resources needed to protect our employees, residents, and visitors.

Sincerely,

Kevin Carroll
President & CEO
Hotel Council of San Francisco

Anand Singh
President
UNITE HERE Local 2

Rudy Gonzalez
Secretary-Treasurer
SF Building & Construction
Trades Council

Steve Lutge
Business Agent
I.A.T.S.E. Local16

Cc Board of Supervisors
Mayor London Breed
Chief Bill Scott

From:	Baier, Michael (SFORD-F)
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Police Budget
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 8:23:35 AM
Attachments:	image001.png Police Budget.docx

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

Michael Baier
Managing Director
HYATT REGENCY SAN FRANCISCO DOWNTOWN SOMA
50 Third Street, San Francisco, CA 94103 USA
T +1.415.974.8762 E: Michael.Baier@Hyatt.com
hyattregencysanfranciscodowntownsoma.com



THINK BEFORE YOU PRINT: Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Facebook | Twitter | Instagram

This email is confidential and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies including all attachments.

Email: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org

Subject: Support for Full SFPD Budget Request

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of the Hyatt Regency SF Downtown Soma to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.

The safety of our associates and our guests is vital so that we can restore the reputation of our magnificent city. Our vitality depends on this.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you for your support.

Michael Baier

Managing Director, Hyatt Regency SF Downtown Soma

From:	Garry Cox
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Kevin Carroll; Kelly Powers; Jeremy H. Kueffner
Subject:	Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 7:54:47 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of the Axiom Hotel to ask you to approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting. As a resident of San Francisco who had lived in SoMa for the past 8 years and now resides in the Castro I have seen and continue to see the results of not having enough police presence on the streets.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy. As a General Manager of a hotel right in the heart of Union Square, having a police presence is so important in making my team members and guests feel safe. I have lost multiple employees due to their families not feeling that it was safe for them to work here in San Francisco. That should never be the way things are in this great city. Like all businesses here in San Francisco, we are having an incredibly hard time finding team members to fill our vacant positions. It does not make it easier contending with the worry that it is not safe. Having the proper police presence will help alleviate those concerns.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you all for your support.

Garry

Garry Cox, CHA | Area General Manager

Email: garry.cox@axiomhotel.com

Tel: 415.39AXIOM (415.392.9466) **Direct:** 628.242.0222

28 Cyril Magnin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

From:	Todd Metzger
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 4:39:45 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing, representing Springboard Hospitality and the Harbor Court Hotel in Downtown San Francisco, to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting. I currently live and work in district 6 and as a representative for travel to our great city, I strongly urge you to support the budgets for the SFPD to keep our residents and tourist safe.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you for your support.

Todd Metzger

Regional Vice President of Operations

C 305.304.6978
Tmetzger@springboardhospitality.com
San Francisco & West Hollywood | California
www.springboardhospitality.com
@springboardhospitality

From:	Beverly Shulman
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@stopcrimesf.com
Subject:	Support mayor's police hiring plan
Date:	Thursday, June 9, 2022 8:51:55 PM

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

My name is — Beverly Shulman and I have lived in San Francisco for — years. I live in the — neighborhood. I join Stop Crime SF in asking that you approve the mayor's budget plan to recruit and retain enough police officers to fill the SFPD staffing shortage.

We're short 500 officers for a city our size. Residents deserve to live in a city with enough police officers to walk beats, respond to break-ins, and handle the drug dealing and safety problems in San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors must focus on delivering the basics around public safety. Incentives to recruit and retain officers are smart policies that will help us continue to build a diverse police department that is reflective of the communities it serves.
And so-
My wonderful ex Washington D.C.poluce officer relocated to SF, my nephew, Robert Costic -after passing all SF police exams and was doing field training in the Excelsior was harassed out of the force three weeks ago because his instructor thought he was too nice! He has a law degree snd would be perfect for San Francisco . Can't believe how this could happen in San Franciscio.

Best wishes for the work you do,
Beverly Shulman
588 47th Ave.
San Francisco, Ca 94121

From: Jensen, Naja
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 3:25:18 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing The Clift Royal Sonesta to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting. I am a resident of San Francisco in District 3.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.
San Francisco has seen a huge increase in car and property burglaries in the past few years, it has affected tourism as well as my person life in terms of feeling safe walking in the city and the perception that San Francisco is no longer safe for visitors and residents. This beautiful city needs to be safe!

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.
Thank you for your support.

Naja Jensen
Regional Account Director, Business & Leisure Travel
The Clift Royal Sonesta

NAJA JENSEN
SONESTA | REGIONAL ACCOUNT DIRECTOR, BUSINESS & LEISURE TRAVEL
THE CLIFT ROYAL SONESTA
SONESTA SILICON VALLEY
SONESTA SAN JOSE
sonesta.com


GBTA CONVENTION 2022
COME VISIT
SONESTA AT
BOOTH #2544

From:	Corey, Daniel
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 7:47:33 AM
Attachments:	image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.

Having worked in the Hospitality Industry in SOMA & Union Square for over 15 years it is heartbreaking to see what has become of the areas surrounding our Hotels. It is important to not only provide safety to bring back tourism but to also provide safety & security for all employees in the area. This, in turn, would likely improve the overall business environment to then positively affect the aforementioned.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you for your support.

Daniel Corey
Executive Chef/Food & Beverage Director
The Clift Royal Sonesta Hotel
495 Geary St. SF CA 94102

ROYAL SONESTA

DANIEL COREY
SONESTA | EXECUTIVE CHEF/ FOOD & BEVERAGE DIRECTOR
CLIFT ROYAL SONESTA
M: 415.939.6514 | sonesta.com

From:	Wes Tyler
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 9:25:22 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of the Guests, Staff and Management of the Chancellor Hotel on Union Square to ask you approve the full SFPD budget. For years, City leaders have allowed the staffing levels and resources to reach crisis levels and it needs to be corrected. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our guests, workers and help the city rebuild from the devastating pandemic.

Thank you for your support.

Wes Tyler, CHA
General Manager
Chancellor Hotel on Union Square
"Where the Cable Cars stop at the doorstep"
433 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Ph. 415.362.2004 Fax 415.395.9476
www.chancellorhotel.com



From: Cloutier, Charles
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 7:17:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.

Without improvements numerous jobs in hospitality will be lost and the reputation of the city will continue to suffer.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you for your support.

Charles Cloutier

CHARLES CLOUTIER
SONESTA | MARKET DIRECTOR OF REVENUE MANAGEMENT
C: 415.847.0674 | SONESTA.COM



From:	Corinna Luebbe
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 5:54:32 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of Taj Campton Place to ask that you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting. I am a resident of District 3 myself and I enjoy walking to and from work but sometimes it is necessary to cross the sidewalk to avoid confrontation with certain individuals.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.
As the General Manager of Taj Campton Place, it is extremely important to me that our employees and guests feel save coming and leaving from work. Unfortunately, we had an incident where one of our laundry employees got assaulted on his 10-minute break in the alley and another associate resigned because she did not feel save on her commute. Just recently I had to calm down a Front Desk Agent who was afraid that an individual who entered the lobby was going to jump over the Front Desk and stab her with a pen. And on a somewhat regular basis a guest calls asking to speak to the manager to let me know that their car was broken into… As you know, this is not a singular incident.
Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.
Thank you for your support.

Corinna Luebbe
General Manager
Taj Campton Place

T +1 415 955 5532
Corinna.Luebbe@tajhotels.com

DISCLAIMER: This email (including any attachments) is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient/s and may contain material that is CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVATE COMPANY INFORMATION. Any review or reliance by others or copying or distribution or forwarding of any or all of the contents in this message is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. The

opinions expressed are those of the sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Company. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email and delete all copies; your cooperation in this regard is appreciated.

From:	Nieves, Mike
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 4:48:26 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png image006.png

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.

I was born in San Francisco, went to High School in San Francisco and now proudly work in San Francisco. It's disheartening to see our city streets in poor condition, crime occurring all too often in broad daylight, and our reputation getting battered repeatedly. Working in the hospitality industry, I've been told countless times by people that they simply don't want to travel to San Francisco because they just don't feel safe. It's such a shame.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you for your support.

Mike Nieves

MIKE NIEVES

SENIOR SALES MANAGER
THE CLIFT ROYAL SONESTA
495 GEARY STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
P: 415.929.2356 | sonesta.com/royal-sonesta

The Clift Royal Sonesta Virtual Tour!

From:	Duverge, Benjamin
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 4:33:32 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png image006.png

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting. I am a resident in San Francisco District 7.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.

This is important to me as a resident and worker is San Francisco, the safely of our employees, guests and visitors is of the utmost importance to bring the city back to its full glory.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you all for your support.

The ROYAL SONESTA

BENJAMIN DUVERGE
GENERAL MANAGER
THE CLIFT ROYAL SONESTA | SAN FRANCISCO
P:415.929.2305 |C: 415.316.3022 | sonesta.com/royal-sonesta

From: Fullmore, Nany
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject: Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date: Sunday, June 19, 2022 2:17:03 PM
Attachments: image001.png

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy. Protecting the SFPD staffing budget is important to me because the safety and security of my staff as well as hotel guest. The streets don't feel safe for walking to explore or for my employees to get to public transportation stations. In addition, if the city is not safe, it would be impossible to attract travelers to visit or for conventions to meet in San Francisco.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you for your support.

Nany Fullmore
General Manager
O: 415-486-6401
The Clancy, Autograph Collection
299 2ND St.
San Francisco, CA 94105
www.marriott.com/sfoaw | Instagram

_____

The Clancy, a member of Marriott International's extraordinary Autograph Collection.



This communication contains information from Marriott International, Inc. that may be confidential. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

From:	Hopkins, Alan
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Full SFPD Budget Request
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 3:05:27 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to you as both a resident and worker here in SF to ask you approve the full SFPD budget that will allow the staffing levels and resources needed across the department and ultimately result in the officers needed on our streets to protect our city. It is critical that SFPD secure all the necessary resources they are requesting. I live in SOMA, in the heart of District 6.

The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed and resourced SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also our economy.

Please approve the SFPD full budget as presented to ensure the staffing and resources needed to protect our city.

Thank you for your support.

Alan Hopkins
Director of Resort Operations – Northern California

Wyndham Destinations
501 Post Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
office: 415-885-8810
fax: 415-885-8891
alan.hopkins@wyn.com

This email message (including all attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information, or may otherwise be protected by work product or other legal rules. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the

sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Unless otherwise indicated in the body of this email, nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature and this transmission cannot be used to form, document, or authenticate a contract. Wyndham Destinations, Inc., and/or its affiliates may monitor all incoming and outgoing email communications, including the content of emails and attachments, for security, legal compliance, training, quality assurance and other purposes.

The sender believes that this email and any attachments were free of any virus, worm, Trojan horse, malicious code and/or other contaminants when sent. Email transmissions cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free, so this message and its attachments could have been infected, corrupted or made incomplete during transmission. By reading the message and opening any attachments, the recipient accepts full responsibility for any viruses or other defects that may arise, and for taking remedial action relating to such viruses and other defects. Neither Wyndham Destinations, Inc., nor any of its affiliated entities is liable for any loss or damage arising in any way from, or for errors or omissions in the contents of, this message or its attachments.

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	6 Letters regarding File No. 220535
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:04:00 PM
Attachments:	6 Letters regarding File No. 220535.pdf

Hello,

Please find attached 6 Letters regarding File No. 220535.

File No. 220535 - Charter Amendment - Homelessness Oversight Commission

Sincerely,

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

From:	Molly Goldberg
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS)
Subject:	File #22053- HSH Commission Proposal
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 10:41:35 AM
Attachments:	2022-6-13 SFADC HSH Opposition unless amended.pdf

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of the San Francisco Anti Displacement Coalition (SFADC) regarding Supervisor Safai's proposed commission overseeing the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. The charter amendment is similar to the one that Supervisor Haney proposed in 2019, supported by the Coalition on Homelessness and other advocates at the time.

Unfortunately, SFADC cannot support this proposal as it currently stands. One significant difference between the 2019 proposal and Supervisor Safai's current language is the makeup of the commission. In the current proposal, the Executive branch holds the majority of the seats, as opposed to Haney's proposal in which seats were divided evenly between the Mayor and the Board with a tie breaker going to the Controller.

We support The Coalition on Homelessness and #30RightNow leader Jordan Davis– who is currently hunger striking on this issue– in their call for a minority of the Commission seats to be held by the Mayor.

Sincerely,

Molly Goldberg
Director, SF Anti-Displacement Coalition
SFADC.org

June 13, 2022

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: File #22053- HSH Commission Proposal

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of the San Francisco Anti Displacement Coalition (SFADC) regarding Supervisor Safai's proposed commission overseeing the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. The charter amendment is similar to the one that Supervisor Haney proposed in 2019, supported by the Coalition on Homelessness and other advocates at the time.

Unfortunately, SFADC cannot support this proposal as it currently stands. One significant difference between the 2019 proposal and Supervisor Safai's current language is the makeup of the commission. In the current proposal, the Executive branch holds the majority of the seats, as opposed to Haney's proposal in which seats were divided evenly between the Mayor and the Board with a tie breaker going to the Controller. We support The Coalition on Homelessness and #30RightNow leader Jordan Davis– who is currently hunger striking on this issue– in their call for a minority of the Commission seats to be held by the Mayor.

Sincerely,

Molly Goldberg
Director, San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition
SFADC.org

Cc: Supervisors Mandleman and Mar

From: Anne Bluethenthal
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS)
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Friday, June 10, 2022 10:34:48 AM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Anne Bluethenthal, I work in District 5, and I am a member of ABD/Skywatchers in the Tenderloin. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor

2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.

4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home

Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Anne Bluethenthal
Associate Artistic Director, ABD Productions / Skywatchers
http://www.abdproductions.org

"The function of art is to do more than tell it like it is – it’s to imagine what is possible."
– bell hooks

From: Kasey Rios Asberry
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS)
Cc: jodav1026@gmail.com
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Friday, June 10, 2022 10:27:41 AM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Kasey Rios Asberry, I live in District 5, and I am a member of Tenderloin Peoples Congress. I am writing to you to urge you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor

2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.

4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,
Kasey Rios Asberry
District 5

From:	Curtis Bradford
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject:	File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date:	Friday, June 10, 2022 10:20:46 AM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Curtis Bradford, co-Chair of the Tenderloin People's Congress and have lived and worked in the TL for about 15 years. I currently live in District 6 part of the TL. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission ***not*** be majority appointed by the Mayor.
2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing highlighted the devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,
Curtis Bradford

From:	LIZA murawski
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Grier, Geoffrey (DPH - Contractor)
Subject:	Opposed to a proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535)
Date:	Thursday, June 9, 2022 11:41:46 PM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Liza Murawski I live in District 5, and I am a member and Mentoring Co-Chair of the Tenderloins People Congress, and long time TL SRO resident. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor

2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.

4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Liza M. Murawski

From:	Eleana Binder
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Peskin, Aaron (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS)
Subject:	File 220535: Amend HSH Commission Charter Amendment
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 10:53:13 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

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

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors,

My name is Eleana Binder, and I am writing on behalf of GLIDE. We support the creation of an oversight commission for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, but only if there is balance in appointment authority, such that the Mayor appoints no more than three seats. In order to have more balanced accountability and oversight, the fourth seat could be appointed by the Controller or the Health Officer. In addition, one of the seats should go to a Permanent Supportive Housing tenant. Finally, the wording related to the Our City Our Home Oversight Committee should be changed to ensure that the Committee can make recommendations to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, not just the Commission, as follows:

17¶ → (3) → Amends Article XLI of Chapter 5 of the Administrative Code and Section
18¶ 2810 of Article 28 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, to provide that the Our City, Our
19¶ Home Oversight Committee ("Oversight Committee") shall advise and make recommendations
20¶ to the Commission and the Health Commission, as well as the Mayor and the Board of
21¶ Supervisor~~, in lieu of advising and making recommendations to the Mayor and the Board of~~
22¶ ~~Supervisors,~~ on administration of the Our City, Our Home Fund ("Fund") and on monies
23¶ appropriated from the Fund, which monies are subject to the City budget approval process set
24¶ forth in Article IX of the Charter, and to provide that the needs assessment conducted by the
25¶ Oversight Committee shall inform the Department's strategic planning process. This subsection

Please adopt these amendments so that the HSH Commission is the most effective it can be.

Thank you,

Eleana

--

Eleana Binder
Policy Associate
Center for Social Justice
GLIDE 330 Ellis Street, Room 511, San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICE (415) 674-6162 | **MOBILE** (510) 926-2834 | **PRONOUNS** She/Her

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Glide. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. GLIDE accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	4 Letters regarding the Shared Schoolyard program
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:47:00 PM
Attachments:	4 Letters regarding the Shared Schoolyard program.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 4 letters regarding the Shared Schoolyard program.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Terence Wu
To:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Cc:	Guillermo Rodriguez
Subject:	SFUSD Shared Schoolyards Budget
Date:	Thursday, June 9, 2022 6:00:58 PM
Attachments:	image001.png SFUSD Shared Schoolyards.pdf

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

Dear Mayor London Breed and SF Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to you all on behalf of Trust for Public Land to urge you all to restore funding for SFUSD's Shared Schoolyards Program Budget. As a long-time resident of San Francisco and placemaking professional, I know how critical these spaces are for our communities and want to emphasize that point with you all in my attached letter.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

All my best,

Terence Wu (he/him)
Parks for People Project Associate
Certified Arborist, ISA WE-12965A

TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND

Trust for Public Land
101 Montgomery St., Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94104
P: 415.800.5297

June 09, 2022

Mayor London Breed
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Supervisors Connie Chan, Catherine Stefani, Aaron Peskin, Gordon Mar, Dean Preston, Matt Dorsey, Myrna Melgar, Rafael Mandelman, Hillary Ronen, Shamann Walton, Ahsha Safaí

Dear Mayor London Breed and SF Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you all on behalf of Trust for Public Land to urge you all to restore funding for SFUSD's Shared Schoolyards Program Budget. As a long-time resident of San Francisco and placemaking professional, I know how critical these spaces are for our communities and want to emphasize that point with you all.

During this pandemic, the significance of parks and open spaces has only grown as they are one of few spaces for communities to recreate outside. The 36-acres of open space and 24 playgrounds that the Shared Schoolyards Program makes available helps meet our communities' need for equitable access to clean and safe recreational spaces. The events and programming that happen at these sites also bring life to spaces that would, otherwise, be unused during off-school hours. Families that rely on these spaces and the programming they provide, communities with limited green space, and historically underserved families would all be disproportionately affected by the loss of this program.

While I understand we are in difficult times, I strongly believe reducing funding for this program would be a huge disservice to our city and our communities.

Sincerely,



Terence Wu, San Francisco Resident

Parks Development Project Associate
Trust for Public Land

From: Annie Du
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Please keep the Shared-Schoolyard program!
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2022 10:50:57 AM

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 urge you to keep the Shared-Schoolyard program. It was a tremendous gift for my family and my 2 kids to be able to access the outdoor sports space at Alvarado every weekend. It keeps my two active boys engaged in sports and the outdoors and fosters neighborhood community as we often run into our neighbor families there.

Best regards,

Noe Valley resident
Annie Du

From: Matthew Hardcastle
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Shared schoolyards program
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 5:11:04 PM

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

To whom it may concern-

I would like this email to serve for myself, my Wife and most importantly our soon to be 10 year old son.

As 12 year residents of Bernal heights south we have very much enjoyed the neighborhood, its amenities and schools/parks etc.

During this time we have become accustomed to being able to take our son to Paul Revere's playground (where our some was a student until this year that we have moved him to Flynn) to get some of the wiggles out, roller skate, practice Lacross, shoot hoops or play catch etc.

This is a fantastic benefit of the neighborhood and would be an absolute shame to see it go away…

Please do what you can (and listen to your constituents) to keep these spaces available for the neighborhood…

<m>

From:	Marjorie Scott
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Shared Schoolyard Program
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 10:19:14 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to preserve the Shared Schoolyard Program. This is valued and needed resource. There are not many safe outdoor venues for people of all ages to enjoy.That is why it is vital that these schoolyards continue to remain open. A few hours on the weekend will not put a monetary stress on the budget.

Thank you for your consideration,
Marjorie Schwartz-Scott
Concerned San Francisco Resident

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	4 Letters regarding Downtown Economic Recovery
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:11:00 PM
Attachments:	4 Letters regarding Downtown Economic Recovery.pdf

Hello,

Please find attached 4 letters regarding Downtown Economic Recovery.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Adam Jed
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Support for Mayor's Full Downtown Recovery Budget Request
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 10:16:10 PM
Attachments:	BluestemLetterofSupport_DowntownBudget_062122.docx

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

Dear Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee,

We are writing on behalf of Bluestem Restaurant and Market located in downtown San Francisco (District 6) to ask for your support in funding the downtown recovery budget for the revitalization of downtown San Francisco.

Our independently owned, small business restaurant opened in 2011. During these last eleven years, we have employed hundreds of residents and served thousands of patrons who are local office workers, business travelers and convention goers. With a decreasing number of residents and visitors coming into the downtown area due to the pandemic, we are currently operating at an unsustainable level ranging from 40-50% of pre-pandemic sales.

We believe it is a tipping-point moment for small businesses such as ours who have invested in the downtown district and depend on office workers and visitors alike to remain open. Now more than ever, we need the City's support to do everything within our means to ensure the downtown market remains a desirable place to live, work and visit.

The pandemic was a once in a lifetime event. Its aftermath will take more than any one independent restaurant can resolve on its own. It will take all of us, working together, including our city government to ensure a strong recovery. The investment proposed in the budget is a very small price to pay considering what is at stake. The future of our city and our businesses will be dependent on our ability to attract visitors and workers back downtown. We must do everything we can to ensure an economic comeback.

Thank you for your attention and support,

Adam and Stacy Jed
Co-owners
Bluestem Restaurant and Market

--

Adam Jed
Co-Founder
(415) 269-2928

Bluestem Restaurant & Market
One Yerba Buena Lane
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 547-1111

www.bluestemsf.com
See Us on facebook and Instagram

"If you really want to make a friend, go to someone's house and eat with {them}...the people who give you their food give you their heart." -Cesar Chavez

BLUESTEM
RESTAURANT & MARKET

One Yerba Buena Lane
San Francisco, CA 94013

June 21, 2022

Dear Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee,

We are writing on behalf of Bluestem Restaurant and Market located in downtown San Francisco (District 6) to ask for your support in funding the downtown recovery budget for the revitalization of downtown San Francisco.

Our independently owned, small business restaurant opened in 2011. During these last eleven years, we have employed hundreds of residents and served thousands of patrons who are local office workers, business travelers and convention goers. With a decreasing number of residents and visitors coming into the downtown area due to the pandemic, we are currently operating at an unsustainable level ranging from 40-50% of pre-pandemic sales.

We believe it is a tipping-point moment for small businesses such as ours who have invested in the downtown district and depend on office workers and visitors alike to remain open. Now more than ever, we need the City's support to do everything within our means to ensure the downtown market remains a desirable place to live, work and visit.

The pandemic was a once in a lifetime event. Its aftermath will take more than any one independent restaurant can resolve on its own. It will take all of us, working together, including our city government to ensure a strong recovery. The investment proposed in the budget is a very small price to pay considering what is at stake. The future of our city and our businesses will be dependent on our ability to attract visitors and workers back downtown. We must do everything we can to ensure an economic comeback.

Thank you for your attention and support,

Adam and Stacy Jed
Co-owners
Bluestem Restaurant and Market

From: Terry Lewis
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Support for Mayor's Full Downtown Recovery Budget Request
Date: Wednesday, June 22, 2022 8:52:13 AM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
image006.png
image007.png
image008.png
image009.png
image010.png

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee:

Please do not cut funding proposed in next year's budget for the revitalization of downtown San Francisco!

Downtown offers thousands of jobs for low- and middle-income people. Downtown has an ecosystem of restaurants and other small businesses that depend on office workers and visitors to come back. Downtown has thousands of hotel workers that depend on their jobs to take care of their families.

75% of San Francisco's economic output is produced downtown. Tax revenues from downtown support police, fire, education and social services that lift up the entire City.

The Covid-19 pandemic was a once in a century event that affected downtown San Francisco more intensely than any other large city in the United States. It will take all of us, working together to ensure a strong recovery. The investment proposed in the budget is a very small price to pay considering what is at stake.

Thank you for your attention and leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,
Terry Lewis

Terry Lewis |Complex General Manager
REPRESENTING THE HILTON HOTELS OF SAN FRANCISCO UNION SQUARE
t: +1 415-202-7096 | m: +1 415-203-7260 | terry.lewis@hilton.com

HILTON SAN FRANCISCO UNION SQUARE & HILTON PARC 55 SAN FRANCISCO
333 O'Farrell Street | San Francisco CA 94102 | USA

Hilton EventReady with CleanStay

Hilton EventReady Hybrid Solutions

Flexible & Ready

Contact me to learn more.



Let's Get Social! @HiltonSFUnionSquare | @Parc55Hotel

This transmission is not a digital or electronic signature and cannot be used to form, document, or authenticate a contract. Hilton and its affiliates accept no liability arising in connection with this transmission. Copyright 2022 Hilton Proprietary and Confidential

From:	Marisa Rodriguez
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Ben Horne
Subject:	Support for Mayor's Full Downtown Recovery Budget Request
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 6:34:29 PM
Attachments:	image002.png image003.png Budget Request Downtown Recovery.docx

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee:

Please do not cut funding proposed in next year's budget for the revitalization of downtown San Francisco!

We have not seen such a negative impact on our city core since the "Great Depression." Downtown offers thousands of jobs for low- and middle-income people. Downtown has an ecosystem of restaurants and other small businesses that depend on office workers and visitors to come back. Downtown has thousands of unionized hotel workers that depend on their jobs to feed their families!

75% of San Francisco's economic output is produced downtown. Tax revenues from downtown support our neighborhoods, police, fire, education and social services that lift up the entire City.

The Covid-19 pandemic was a once in a century event that affected downtown San Francisco more intensely than any other large city in the United States. It will take all of us, working together, including our City government to ensure a strong recovery. The investment proposed in the budget is a very small price to pay considering what is at stake. The future of our city and its recovery is dependent on our ability to attract visitors and workers back downtown. We must do everything we can to ensure an economic come back. Otherwise 2025 will be facing an economic crisis and the entire city will suffer.

Thank you for your attention and leadership on this issue.

Best,

UNION SQUARE ALLIANCE

Marisa Rodriguez
Executive Director
415-781-7880 x102
marisa@unionsquarealliance.com

291 Geary Street, Suite 200

San Francisco, CA 94102

www.visitunionsquaresf.com
Member Services 415-781-4456



The Union Square Business Improvement District is now the Union Square Alliance.
Please make note of our new name and email address.

UNION SQUARE ALLIANCE

6/21/2022

Subject: Support for Mayor's Full Downtown Recovery Budget Request

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee:

Please do not cut funding proposed in next year's budget for the revitalization of downtown San Francisco!

We have not seen such a negative impact on our city core since the "Great Depression." Downtown offers thousands of jobs for low- and middle-income people. Downtown has an ecosystem of restaurants and other small businesses that depend on office workers and visitors to come back. Downtown has thousands of unionized hotel workers that depend on their jobs to feed their families!

75% of San Francisco's economic output is produced downtown. Tax revenues from downtown support our neighborhoods, police, fire, education and social services that lift up the entire City.

The Covid-19 pandemic was a once in a century event that affected downtown San Francisco more intensely than any other large city in the United States. It will take all of us, working together, including our City government to ensure a strong recovery. The investment proposed in the budget is a very small price to pay considering what is at stake. The future of our city and its recovery is dependent on our ability to attract visitors and workers back downtown. We must do everything we can to ensure an economic come back. Otherwise, 2025 will be facing an economic crisis and the entire city will suffer.

Thank you for your attention and leadership on this issue.

Best,

Marisa Rodriguez
Executive Director
Union Square Alliance

From:	Amy Cleary
To:	Ronen, Hillary; Chan, Connie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Laurie Thomas; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	GGRA Letter of Support for the Mayor"s Proposed Budget Investment for Economic Recovery
Date:	Friday, June 17, 2022 10:51:19 AM
Attachments:	GGRA Letter of Support for the Mayor"s Proposed Budget Investment for Economic Recovery.pdf

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 Budget and Finance Sub Committee,

On behalf of the Golden Gate Restaurant Association, we ask for your support for the Mayor's proposed budget investment of $48.9 million over the two years to promote the City's economic recovery. This proposal, which includes new direct support for small businesses, as well as dollars for new events, activations, public space improvements, and marketing efforts to support areas in our economic core area that rely on workers, tourists, and other visitors, is essential.

As our decimated hospitality industry continues to recover from the devastating effects of the covid pandemic and related closures, our downtown restaurants, cafes, and bars have been impacted the most. These proposed investments are necessary to help bring back leisure and business visitors, office workers and residents to the downtown core.

In addition, the grants for businesses across the city will help to ensure the survival of restaurants, bars, cafes and other small businesses that are the cornerstones of our neighborhoods.

We also support the funding proposal to continue the City's existing Ambassador programs located in areas like Mid-Market, Union Square, Downtown, South of Market, and along the Embarcadero. These ambassadors have been a positive tool to make our streets feel safer for locals and tourists, and provide services such as directions and restaurant recommendations for business and leisure visitors.

The above budget amounts represent less than 1/10th of a 1 percent of the total budget. Surely these dollars can be found to help give our small businesses in the economic core a chance of survival.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Laurie Thomas, Executive Director
Golden Gate Restaurant Association

Board members:
Marie Trimble Holvick (Partner) Gordon & Rees
Steven Grant (Director of Food and Beverage) Hotel Nikko
Bryan Tublin (Owner) Kitava
Andy Chun(Owner) Press Club, Schroeders and Elite
Andrew Freeman (Founder) AF&CO and Carbonate
Benson Wang (Owner) Blue Plantain, LLC
Bob Partrite (Chief Operating Officer) Simco Restaurants
Cassie Corless (Director of Business Operations) Tastes on the Fly
Denise Tran (Founder / CEO) Bun Mee LLC
Doug Collister (Partner, Director of Marketing & IT) China Live Ventures
Douglas Marschke (CEO) Underdogs Too, Underdogs Tres, Tacko
Dylan MacNiven (Executive Director) Woodhouse Fish Co/Wooden Spoon/West of Pecos/Cafe Du Nord
Evan Kidera (Owner), Senor Sisig
Hanson Li (Managing Partner) Salt Partners
Jenna Johnson (Client Executive) NFP
John Konstin (Proprietor) John's Grill
Josh Harris (Owner) BV Hospitality
Justin Richardson (President) The City POS
Keba Konte (Founder/CEO) Red Bay Coffee Company
Lee Gregory (Executive Vice President) McCalls Catering
Lindsay Tusk (Owner) Quince & Co.
Margie Butler (Development & Marketing) Perry's San Francisco
Nghia Tran (COO) Burma Inc
Patric Yumul (CEO) Tableone Hospitality
Rachel Herbert (Owner) Park Cafe Group
Ranjan Dey (President) New Delhi Restaurant
Roberta Economidis (Partner) GE Law Group
Steve Sarver (Treasurer) Ladle & Leaf
Tony Marcell (Director of Operations) Wayfare Tavern

--
Amy Cleary
Director of Public Policy and Media Relations
Golden Gate Restaurant Association

415.370.9056
amy@ggra.org

June 17th, 2022

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub Committees,

On behalf of the Golden Gate Restaurant Association, we ask for your support for the Mayor's proposed budget investment of $48.9 million over the two years to promote the City's economic recovery. This proposal, which includes new direct support for small businesses, as well as dollars for new events, activations, public space improvements, and marketing efforts to support areas in our economic core area that rely on workers, tourists, and other visitors, is essential.

As our decimated hospitality industry continues to recover from the devastating effects of the covid pandemic and related closures, our downtown restaurants, cafes, and bars have been impacted the most. These proposed investments are necessary to help bring back leisure and business visitors, office workers and residents to the downtown core.

In addition, the grants for businesses across the city will help to ensure the survival of restaurants, bars, cafes and other small businesses that are the cornerstones of our neighborhoods.

We also support the funding proposal to continue the City's existing Ambassador programs located in areas like Mid-Market, Union Square, Downtown, South of Market, and along the Embarcadero. These ambassadors have been a positive tool to make our streets feel safer for locals and tourists, and provide services such as directions and restaurant recommendations for business and leisure visitors.

The above budget amounts represent less than 1/10th of a 1 percent of the total budget. Surely these dollars can be found to help give our small businesses in the economic core a chance of survival.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Laurie Thomas, Executive Director
Golden Gate Restaurant Association

Board members:
Marie Trimble Holvick (Partner) Gordon & Rees
Steven Grant (Director of Food and Beverage) Hotel Nikko
Bryan Tublin (Owner) Kitava
Andy Chun(Owner) Press Club, Schroeders and Elite
Andrew Freeman (Founder) AF&CO and Carbonate
Benson Wang (Owner) Blue Plantain, LLC
Bob Partrite (Chief Operating Officer) Simco Restaurants
Cassie Corless (Director of Business Operations) Tastes on the Fly
Denise Tran (Founder / CEO) Bun Mee LLC
Doug Collister (Partner, Director of Marketing & IT) China Live Ventures
Douglas Marschke (CEO) Underdogs Too, Underdogs Tres, Tacko
Dylan MacNiven (Executive Director) Woodhouse Fish Co/Wooden Spoon/West of Pecos/Cafe Du Nord
Evan Kidera (Owner), Senor Sisig
Hanson Li (Managing Partner) Salt Partners
Jenna Johnson (Client Executive) NFP
John Konstin (Proprietor) John's Grill
Josh Harris (Owner) BV Hospitality
Justin Richardson (President) The City POS
Keba Konte (Founder/CEO) Red Bay Coffee Company
Lee Gregory (Executive Vice President) McCalls Catering
Lindsay Tusk (Owner) Quince & Co.
Margie Butler (Development & Marketing) Perry's San Francisco
Nghia Tran (COO) Burma Inc
Patric Yumul (CEO) Tableone Hospitality
Rachel Herbert (Owner) Park Cafe Group
Ranjan Dey (President) New Delhi Restaurant
Roberta Economidis (Partner) GE Law Group
Steve Sarver (Treasurer) Ladle & Leaf
Tony Marcell (Director of Operations) Wayfare Tavern

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS)
Subject:	3 Letters regarding the Dyke March
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:13:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding the Dyke March.pdf

Hello,

Please find attached 3 letters regarding the Dyke March.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Fred Winograd
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Dyke March in Dolores Park- Sat June 25 - Provide Health and Safety
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 1:32:30 PM

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

I live in the Dolores Park area. I just learned that the Pride Dyke Rally and March in Dolores Park being held on Saturday June 25 is not permitted and is expected to draw tens of thousands of participants.

I ask you as the march organizers to respect the local community and to provide for the health and safety of your rally/march participants by obtaining a permit and by ensuring the required portable toilets and the appropriate monitoring and clean-up plans are in place.

I ask you, the Board of Supervisors, and the Mayor's Office to put together a plan of action to ensure that this march does not create a public health emergency.

Thank you!

Fred Winograd

From:	Bruce Bowen
To:	info@thedykemarch.org; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR)
Subject:	Provide Health and Safety for Dyke March in Dolores Park- Sat June 25
Date:	Monday, June 20, 2022 9:10:34 PM

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

To: Dyke March organizers, Mayor Breed, Members of the Board of Supervisors

I live near Dolores Park. I have learned that this year's San Francisco Dyke March, to be held on Saturday, June 25, is expected to draw tens of thousands of participants but does not have a permit and may not be providing enough resources for health and safety, including toilets.

I urge you, as the organizers of this wonderful event that is the one day out of the year where ALL trans and cis self-identified dykes can proclaim space, rights, visibility and respect, to also respect the local community and provide for the health and safety of your participants by obtaining a permit and ensuring that the required portable toilets and appropriate monitoring and clean-up plans are in place.

In addition, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Office should develop a plan of action to ensure that this event does not create a public health problem.

Thank you!

Bruce Bowen

From:	Carolyn Kenady
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); info@thedykemarch.org
Subject:	Dyke March in Dolores Park - Provide Health and Safety - Sat. June 25
Date:	Sunday, June 19, 2022 7:26:24 PM

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

To the Dyke March organizers, Board of Supervisors, Mayor Breed -

I live in the Dolores Park area. I just learned that the Pride Dyke Rally and March in Dolores Park being held on Saturday June 25 is not permitted and is expected to draw tens of thousands of participants.

I ask you as the march organizers to respect the local community and to provide for the health and safety of your rally/march participants by obtaining a permit and by ensuring the required portable toilets and the appropriate monitoring and clean-up plans are in place.

I ask you, the Board of Supervisors, and the Mayor's Office to put together a plan of action to ensure that this march does not create a public health emergency.

Thank you!

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS)
Subject:	2 Letters regarding the Great Highway
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:16:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding the Great Highway.pdf

Hello,

Please find attached 2 letters regarding the Great Highway.

Sincerely,

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

From:	myoldgoat@yahoo.com
To:	Short, Carla (DPW)
Cc:	Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	Great highway
Date:	Tuesday, June 21, 2022 12:26:26 PM

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

I think that people have been very patient regarding your departments failure to clear the sand off of the great highway. What is the problem that you department can’t seem to fulfill its responsibilities regarding maintaining this road.

Please get this road reopened. The reason the bond measure failed is people on the west side of the city are tired of getting the short end and are not going to remain patient for much longer.

It seems there is plenty of money to put in speed bumps, divert traffic and make driving here ridiculous but not enough money to take car of the basic needs of motorist.

Sent from my iPad

From:	Patricia Arack
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Marstaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Short, Carla (DPW); Wayne, Maura (DPW); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); info@sfwater.org
Cc:	Spitz, Jeremy (PUC); Imperial, Megan (BOS); Roche, Anna (PUC)
Subject:	Dump in the Dunes off Kirkham west of the GH; Climate Change Failure By SF Government
Date:	Friday, June 3, 2022 3:52:11 PM
Attachments:	IMG_1280.mov

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

Who is going to clean this up? This is our future, the future of residents and the lovely Great Highway area.. The complete annihilation of the dunes and destruction of wildlife habitat. This pristine area will be destroyed forever by your negligence and slavish obeisance to selfish bikers and others who will not compromise. Close this Highway, at your peril. Only 35% of San Francisco voters approve of closed streets, yet you do nothing that the majority want. 65@ DO NOT WANT closed streets.

This is from a professional 3rd person polling company, not the CTA manipulative and skewed surveys done which always show that the majority of (white) people in SF want closed streets.

Does the Bike Coalition, which you have supported in the millions of dollars over the years, care about, or have empathy for others? Here is a public comment the Bike Coalition Executive Director from the Richmond Review:

> From the latest print edition of the Richmond Review (last paragraph): During public comment regarding the closure of JFK Drive , the *San Francisco Bicycle Coalition's Executive Director Janelle Wong* said:
>
> "I want to address Supervisor Chan's question, 'who is this for?'," Wong said. "Candidly, every day I swing my leg over my bike, climb in the saddle and ride off, ***it's about MY life.*** And ***it's about all of our members lives*** every time we ride the bike around town. This is not about recreation, which, I love all the joy, and our organization's all about that. The reality is, for us, every single day, is that it's about our life and protecting it and keeping it safe."
>
> **And that's it, folks, only cyclists matter!**

Is this comment representative of how you feel about all the people who do not or cannot ride a bike? Do you agree that only cyclists matter? If so, you should not be in public service. You need to represent ALL San Franciscans, not Janelle Wong and her ilk. There must be a compromise about the Great Highway. You will do too much damage to the residents of the Richmond and the Sunset if you close it permanently. This area will become a dump, with unsavory characters congregating out here. It will return to the intolerable state of the Great HIghway and the outer Sunset during the full closure of 2020.

Feces on the streets, garbage everywhere, two violent assaults at GH and Noriega, drunken carousing until 2 am in front of my house on the LGH, completely jammed cars on the LGH, no one EVER stopping for stop signs, and on and on. You will destroy the GH for the peaceful respite it has been for a hundred years, not to mention a safe roadway for commuter traffic, which now is on the LGH and other narrow residential streets because DPW says it's too poor to keep the GH clean of Sand. People can't even get to the beach because DPW, the very few times it has send a truck out here to move sand since April 1, has dumped 10 feet of sand in front of the beach access paths.

You, those in power in City Hall, have failed your constituents badly. For a city with a 12-Billion-dollar budget, you can't find the $$ to keep a major arterial open, but you can fund millions for studies and bike lanes. This is a dereliction of your duty to the majority of tax-paying, voting citizens.

Below is a schedule to make sense. There is a very small, scant number of bikes/peds during the week on the GH. I counted about 5.3 average of recreational users during the week when it was closed in 2020 and part of 2021. This includes Friday afternoon. And this is from Pacheco stop light to the Noriega stoplight. Only 5.3 people are using the highway, yet you want to close it forever. People are fed up with your shortsighted decisions, actually cruel decisions, like JFK. Thousands of seniors and disabled are disinclined to visit the park now because it would be too dangerous to go there without being in a private car. I am one of those people. Too dangerous for me to go there now, because of the distance I would have to walk, and fear of the nasty bikers who yell at elders and the disabled to get out of the way. They do this consistently on JFK and the GH.

Permanent Schedule for the GH, one that makes sense and is fair and just:

- Open the Great Highway to cars Sunday 9 pm to Saturday 6 am.
- Close it for bikes/peds from Sat. 6 am to 9 pm Saturday.
- Open to cars 9 pm Saturday to 6 am Sunday
- Close for ped/bikes Sunday 6 am to 9 pm Sunday
- Open to cars 9pm Sunday to Saturday 6 am

If you don't keep cars on the GH, it will become a disgusting, ugly, and dangerous dump.

Climate Change and Failed San Francisco Government

Those who are working to close the GH and other streets all over SF keep saying cars must go because of GHG and climate change. Yet none of these non-profit groups to whom the MTA has given millions ever mention the most effective and rapid option to reduce GHG, according

to YOUR OWN CLIMATE ACTION PLAN. The Climate Action Plan clearly states that the most effective strategy to reduce GHG is to get drivers out of gas-powered vehicles and into EVs. Of the six potential strategies outlined in the CAP, Clean Vehicles (EVs) would reduce 776,726 megatons of CO2e. All the other strategies combined (road pricing, parking pricing, land use, transit, and biking/walking) total only 176,063 megatons of C02e. By 2030, if 25% of vehicles are EVs, that would amount to 191,700 megatons, still more than the total of all other strategies. EVs are 89% of potential strategies. Biking/walking is 1%. If you don't believe me, see the chart on page 77 of the CAP.

This is the height of hypocrisy to say that the only way to lower GHG is turn SF into one big bike lane, and screw people who need their cars for work or medical or family business. People are not going to give up their cars for you or the bike lobby. If you REALLY, as a city government, want to help reduce global warning and the holocaust ahead with a hot planet, you would provide incentives for people who need their cars to get into an EV! But I hear nothing about EVs from anyone in SF government. Why not?

Patricia Arack
Leader, Concerned Residents of the Sunset
Ret. Faculty Member, CCSF

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS)
Subject:	2 Letters regarding funding for the Department of Disability and Aging Services
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 12:54:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding the Department of Disability and Aging Services.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached two letters regarding funding for the Department of Disability and Aging Services.

Sincerely,

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

From:	Brenda D . Rivera-Billings
To:	Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); info@sfdignityfund.org
Subject:	Fund Digital Access and Keep Us Connected!
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 11:58:52 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Walton:

I am a resident of District 10 and am joining the Dignity Fund Coalition in urging you to dedicate add-back funding to strengthen and expand the Department of Disability and Aging's SF Connected Programs beyond current baseline funding so that we can close the digital divide in San Francisco. The ask is for $3.5 million a year for two years, and I hope you will contribute to this citywide total as the need is great.

Digital access for older adults is even more critical now than ever. Without assistive technology and the internet, older adults are left not having access to doctor's offices to order medications and schedule doctor's appointments. More importantly, digital access allows older adults to stay connected with family and friends via FaceTime and Zoom to avoid isolation.

Older adults and people with disabilities need internet access, devices, digital literacy training, tech support, and assistive technology. Please commit to adding back this $3.5 million in vital funding to close the digital divide in San Francisco.

Thank you!

Brenda Billings
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 10

From:	Daniel Gallagher
To:	Dorsey, Matt (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS); info@sfdignityfund.org
Subject:	Fund Digital Access and Keep Us Connected!
Date:	Wednesday, June 22, 2022 11:49:14 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Dorsey,

I am the Chief Executive Officer of SteppingStone Health located in District 6. We provide adult day health care to some 300 older adults and adults with disabilities daily at our four locations. I am joining the Dignity Fund Coalition in urging you to dedicate add-back funding to strengthen and expand the Department of Disability and Aging's SF Connected Programs beyond current baseline funding, so we can close the digital divide in San Francisco. The ask is for $3.5 million a year for two years, and I hope you will contribute to this citywide total as the need is great.

The past two years of the pandemic have increasing illustrated the great need for our participants to stay engaged and connected to services, to their family and friends, and to their community. It is well known that isolation is a leading cause for significant illness and death in older adults. At SteppingStone we partnered with the Dignity Fund Coalition and the Coalition of Agencies Serving the Elderly to bridge the digital divide and mitigate the isolation and loneliness so many older adults were facing for fear of COVID. The result of this effort was our ability to keep otherwise isolated seniors connected to critical services so they could maintain their health and remain at home with their loved ones.

Older adults and people with disabilities need internet access, devices, digital literacy training, tech support, and assistive technology. Please commit to adding back this $3.5 million in vital funding to close the digital divide in San Francisco.

Thank you!

Daniel Gallagher, M.Ed.
Executive Director
SteppingStone Health ADHC
930 4th St.
San Francisco, CA 94158

Phone: 415-974-6784
Fax: 415-974-6785
Website: www.SteppingStoneHealth.org

Licensed as North & South Market Adult Day Health, Corporation

This communication, including all attachments, is intended for the addressee only and may contain information that is confidential and prohibited from disclosure. Please do not copy it or use it for any purposes, or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so could violate state and Federal privacy laws. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail to DanielGallagher@steppingstonehealth.org and delete the message and any attachments. Thank you for your cooperation

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)
Subject:	2 Letters regarding funding for OEWD
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:30:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding funding for OEWD.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding funding for the Office of Economic and Workforce Development.

Sincerely,

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

From: Justine Crosby
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2022 11:36:28 AM
Attachments: image001.png

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of funding the Office of Economic and Workforce Development has requested for San Francisco's Economic Core. San Francisco's downtown is the driver of our city's entire economy - it provides jobs for our residents, demand for our small businesses, and the tax base that supports the services, arts, and resources that our communities depend on. Our neighborhoods cannot thrive if our economic engine is jeopardized.

We know at this point that neither tourists nor employees are expected to return to our downtown anytime soon unless we do something. We must give people new reasons to come to downtown if the service workers and the small businesses in our downtown core that depend on their business are to survive. Investing City dollars in community driven efforts that are going to help reinvent our economic core so that it continues to thrive as the economic base for the city and everyone in it - and doing so specifically with initiatives that are going to put the very artists, entrepreneurs, and cultural groups that have been hurt most by the pandemic to work - is the best way to protect our city's economic wellbeing for the future and a win for everyone.

Please maintain the funding OEWD requested for the economic core in their budget proposal.

Sincerely,

Justine Crosby

Justine Crosby
Sr. Director Corporate Communications and Brand
+1 415.254.6236 • justine.crosby@brightmachines.com
132 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94107

Bright Machines
Rethink Manufacturing

IMPORTANT NOTICE - The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by person or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

From: Camelin Blackstone
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: save OEWD funding
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2022 11:34:30 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of funding the Office of Economic and Workforce Development has requested for San Francisco's Economic Core. San Francisco's downtown is the driver of our city's entire economy - it provides jobs for our residents, demand for our small businesses, and the tax base that supports the services, arts, and resources that our communities depend on. Our neighborhoods cannot thrive if our economic engine is jeopardized.

At this point, neither tourists nor employees are expected to return to our downtown anytime soon unless we do something. We must give people new reasons to come downtown, if the service workers and the small businesses downtown that depend on their business are to survive. Investing City dollars in community driven efforts that are going to help reinvent our economic core so that it continues to thrive as the economic base for the city and everyone in it - and doing so specifically with initiatives that are going to put the very artists, entrepreneurs, and cultural groups that have been hurt most by the pandemic to work - is the best way to protect our city's economic wellbeing for the future and a win for everyone.

Please maintain the funding OEWD requested for the economic core in their budget proposal.

Sincerely,

Cammy Blackstone

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS); Perkinson, Jessica (BOS)
Subject:	2 Letters regarding File No. 220281
Date:	Thursday, June 23, 2022 12:12:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding File No. 220281.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached 2 letters regarding File No. 220281.

File No. 220281 - Administrative Code - Shelter and Permanent Supportive Housing Expansion Program

Sincerely,

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

From:	Andy Phan
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); StefaniStaff, (BOS); PeskinStaff (BOS); Marstaff (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS); Haneystaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; RonenStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); SafaiStaff (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); placeforall@growsf.org; Somera, Alisa (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject:	I support "A Place for All" to end street homelessness
Date:	Sunday, June 19, 2022 3:05:00 PM

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

Hello,
I'm reaching out to express my support for Supervisor Mandelman's "A Place for All" legislation.

For too long, the city has spent more and more money on homelessness without a concrete plan and the number of people forced to live on the streets has only increased.

I believe we need to end the homelessness crisis and that we should efficiently use our city's resources to shelter as many people as possible. Supervisor Mandelman's "Place for All" would finally require the city to develop a plan to do that.

I hope you will support this plan.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Cynthia Gómez
To:	Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	Rudy Gonzalez
Subject:	RE: A Place for All program
Date:	Monday, June 13, 2022 5:34:58 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express Unite Here, Local 2's support for the goal of the proposed A Place for All shelter program, and to express two concerns that we are asking to be addressed before the program advances.

The first concern is related to the program's goals of converting tourist hotels into short-term shelter and/or permanent supportive housing. We ask that, as program staff choose hotels for possible inclusion into this program, they consider the harmful impact of permanently eliminating the kinds of union jobs for which our members have fought and continue to fight.

In the summer of 2021, dozens of Local 2 members, some of whom had served at the Hotel Buchanan for decades, found themselves faced with the possibility of permanently losing their jobs and livelihoods as the City considered converting the Buchanan into permanent supportive housing. They testified, often late into the evening, about the devastating impact on them and their families of the jobs that offered a living wage, health care, and a dignified retirement. The loss of good union jobs harms not just the workers themselves, but their families and their entire communities. And once those jobs disappear, there is simply not a wide pool of jobs for our members to choose from that also provide a living wage, affordable health care, a dignified retirement, and respect and dignity at work.

It is *vital* to implement a plan for providing housing for our fellow human beings who currently have no other choice than to live outside. Programs that provide this housing are extremely important and deserve widespread support. But please do not choose to uplift one segment of our population at the expense of another.

Our second concern is related to the need for explicit language regarding standards for the labor of the construction and maintenance of the various kinds of housing that would be created or maintained by this program. Union construction and maintenance jobs don't merely provide a living wage and affordable health care: our siblings in the Building Trades Council could also

describe at length the safety and quality concerns that come from trying to save money by building housing using off-site, modular construction.

All San Franciscans deserve safe, quality, affordable housing, and they all deserve dignified work that pays enough to live and that provides affordable health care. As you consider the Place for All program, please do not attempt to meet one of these goals by shortchanging another.

Thank you,

--
Cynthia Gómez
Senior Research Analyst
she/her/hers
UNITE/HERE, Local 2
209 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
cgomez@unitehere2.org
415.864.8770, ext. 763