File No	250603	Committee Item No Board Item No. <u>16</u>	14
(	COMMITTEE/BOAR AGENDA PACKE	D OF SUPERVISOR T CONTENTS LIST	RS
	Budget and Appropriation pervisors Meeting	ns Committee Date June 2 Date July 8	
Cmte Boa	Motion Resolution Ordinance Legislative Digest Budget and Legislative A Youth Commission Repolation Form Department/Agency Cov Submission Letter 5/30/20 MOU Grant Information Form Grant Budget Subcontract Budget Contract/Agreement Form 126 – Ethics Comm Award Letter Application Public Correspondence	er Letter and/or Report 025	
OTHER	(Use back side if addition	nal space is needed)	
	MYR Trailing Legislation MYR 30-Day Waiver Rec Presidential Action Memor CEQA Determination 6/4 10-Day Fee Ad Notice 6/ CEQA Referral 6/3/2025 REC Presentation 6/20/2	<u>juest 5/30/2025</u> 5 – 30-Day Waiver 6/5/2025 /2025 18/2025	5

 Date
 June 20, 2025

 Date
 July 2, 2025

Completed by: Brent Jalipa
Completed by: Brent Jalipa

1	[Park Code - Court Reservations]
2	
3	Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department
4	to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden
5	Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under
6	the California Environmental Quality Act.
7 8	NOTE: Unchanged Code text and uncodified text are in plain Arial font.  Additions to Codes are in single-underline italics Times New Roman font.  Deletions to Codes are in strikethrough italics Times New Roman font.
9 10	Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.  Board amendment deletions are in strikethrough Arial font.  Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.
11	Subsections of parts of tables.
12 13	Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:
14	Section 1. Environmental Findings. The Planning Department has determined that the
15	actions contemplated in this ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act
16	(California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with
17	the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 250603 and is incorporated herein by
18	reference. The Board affirms this determination.
19	
20	Section 2. Article 12 of the Park Code is hereby amended by revising Section 12.41, to
21	read as follows:
22	SEC. 12.41. TENNIS/ <u>PICKLEBALL</u> FEES.
23	(a) The following hourly fees shall be charged to reserve tennis/pickleball courts at locations
24	other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center:
25	(1) Reservations made by Individuals not more than one week in advance: \$5

1	(2) Reservations made more than one week in advance:
2	(A) Not-for-Profit Organization or Individual: \$20 per hour
3	(B) For-Profit Organization: \$40 per hour
4	(b) The following hourly fees shall be charged for court reservations at the Golden
5	Gate Park Tennis Center upon completion of the renovations described in Board of Supervisors File
6	No. 180464, subject to annual adjustment beginning with $f\underline{F}$ iscal $f\underline{Y}$ ear 2018-2019 in
7	accordance with Section 12.20:
8	* * * *
9	
10	Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
11	enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
12	ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
13	of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.
14	
15	Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
16	intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
17	numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
18	Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
19	additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under
20	the official title of the ordinance.
21	
22	APPROVED AS TO FORM: DAVID CHIU, City Attorney
23	
24	By: <u>/s/</u> MANU PRADHAN
25	Deputy City Attorney n:\legana\as2025\2500297\01844099.docx



# San Francisco Recreation & Parks

The San Francisco Recreation and Park
Department's Mission is to provide
enriching recreational activities,
maintain beautiful parks and preserve
the environment for the well-being of
everyone in our diverse community



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET & APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

June 20, 2025

# Budget: Recreation - Proposed Reductions

# RPD disagrees with the proposal to eliminate 7 additional recreation positions

# **Recreation Staffing Model**

- Programs are run with both permanent and part-time staffing.
- If permanent positions are vacant due to hiring delays, RPD uses the salary dollars for part-time employees that run programming.
- Despite vacancies due to attrition and hiring, Recreation's current 253 FTE, is higher than its budgeted 186 FTE by 67 FTE.

# **Aquatics**

- Due to on-going, nationwide Lifeguard shortage, permanent Aquatics positions have been left vacant for an extended period.
- RPD has used TEX positions for a Lifeguard Trainee program

Aquatics	Budget	Actual	Balance	Comments
Permanent Positions	62.72	48.72	14.00	Approved by Mayor's Office for hire in May
Attrition Savings - Miscellaneous	(8.55)	(8.72)	0.17	Vacancies held in attrition
<b>Funded Permanent Positions</b>	54.17	40.00	14.17	
Temporary Staff FTE	8.32	22.44	(14.12)	Using salary balance for TEX staffing
Total Staffing	62.49	62.44	0.05	



# Budget: Partnerships - Policy Recommendation

# RPD disagrees with the potential cut of 6 filled Partnerships positions

Elimination of the Partnerships Division would leave the Department with no staff to support and project manage community driven projects and programs. This team supports hundreds of donors and community groups in every supervisorial district.


Examples of current and recently completed projects supported by partnerships include India Basin, Crocker Amazon Playing Fields, Herz Playground Rec Center, Esprit Park, Gilman Playground, Heron's Head, Francisco Park, McLaren Park Tennis Courts, Embarcadero Plaza, Jackson Park, Koshland Park, Reforestation of Parks in the Southeast of San Francisco, Tenderloin Rec Center Playground, and more.

Over the last five years the partnerships division has generated on average \$29M a year in philanthropic support and state and federal grants <u>unrelated to the former</u> San Francisco Parks Alliance.





# **Utility Cost Recovery Surcharge**



RPD's total utility budget is expected to increase by **roughly 50% over the next two years**.

• \$13M in FY 2024-25 to \$20M in FY 2026-27


# Proposed surcharges to offset utility increases

- Golf: \$4 (9 holes), \$6 (18 holes)
- Athletic Fields: \$1 per hour
- Picnic Areas: \$5–\$25
- Outdoor Events: 10% of venue fees

# **Estimated revenue**

- \$1.2M (FY25-26), \$1.75M (FY26-27)
- Recovers ~10% of utility costs (FY25-26, 9 months)
- Indexed to CPI
- Total utility budget projected compound annual growth is 17% over five years

# **Court Reservations**



Proposed \$1M in new revenue from implementing a **\$5 per** hour court reservation fee.

# For reservations made more than one week in advance:

- Not for profit or individual \$20 per hour
- For profit \$40 per hour

# 28 out of 66 locations will have reservations

 Walk-up play remains free at the majority (68%) of court locations

# **Other Major Cities:**

Seattle: \$7–\$15/hour

Berkeley: \$12/hour

Santa Cruz: \$20–\$30/hour

Oakland: \$10–\$15/hour

 New York, Los Angeles, Portland, Chicago: All charge for reservable court access



# Recreation Scholarships and Cost Recovery

Current Recreation Cost Recovery: \$0.15 for every \$1 spent.

Milpitas) and around the country. participants. Model is a best practice in other Bay Area cities, (San Jose, Santa Clara, Mountain View, Proposal allows Recreation to recover up to specified amounts based on the type of program and the

programming, and improved financial sustainability. Cost recovery models provide equitable distributions of funding support, greater transparency on the cost of

Program categories

- Community benefit are group-based, inclusive, and promote community health and/or engagement
- recovery target. Individual benefit are more specialized, skill-focused, or serve a single participant, justifying a higher

RPD offers over 3,500 classes annually, with fees ranging from \$0 to \$600 and most benefit the community.

Program Category	Maximum Cost Recovery	Examples
Community Benefit	Up to 50%	Peace Parks Program: No increase, remains free Senior Dance Programs: No increase, remains free
Youth, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities	Up to 75%	Youth Swim Lessons: \$5 increase per lesson Youth Karate: \$3.80 increase per lesson
Individual Benefit for Adults	Up to 100%	Adult Yoga: \$8 increase per lesson



# **Recreation Scholarships and Cost Recovery**





**Scholarships:** Applicants must live in San Francisco and have income equal to or less than 250% of the current federal poverty level or live in public housing, be in Foster Care, or unhoused.

25% of all program participants are currently on scholarship

Scholarship	Eligibility
50% Subsidy	Households that meet income eligibility.
75% Subsidy	Household are in 2+ government subsidized programs AND <b>Adult</b>
100% Subsidy	Household are in 2+ subsidized programs AND Child or Senior

RPD projects an additional **\$0.6M in FY 2025-26** and **\$1.2M in FY 2026-27** with the adoption of a new program cost recovery model.



# Golden Gate Park Paid Parking



# Paid parking in all legal parking areas within Golden Gate Park (~3,100 spaces)

# Rate:

Set in consultation with SFMTA. Demand responsive rate averaging \$3.00/hour with early bird option.

# **Projected Schedule:**

9 a.m. to 6 p.m., 7 days per week

# **How to Pay:**

App to facilitate mobile payment and pay stations located near park destinations.

# **Implementation Date:**

Scheduled for January 2027

# **Net Revenue:**

\$4.9M for six months





# Golf

# Original proposal

Eliminate \$7.5M General Fund subsidy in FY 2026-27 through the potential leasing of golf courses to private operators.

With approval of trailing budget legislation, and revised golf fees, (pending introduction), RPD will no longer pursue lower cost private sector maintenance agreements.

This solution (a new Utility Cost Recovery Surcharge and revised Golf Fees) will preserve excellent public sector work, generate an additional \$4M over the next two years, and result in up to a 60% reduction of the General Fund subsidy.







# **Golf Affordability**



# Maintaining Affordable Access to Municipal Golf For All

- No fee increases at Lincoln or Golden Gate (except for utility surcharge)
- Youth rates unchanged, except for utility surcharge
- First Tee provides free access to 11,000 youth annually (2,000 at Harding)
- Senior discounts continue Mon–Thurs at all courses
- Harding Park Highlights
  - Youth on Course: \$3-\$5 per round at Harding/Fleming
  - 14 high schools retain discounted access
  - PGA HOPE: SF resident rates for all veterans
  - Beginner lesson discounts for seniors, adults, and youth



# Potential service reductions October 2025

If legislation is not approved, Rec Park will need to reduce services, vacate positions, and implement layoffs as necessary in October 2025 by an additional \$5M, (\$6.7M on an ongoing 12-month basis,) which includes **34 full-time** and **92 part-time positions.** 

	FY26	FY27
Revenue at risk		
No Paid Parking in GGP		(4.9)
No additional fee revenue	(2.9)	(4.0)
At risk revenue subtotal	(2.9)	(8.9)
Service reductions to balance		
Service Reductions	5.0	6.7
Year 1 savings		2.2
Potential reductions subtotal	5.0	8.9
Ending Balance	2.2	0.0

# **SWIMMING POOLS (\$0.5M; 4 full-time and 4 part-time positions)**

- Closing one pool out of 9 pools (8 year-round) at a time on a rotating schedule to reduce costs while keeping overall access available across the city.
  - o Swim lessons serve about 5,000 children annually, but waitlists have soared to nearly 7,000—a 131% unmet demand.

# RECREATION CENTER PROGRAMS (\$0.5M; 18 part-time positions)

• Reduced hours at 25 recreation centers from 60 to 40 per week, a 30% reduction. Fewer senior, tot, and drop-in program hours.

# **SUMMER CAMPS (\$0.9M; 70 part-time positions)**

- A 25% reduction in summer camps—2,500 fewer camp slots
  - o In 2024, our summer camps are offering 9,000 spots, but more than 4,200 children are still on the waitlist. One of our most popular, the Jr. Warriors basketball league has more kids waiting to join than are enrolled.

# PARK MAINTENANCE (\$2.0M, 21 full-time positions)

- Reducing 2.5 hours from 120 restrooms from 8 AM–8 PM to 8 AM–5:30 PM results in a 21% reduction in open restroom hours.
- Reduction in Local 261 gardener apprenticeship program; currently, we have a class of 15, which will be reduced to 6.
- Reduction in trash service

## **PUBLIC SAFETY (\$1.1M, 9 full-time positions)**

 A 10+% cut to Park Rangers—reducing our ability to prevent illegal encampments and possibly eliminating fixed posts like UN Plaza and Dolores Park.





### **BOARD of SUPERVISORS**



City Hall
1 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) 554-5227

# **NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

# BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: June 18, 2025

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

**Subject:** File No. 250603. Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the

Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving

tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the

California Environmental Quality Act.

If this legislation passes, a fee of \$5 will be established to reserve tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center by individuals not more than one week in advance. It will also establish fees for reservations made more than one week in advance by Not-for-Profit Organizations or an individual at \$20 per hour, and \$40 per hour for For-Profit Organizations.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee:

Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712)

Angela Calvillo

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors City and County of San Francisco

bjj:vy:ams

# CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

## DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address: 915 E 1ST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012 Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839 Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

**BRENT JALIPA** CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES) 1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

# COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: **GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE** 

Ad Description

BJJ Fee Ad File No. 250603

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

06/08/2025, 06/15/2025

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an invoice.

Publication	\$1247.40
Set aside for CCSF Outreach Fund	\$138.60
Clearinghouse Service Charge	\$207.90
Total	\$1593.90

EXM# 3935408

EXM# 3935408

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
THAT THE BOard of Supervisors of the City and County
of San Francisco's Budget
and Appropriations Commitof San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 250603. Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charce authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, a fee of \$5 will be established to reserve tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center by individuals not more than one week in advance. It will also establish fees for reservations made advance. It will also establish fees for reservations made more than one week in advance by Not-for-Profit Organizations or an individual at \$20 per hour, and \$40 per hour for For-Profit Organizations. In accordance with Administraand \$40 per hour for ForProfit Organizations. In
accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1,
persons who are unable to
attend the hearing on this
matter may submit written
comments prior to the time
the hearing begins. These
comments will be made as
part of the official public
record in this matter and
shall be brought to the
attention of the Board of
Supervisors. Written
comments should be
addressed to Angela Calvillo,
Clerk of the Board, City Hall,
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett
Place, Room 244, San
Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent
via
[Proceed of supervisors @effort.] via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov (Doard.ori.Supervisions estigovorg). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center

Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda

information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco EXM-3935408#



# San Francisco Examiner $PUBLIC\ Notices$

Qualified for San Francisco and San Mateo Counties File & Publish New Business Name: Examiner.DBAstore.com Other Legal Notices: Examiner.LegalAdStore.com

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER . DALY CITY INDEPENDENT . SAN MATEO WEEKLY . REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE . ENQUIRER - BULLETIN . FOSTER CITY PROGRESS . MILLBRAE - SAN BRUNO SUN . BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER . EXAMINER - SO. SAN FRANCISCO . EXAMINER - SAN BRUNO

GOVERNMENT NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
THAT the Board of Supervisors
of the City and County of San COMMITTEE of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 250592.

Ordinance amending the Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes to adjust fees charged by the Department of Building Inspection and to establish Subfunds within the Building Inspection Fund; and affirming the Planning Department's the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, Building Code, Chapter 1A, will be amended to raise fees in the tables of Section 110A. Table 1A-A will be modified for Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$1 Fees with total valuation of \$1 to \$2,000: new construction plan review fees for the first \$500 will increase from \$163 to \$182 plus each additional \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000 will increase from \$7.32 to \$10; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$500 will increase from \$116.58 to \$160; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$500 will increase from \$163 to \$182 plus each additional \$100 or fraction thereof will increase from \$6.45 to \$9.47; alterations to permit issuance alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$500 will increase from \$128.31 to \$168; and no plans permit issuance fees for the first \$500 issuance fees for the first \$500 will increase from \$169 to \$193. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$2,001 to \$50,000 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$273 to \$332 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, and including \$50,000 will increase from \$17.01 to \$20.46; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$188.54 to \$237 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, will increase plus each additional \$1,000 of fraction thereof, will increase from \$3.51 to \$6.46; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$259.97 to \$324 plus each additional \$1,000 or plus each adultorial \$1,000 of fraction thereof will increase from \$21.85 to \$27.83; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$167.59 to \$223 plus each additional \$1.000 or plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$3.51 to \$6.75; and no plans permit issuance fees for the first \$2,000 will increase from \$284 to \$288 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$7.97 to \$9.31. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of Fees with total valuation of \$50,001 to \$200,000 will be as ollows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$50,000 will increase from \$1,089 to \$1,314 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$200,000 will increase from \$10.19 to \$13.15; new \$13.15; new \$10.19 to \$13.15; new \$10.19\$ to \$13.15; new \$10.19\$ to \$13.15; ne construction permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000 will plus each additional \$1,000 or plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$4.96 to \$5.81; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$50,000 will increase from \$1,309 to \$1,660 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$12.74 to \$16.31; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first issuance fees for the first \$50,000 will increase from \$452 to \$547 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction will increase from \$4.96 to \$5.81; and no plans permit issuance fee for the first \$50,000 will increase from \$666 to \$735. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$200,001 to \$500,000 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first plan review tees for the mas \$200,000 will increase from \$2,618 to \$3,286 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,418 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$3.76 to \$4.51; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$200,000 will increase from \$3,221 \$4,106 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will from \$10.69 \$13.53; alterations to permissuance fees for the first issuance fees for the first \$200,000 will increase from \$1,197 to \$1,418 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$3.76 to \$4.51; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$1,418 will be established for the first \$200,000 plus \$4.51 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000 to Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$500,001 to \$1,000,000 will be as follows: new construction be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$4,785 to \$5,721 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000 will increase from \$6.93 to \$8.51; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$500,000 will from increase from \$2,324 to \$2,771 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.87 to \$3.42; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$6,427 to \$8,165 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$7.58 to \$9,67 alterations to permit issuance alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$2,324 to \$2,771 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.87 to \$3.42; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$2,771 will be established for the first \$500,000 plus \$3.42 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000 Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$8,253 to \$9,976 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000,000 will increase from \$5.55 to \$6,29; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$3,759 to \$6.29; new additional \$1,000 or fraction

\$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.47 to \$2.83; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$10,218 to \$12,998 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$6.97 to \$8.38; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$3,759 to \$4,479 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.47 to \$2.83; and no plans permit issuance \$1,000 or fraction thereof will and no plans permit issuance fees of \$4,479 will be established for the first \$1,000,000 plus \$2.83 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof to and raction thereof, to and including \$5,000,000. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$5,000,001 to valuation of \$5,000,001 to \$50,000,000 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$30,457 to \$35,117 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.33 to \$2.66; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$13,648 to \$15,803 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from thereof will increase from \$1.29 to \$1.47; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$38,116 to \$46,532 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.02 to \$2.57; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$5,000,000 will increase first \$5,000,000 will increase from \$13,648 to \$15,803 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$129 to \$1.47; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$15,803 will be established for the first \$5,000,000 plus \$1.47 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$135,479 to \$154,996 plus each additional \$1,000 or each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.10 to \$2.17; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$71,672 to \$82,049 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.46 to \$1.69; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$50,000,000 will increase from \$128,831 to \$162,132 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.78 to \$2.84; alterations to permit issuance will increase from \$71,672 to will increase from \$71,672 to \$82,049 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.46 to \$1.69; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$82,049 will be stablished for the first \$50,000,000 plus \$1.69 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. Building Permit Fees with total Permit Fees with total valuation of \$100,000,000 to \$200,000,000 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$240,442 to \$263,263 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.39 to \$2.68; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$1.4627 to \$166,419 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.37 to \$2.66; alterations to plan review fees alterations to plan review fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$267,752 to \$304,022 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.67 to \$2.87; increase from \$2.67 to \$2.87; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$144,627 to \$166,419 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.37 to \$2.66; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$166,419 will be established for the first \$100,000,000 plus \$2.66 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. Building Permit Fees with total Permit Fees with total valuation of \$200,000,000 and up will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$479.707 \$531,050 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.39 to \$2.68; new construction issuance fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$381,396 to \$432,116 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.91 to \$2.16; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$534,326 to \$590,988 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.67 to \$2.87; alterations to permit issuance increase from \$2.39 to \$2.68 alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$381,396 to \$432,116 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.91 to \$2.66; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$432,116 will be established for the first \$200,000,000 plus \$2.66 for each additional \$1,000 or each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. Table 1A-B will be modified to increase plan review fees not covered in Table 1A-A and back check fee from \$280 to \$399 per hour (minimum of one hour); and a pre-application plan review fee from \$239 to \$368 per hour (minimum of four hours). Table 1A-C will be modified to increase hourly permit issuance/inspection permit issuance/inspection rates from \$280 to \$399 per hour for regular inspections and from \$300 to \$457 per hour (minimum of two hours) for off-hour inspections for plan review fee not covered in the table for Permit Issuance the table for Permit Issuance Fees by Category. Permit issuance fees for Category 1P - Single Residential Unit -water service, sewer replacement, single plumbing fixture installation, shower pan installation, or kitchen or bathroom remodels will increase from \$205.28 to \$273; Category 1M - Single Residential Unit - mechanical gas appliance (furnace, gas appliance (furnace, hydronic heat, heat pump) will increase from \$192.55 to \$264; Category 2PA -Plumbing installation for residential construction with 6 or less dwelling units or guest rooms; without underground plumbing installation (includes water, gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$352.24 to will increase from \$352.24 to \$477; Category 2PB - Plumbing installation for residential construction with 6 dwelling units or guest rooms or less; with underground plumbing installation (includes water as waste and vent) water, gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$513.49 to \$692; Category 2M Mechanical gas appliances for residential construction with 6 was the structure of the structure of

dwelling units or guest rooms

or less will increase from \$309.16 to \$395; Category

3PA - 7-12 Dwelling Units will increase from \$738.97 to \$978; Category 3PB - 13-36

\$978; Category 3PB - 13-36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$1,478.93 to \$1,957; Category 3PC - Over 36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$6,172.56 to \$7,887; Category 3MA - 7-12 Dwelling Units will increase from \$740.19 to \$987; Category 3MB - 13-36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$1,472.17 to \$1,957; Category 3MC - Over

will increase from \$3,759 to \$4,479 plus each additional

\$67; exterior/interior electrica

signs will increase from \$218.18 to \$279, and each additional sign at the same

address will increase from \$51.26 to \$85; garage door

operator requiring receptacle installation will increase from \$218.18 to \$281; quarterly permits for a maximum of five

outlets in any one location will increase from \$479.75 to \$641; survey, per hour or fraction thereof will increase

from \$218.18 to \$281; survey,

36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$6,149.75 to \$8,293; Category 4PA - Fire sprinklers - one and two family dwelling units will increase from \$192.55 to \$264; Category 4PB - Fire sprinklers - 3 or more dwelling units or guest rooms, commercial and office - per floor will increase from \$321.90 to \$344; Category 5P/5M - Office, mercantile & retail buildings: New or Tenant Improvements; heating/cooling equipment to piping connected thereto - per tenant or per floor, whichever is less will increase from \$418.54 to \$575; Category 6PA will increase from \$418.54 to \$575; Category 6PA - Restaurants (new and remodel) fee includes 5 or less drainage and or gas outlets - no fees required for public or private restroom will increase from \$398.37 to \$537; Category 6PB - Restaurants (new and remodel) fee includes 6 or more drainage and/or gas outlets - no fees required for public or private restroom will increase from \$1,125.42 to \$1,507; Category 8 - New boiler installations 8 - New boiler installations over 200 kbtu will increase from \$353.30 to \$478; Category 9P/M - Surveys will increase from \$385.74 to \$500; Category 10P/M - Condominium conversions will increase from \$468.95 to \$609. Fees will be established for a new Category 11P/M - Miscellaneous of \$302; Boiler Maintenance Program for permits to operation or renew certificates issued online of \$121 and in-house of \$207; and connection to utility company-provided steam of \$207 per hour with a minimum of one-half hour. Table 1A-D will be modified to increase standard hourly rates for plan review from \$439 to \$481 per hour; inspection rates from \$609. Fees will be established hour; inspection rates from \$461 to \$555 per hour; off-hour inspections from \$511 to \$680; and administration from \$214 to \$298 per hour. Table \$214 to \$298 per hour. Table 1A-E will be modified to increase hourly issuance/inspection rates from \$280 to \$399 per hour for regular inspections and from \$300 to \$457 per hour (minimum of two hours) for off-hour inspections for installations not covered by the fee schedule. Category 1 -General Wiring: Residential Buildings up to 10,000 sq. ft. up to 10 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$204.71 to \$270; 11 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$307.06 to \$421; up to 40 outlets and or devices, includes up to 200 Amp service upgrade, will increase from \$36.37 to \$527; more than 40 outlets and/or devices sand or devices will increase from \$386.37 to \$527; more than 40 outlets and/or devices. than 40 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$536.98 to will increase from \$536.98 to \$725; and buildings of 5,000 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$772.40 to \$1,053. Category 2 - General Wiring: Nonresidential Buildings & Residential Buildings over Nonresidential Buildings & Residential Buildings over 10,000 sq. ft. up to 5 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$307.06 to \$406,6 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$307.06 to \$400.94 to \$622; areas up to 2,500 sq. ft. will increase from \$617.19 to \$844; 2,501 to 5,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$927.68 to \$1,236; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$3,069 to \$1,000 to \$ \$2,092; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$3,089 to \$4,122; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$6,153 to \$8,414; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$9,255 to \$12,505; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$9,255 to \$12,505; 100,001 to 500,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$18,493 to \$25,337; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$41,519 to \$56,302; and more than 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$82,990 to \$112,544. Category 3 - Service Distribution and Utilization Equipment of 225 amps rating or less will increase from \$307.73 to \$393; 250 to 500 amps will increase from \$307.73 to \$393; 250 to 500 amps will increase from \$460.44 \$682\* 600 to 1000 amps will increase from \$460.44 to \$602; 600 to 1000 amps will increase from \$614.72 to \$811; 1,200 to 2,000 amps will increase from \$924.29 to \$1.232; more than 2,000 amps will increase from \$1,230.78 to \$1,597; 600 volts or more will increase from \$1,230.78 to \$1,650; 150 kva or less will increase from or less will increase from \$308.22 to \$393; 151 kva or more will increase from \$460.44 to \$602; and Fire Pump installations will increase from \$616.77 to \$813. Category 4 - Installations of Fire Warning and Controlled Devices up to 2,500 sq. ft. will increase from \$307.55 to \$455; 2,501 to 5,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$460.43 to \$671; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$927.68 to \$1,236; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,236; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,539 to ft. will increase from \$1,539 to \$2,041; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$3,087 to \$4,157; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$6,153 to \$8,209; 100,001 to 500,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$9,217 to \$12,049; 500,001 to \$9,217 to \$12,049; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$20,822 to \$27,376; and more than 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$41,466 to \$54,956. Fire Warning and Controlled Devices (Retrofit Systems) for buildings of not more than 6 dwelling units will increase from \$462.34 to \$616; buildings not more than 12 dwelling units will increase from \$614,71 to \$832; buildings with more than 12 dwelling units and non-residential occupancy up to 3 floors will increase from floors will increase from \$923.18 to \$1,210; 4-9 floors will increase from \$1,853.18 to \$2,465; 10-20 floors will \$2,465; 10-20 floors will increase from \$3,074 to \$4,148; 21-30 floors will increase from \$6,153 to increase from \$6,153 to \$8,209; and more than 30 floors will increase from \$9,217 to \$12,049. Category 5 - Miscellaneous Installations for a remodel/upgrade of existing hotel guest/SRO rooms up to 6 rooms will increase from \$385.86 to \$519, and each additional group of 3 rooms will increase from \$191.76 to \$261; data, communications, and wireless communications, and wireless communications, and wireless system of 11 to 500 cables will increase from \$218.18 to \$279, and each additional group of 100 cables will increase from \$32.11 to \$67; components or less will increase from \$218.18 to \$279, and each additional components of the component security systems components or le increase from \$218.18 to \$279, and each additional group of 10 components will increase from \$12.82 to \$42; office workstations of 5 or less will increase from \$218.18 to \$279, and each additional group of 10 workstations will increase from \$64.19 to \$95; temporary exhibition wiring from 1 to 100 booths (1 inspection) will increase from \$307.55 to \$406, and each additional group of 10 booths will increase from \$32.11 to \$67; extentior/interior electrical

research, and report preparation, per hour or fraction thereof will increase from \$385.74 to \$532; witness testing: life safety, fire warning, emergency, and energy management systems hourly rate will increase from \$280 to \$424 and off-hour inspections hourly rate, two hour minimum, will increase from \$300 to \$457; energy management, HVAC controls, and low-voltage wiring systems for 1-10 floors (3 inspections) will increase from \$614.78 to \$850, and each additional floor will increase from \$64.19 to \$95; and solar photovoltaic to \$95; and solar photovoltaic systems with 10 KW rating or less will increase from less will increase from \$218.18 to \$279, and each additional 10 KW rating will increase from \$192.57 to \$235. Table 1A-G increase from \$192.57 to \$235. Table 1A-G - Inspections, Surveys and Reports will be modified to increase the standard hourly rate, survey inspection rate, re-inspection fee, and survey of nonresidential buildings with a minimum two hours from \$280 to \$399 per hour; off-hours inspection rate from \$300 to \$457 per hour, minimum two hours plus permit fee; survey of residential buildings for any purpose Condo purpose or Condo Conversions for a single unit will increase from \$2,804.07 to \$3,656; two to four units will increase from \$3,698.29 to increase from \$3,698.29 to \$4,679; and five plus units will increase from \$3,690.04 to \$5,093 plus Standard Hourly Inspection Rate; hotels including 10 guestrooms will increase from \$1,871.63 to \$3,497, and 11+ guestrooms will increase from \$2,459.85 to \$3,497 plus an increase from \$59.30 to \$113 per guestroom over 10; and temporary certificate of occupancy will increase from \$545.46 to \$663. Fees will be established for demolition permits of \$629; house moving permit of \$399 house moving permit of \$399 per hour with a three-hour minimum; re-roofing permits for single-family homes and duplexes of \$306 and \$504 for duplexes of \$306 and \$504 for all others; construction of impervious surface in the requires front and setback area of \$229; and night noise permits of \$663. Table 1A-J-Miscellaneous Fees will be modified to increase the general administrative fees not covered in Section 110A from general administrative fees not covered in Section 110A from \$166.64 to \$226 per hour for a minimum one-half hour; building numbers (each entrance) for new addresses from \$166.61 to \$317 and change of existing addresses will increase from \$335.91 to \$506; application extension (in plan review) will increase from plan review) will increase from \$298.38 to \$526 each plus 20% of plan review fees; each permit extension will increase from \$298.38 to \$452 each plus 10% of building permit inspection fees. Fees will be plus 10% of building perflit inspection fees. Fees will be established for California Building Standards Commission of \$4 per \$100,000 in valuation, as determined by the Building Official, with appropriate fractions thereof, but not less than \$1; strong motion instrumentation program for Group R occupancies of three stories or less, except hotels and motels of 0.00013 times the valuation; hotels and motels, all buildings greater than three stories, and all occupancies other than Group R of 0.00024 times the valuation; with a minimum fee of \$1.60; subdivision of \$692; slope and seismic hazard area pretoction at 6 \$2.980; slope and seismic hazard zone protection act of \$2,888; zone protection act of \$2,888; and local equivalency fee of \$481 per hour with a minimum quarter hour. Table 1A-K - Penalties, Hearings, Code Enforcement Assessments will be modified to increase the filing fee for an Abatement Appeals Board hearing from \$326.45 to \$526 per case; Board of Examiners filing fees for each appeal for variance from interpretation of code requirements, each appeal for requirements, each appeal for approval of substitute materials or methods of construction from \$280 to \$372 per hour, with a minimum of four hours; Building Official's abatement order hearing will increase from \$280 to \$372 per hour with a minimum of two hours and emergency order will increase from \$280 to \$493 with a minimum of two hours; Access Appeals Commission filing fee/request for a rehearing will increase from \$280 to \$471 per hour with a minimum of two hours per appeal; lien recordation charges will increase from \$200 to \$372; Building Inspection Commission hearing fees for notice of appeal, request for jurisdiction and rehearing and additional increase from \$280 to \$372 and rehearing and additional hearings required by Code will hearings required by Code will increase from \$280 to \$471 per hour with a minimum of four hours. Fees will be established for subordination of \$894, and for vacant building – initial and annual registration of \$1,825. Table 1A-L - Public Information will be modified to increase the fees for public notification and record keeping for structural addition notices, posting of notices (change of use), and requesting notice of permit issuance (each address) per year from \$214 to \$257 per hour at a three-quarter hour hour at a three-quarter hour minimum; and a 30-inch by 30-inch sign from \$53 to \$64. Demolition notice of application and permit issuance by area/interested parties per area (1 area = 2 blocks) will increase from \$111.23 to \$205 per year for each area. Fees will be established for demolition notices for 300-foot notification letters of \$184 per hour with a minimum three hours, and residential tenant notification of \$184 with a minimum one-half hour. Reproduction and dissemination of public information for certification of copies for each 10 pages or fraction thereof will increase from \$15 to \$33, and a fee of \$0.10 will be established for notices for 300-foot notification \$0.10 will be established for hard copy prints. The records retention fee for each 20 pages or fraction thereof of plans or supporting documentation will increase from \$3 to \$74. Fees will be established for a report residential records (3R \$286, and duplication of plans administration of \$113. Table 1A-N - Energy Conservation will be modified for the initial inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings to increase from \$273.45 to \$443, apartment houses and residential hotels up to 20 rooms to increase from \$409.46 to \$598 and each additional 10 rooms, or portion thereof, will increase from \$136.36 to \$197. Compliance inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings will administration of \$113. Table two-family dwellings will increase from \$136.36 to

\$444. Table 1A-P - Residential Code Enforcement and License Fees will be modified to increase one and two-family dwelling unit fees from \$107 to \$136 per rental unit. Apartment house license fees of 13 to 30 units will increase from \$798 to \$839 per year, and more than 30 units for each additional 10 units or portion thereof will increase portion thereof will increase from \$107 to \$153. Hotel license fees will increase per year as follows: 6 to 29 rooms will increase from \$530 to \$622; 30 to 59 rooms will increase from \$843 to \$933; 60 to 149 rooms will increase from \$1,012 to \$1,127; 150 to 200 rooms will increase from \$1,242 to \$1,418; and hotels with more than 200 rooms will increase from \$1,579 to \$1,804 and increase from \$107 to \$153 for each additional 25 rooms or portion thereof. Table 1A-Q - Hotel Conversion Ordinance Fees will be modified to increase the annual unity usage report 60 to 149 rooms will increase the annual unity usage report from \$169.84 to \$228; from \$169.84 to \$228; increase the fee per hour of appeals of initial or annual status determination, inspection staff review of requests for hearing to exceed 25% tourist season rental limit, and inspection staff review of unsuccessful challenge of a usage report and standard hourly inspection or request for winter rental from \$280 to \$399; challenges to claims of exemption usage reports will increase from \$83.64 to \$113; claims of exemption based on low-income housing will increase from \$546.46 to \$788; claims of exemption based on partially completed conversion will increase from \$820.19 to \$1,183; complaint of unlawful conversion will increase from \$820.64 to \$128; institutions of the state of the season o requests for hearing to exceed 25% tourist season rental conversion will increase from \$83.64 to \$113; initial usage report will increase from \$546.46 to \$788; permit to convert will increase from \$818.01 to \$1,300; statement of exemption - Hearing Officer fee for requests for hearing to exceed 25% tourist season rental limit will increase from \$542.82 to \$785; and statements of exemption - Hearing Officer fee for unsuccessful challenges of usage reports will increase from \$546.46 to \$788. Table 1A-S - Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Wall Building Retrofit will be modified to establish a \$372 per hour fee with a minimum two hours for reviews of inventory form and summary of the engineering report; Board of Examiners filing fee will be established at \$272 per hour challength of the engineering report; Board of Examiners of exemption - Hearing Officer filing fee will be established at \$372 per hour with a minimum of two hours for each appeal a variance from rpretation of c interpretation of code requirements, and approval of substitute materials or methods of design or construction. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk et a Board City Holl II. interpretation addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov. org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations (board of supervisors@sfgov the Budget and Appropriations (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco EXM-3935427# NOTICE OF PUBLIC

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B. 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the
following proposal and said
public hearing will be held
as follows, at which time
all interested parties may
attend and be heard: File
No. 250608. Ordinance
amending the Public Works
and Subdivision Codes to
modify certain permit fees,
including waiving fees for cafe
tables and chairs and display tables and chairs and display merchandise registrants and certain minor sidewalk encroachments that are appurtenant building features, and affirming the Planning Department's determination Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, fees for street improvement permits in an accepted or unaccepted right-of-way in order to satisfy requirements under Public Works Code, Sections 416, 706, 708, and 724.2, will increase from \$1,010 to \$2,033.77; street improvement permit fees for sidewalk repair that is not the subject of a Departmental Notice to Repair will increase from \$29,67 to \$35.45 per 100 square feet; special sidewalk square feet; special sidewalk permit fees will increase from \$704.90 to \$833.13, and from \$250.39 to \$295.44 for an existing special sidewalk or if needed in conjunction with a Street Improvement Permit; standard minor encroachment permits will increase from \$1,683.45 to \$1,988.87, and from \$239.84 to \$283.62 if existing or if needed in conjunction with a Street Improvement Permit (except shoring); street encroachment permit (also known as a major encroachment, permit) fees \$250.39 to \$295.44 for an encroachment permit) fees will increase from \$6,533.75 to \$7,721.49; if a pipe barrier permit is associated with a Street Improvement Permit but that pipe barrier permit does not specifically reference a Street Improvement Permit, the additional fee for each pipe barrier permit will increase from \$133.20 to \$257.62

for each pipe barrier permit; street improvement permits,

street improvement permits, special sidewalk permits, and automobile runway (driveway) permits associated with a Department of Public Works Notice to Repair, the permit fee will increase from \$330.32 to \$678.32 per permit; sidewalk width change fees, minimum per block or less, will increase from \$3,875 to \$4,043.46; and nighttime work permits will increase from \$171.64 to \$203.26. Administrative

\$197, apartment houses and

residential hotels up to 20 rooms will increase from \$204.18 to \$295 and each

additional 10 rooms, or portion thereof, will increase from \$83.19 to \$153; energy additional 10 rooms, or portion

reports and certificates will increase from \$83.64 to \$113;

increase from \$83.64 to \$113; filing fee for appeals will increase from \$167.28 to \$226; and certification of a qualified energy inspector will increase from \$319.88 to

fees for each permit issued for a small excavation project and any block for which the permit has been extended or amended will increase from \$66 to \$135.90, each block contained in a medium excavation project will increase from \$83 to \$171.35, and each block contained in a large excavation project will increase from \$110 to \$226.89. Fees for each permit issued to a small utility excavation project and any fees upward or downward for the upcoming fiscal year as appropriate to ensure that the excavation project and any permit extension will increase from \$16 to \$31.91 and a \$640 fee will be established program recovers the costs of operation without producing revenue. Health Code, Section \$640 fee will be established for a small general excavation project related to buildings. An inspection fee of \$189.08 per hour will be established for inspection of underground tank removal, side sewer, or boring/monitoring wells. Fees for temporary street space occupancy for any purpose other than a building construction operation will increase from \$95.48 to \$112.27 per day. The nonrefundable additional permit application fee for temporary street occupancy temporary street occupancy will increase from \$353 to \$833.13, and applications for agricultural products to be shipped from \$40 to \$70; to request extension of original terms of temporary street occupancy permits will increase from \$200 to \$471.51. increase from \$200 to \$471.51. Fees payable to Public Works for air space for four lots or less will increase from \$8,598 to \$16,969.79; Lot Subdivision "Final Map", including from a minimum of \$135 to \$240 plus any hour or portion thereof in excess of three hours required to complete the inspection will increase from \$45 to \$90 per hour; and per mile traveled to perform such inspections will increase from \$0.30 to \$0.56 per mile. Inspections of quarantine shipments which require special handling will increase from \$35 to \$90 per hour, and from \$0.30 to \$0.56 per mile traveled to perform such less will increase from \$8,598 to \$16,969.79; Lot Subdivision "Final Map", including Vesting Tentative/Final Subdivision Map, and whether condominium conversion or new construction of five or more units or lots from \$8,437 to \$16,651.90; Condominium Conversion of four units or less from \$8,336 to \$16,452.18; Parcel Map new construction of four lots or less from \$7,770 to \$15,335.44; Amended Map from \$2,704 to \$5,337.92; Lot Line Adjustment from \$2,704 to \$5,337.92; certificate of compliance from \$2,139 to \$4,222.36; record of survey from \$507 to \$1,01.39; and fees will be established for mile traveled to perform such inspections. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made from \$507 to \$1,010.39; and fees will be established for corner record at \$35.03, incomplete application submittal at \$295.44, Project Application Reinstatement at \$1,027.60, and sidewalk width change or street vacation, minimum per block or less at \$4,043.46. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Accident Clerk for record in this matter and shal contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent Jalipa @ sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

EXM-3935423# NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the the Budget and Appropriations
Committee: Brent Jalipa
(Brent.Jalipa @ sfgov.org
- (415) 554-7712) Angela
Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of
Supervisors, City and County
of San Francisco

EXM-3935424# NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY JUINE 18 hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18. 2025 - 10:00 AM LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER. interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 250605. Ordinance amending the Park ROOM 250, CITY HALL 1 DR. CARLTON B. 1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the
following proposal and said
public hearing will be held
as follows, at which time
all interested parties may
attend and be heard: File
No. 250606. Ordinance Code to allow the Recreation and Park Department to set fees for recreation programs based on the Department's operating costs for those programs and various other factors, including whether the program is designated for youth, seniors, or persons with disabilities, subject to approval of the Recreation and Park Commission; and Park Commission; directing the Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide for further discounts No. 250606. Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code, Health for recreation programs based on financial certain clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination rax negulations Code, Health Code, Administrative Code, and Public Works Code to:

1) eliminate Department of Public Health permit requirement for veterinary California environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, a \$100 deposit will be established to requirement for veterinary hospitals and laundry facilities; 2) eliminate the food facility surcharge and certain fees for agricultural inspections; 3) establish fees for regulatory compliance activities for solid waste facilities, refuse service for commercial and residential properties, and licensing of refuse collectors; 4) establish regulatory fee for food safety examinations; 5) increase existing regulatory fees for agricultural inspections, certified farmers' market permits, and hazardous waste deposit will be established to hold a reservation for each tent site or cabin reserved at Camp Mather. The remaining balance of the reservation fee shall be due 30 days prior to the start of the reservation. The proposed Ordinance would allow the Recreation and Park Department to set recreation program fees based on the estimated operating costs of those programs. The Department generally could Department generally could set fees intended to cover the programs' full operating costs, but for programs designated for youth or seniors or persons with disabilities could set fees certified farmers' market permits, and hazardous waste management; and 6) increase penalties for violations of tobacco sales ordinances with disabilities could set fees that recovered only 75% of the operating costs. In addition, the Ordinance urges the Department to set fees for programs that benefit the community at large based on only 50% of the operating costs. All fees would require approval from the Recreation and Park Commission and, once approved, would be published on the Department's website. The Ordinance also penalties for violations of tobacco sales ordinances by tobacco retailers. If this legislation passes, the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 35, will be modified to establish a fee of \$251 per hour for service by environmental health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health conducts inspections, permitting, and enforcement of solid waste facilities, as defined in Section 40194 and required by California Public website. The Ordinance also directs the Recreation and Park Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide for further discounts for required by California Public Resources Code, Sections recreation programs based on financial need. In accordance Resources Code, Sections 43209 et seq.; and a fee of \$188 per training, class, or examination will be charged when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety examinations as required by California Health and Safety Code, Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual Administrative Code Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to 249.6, will establish an annual license fee for \$12,545 to the Tax Collector for every refuse Collector licensed by the Director of Health for each refuse collection route permitted by the Director of Health in accordance with Health Code, Article 6. Health Code, Section 22A.19, will be modified to increase org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org — (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

EXM-3935419# (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda will be modified to increase the initial fee payable to the Department of Public Health upon filing documents for review in administration of Article 22A: Hazard Waste Management from \$609.50 to \$1,000, and increase the additional fee from \$203.17 to \$333 per hour exceeding three hours or portion thereof. San Francisco Health Code, Sections 1249 and 3108, will be modified to establish an

the Budget and Appropriations

initial fee of \$1,000 payable to the Department of Public Health due upon filing documents for a dust control plan and for review and establish an additional fee of \$333 per hour exceeding three hours or portion thereof for the administration of Articles 22B and 31. The Controller shall, if necessary, adjust the fees upward or downward for revenue. Health Code, Section 3811, will be modified to increase the fees in review and approval of an enhanced ventilation proposal from \$984 to \$1,255; additional consultation, document review or inspection will increase from \$225 to \$251. The Controller shall, if necessary, adjust the fees upward or downward for the upcoming fiscal year to ensure program recovery without producing revenue. Administrative Code, Section 1.10, will be modified to increase the fees for inspection and certificates for inspection and certificates certificate of fumigation from \$30 to \$70, and the minimum charge for any single certificate from \$25 to \$70. Quarantine inspection fees will increase from a minimum of \$135 to These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Cartton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda research-center-irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for

> of San Francisc EXM-3935411# NOTICE OF PUBLIC
> HEARING
> BUDGET AND
> APPROPRIATIONS
> COMMITTEE
> BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
> OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
> OF SAN FRANCISCO
> WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
> 2025 - 10:00 AM
> LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
> ROOM 250, CITY HALL
> 1 DR. CARLTON B. with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors @sfgov. (board.of.supervisors@sfgov. org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent Jalipa @ sfgov. org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco
>
> EXM.3935408#

NOTICE OF PUBLIC

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE 1S HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the
following proposal and said
public hearing will be held
as follows, at which time
all interested parties may
attend and be heard: File
No. 250604. Ordinance
amending the Park Code
to authorize the Recreation
and Park Department to add
a cost recovery surcharge to and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, cost recovery fees will be established for each player using City Golf Courses of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, as an additional surcharge to cover operating costs related to the Golf Courses; an additional surcharge of 10% for the use of the parks for outdoor events, to cover operating events, to cover operating costs related to the outdoor event facilities; an additional surcharge of \$5 for picnics with up to 100 participants, and \$25 for picnics with more than 100 participants, to cover operating costs related to the picnic areas; and an additional surcharge and an additional surcharge of \$1 per hour for the use of the athletic fields to cover operating costs related to the athletic fields. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board. of. supervisors @ sfgov. org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations the Budget and Appropriations
Committee: Brent Jalipa
(Brent Jalipa @ sfgov.org
- (415) 554-7712) Angela
Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of
Supervisors, City and County

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the
following proposal and said
public hearing will be held
as follows, at which time
all interested parties may
attend and be heard: File No.
250603. Ordinance amending
the Park Code to authorize
the Recreation and Park FRANCISCO, CA 94102 the Recreation and Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, a fee of \$5 will be established to reserve tennis/ pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center by individuals not more than one week in advance. It will also establish fees for reservations made more than one week in advance by Notfor-Profit Organizations or an individual at \$20 per hour, and \$40 per hour for For-Profit Organizations. In accordance with Administrative Code,

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the BUDGET AND

hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time

EXM-3935419#

# Classifieds

**PLACE YOUR AD** 

415.359.2686 classads@sfexaminer.com **DEADLINES Weekdays:** 2 p.m. ONE business day prior to publication.

Sunday: 2 p.m. on Friday prior to publication.

SICION VISA AMERICAN DISCOVER The publisher reserves the right to omit,

ANNOUNCEMENTS

**ANNOUNCEMENTS** 

Consumer Cellular - the same reliable, nationwide coverage as the largest carriers. No long-term contract, no hidden fees and activation is free. All plans feature unlimited talk and text, starting at just \$20/month.

For more information, call 1-844-908-0605 (CDCN)

DID YOU KNOW Newspaper-generated content is so valuable it's taken and repeated, condensed, broadcast, tweeted, discussed, posted, copied, edited, and emailed countless times throughout the day by others? Discover the Power of Newspaper Advertising. For a free brochure call 916-288-6011 or email

cecelia@cnpa.com (CDCN)

Prepare for power outages today with a Generac Home Standby Generator. Act now to receive a FREE 5-Year warranty with qualifying purchase. Call 1-844-964-3998 today to schedule a free quote. It's not just a generator. It's a power move

Tiene un vehiculo no deseado? Donelo a Patriotic Hearts! Recogida rápida y gratuita en los 50 estados. Patriotic Hearts ofrece programas para ayudar a los veteranos a encontrar trabajo o iniciar su propio negocio Llama ahora: 866-388-1713 (24/7) (CDCN)

GOT AN UNWANTED CAR??? Your car donation to Patriotic Hearts helps vet erans find work or start their own business. Fast free pick. Running or not! Call 24/7: 855-569-1425. (CDCN)

AUTOMOBILES

**AUTOMOBILES** 

DONATE YOUR CAR TO KIDS Fast Free Pickup - Running or Not - 24 Hour Response - Maximum Tax Donation - Help Find Missing Kids! Call 1-844-408-0971. (CDCN)

FINANCIAL SERVICES

RETIRED COUPLE \$\$\$\$ for business purpose Real Estate loans. Credit unimportant. V.I.P. Trust Deed Company www.viploan.com Call 1-818-248-0000 Broker-principal DRE 01041073 No Consumer Loans. (CDCN)

Over \$10K in Debt? Be debt free in 24 to 48 months. No upfront fees to enroll. A+ BBB rated. Call National Debt Relief 1-866-628-5726. (CDCN)

HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS

Call us at 415.359.2686

San Francisco Examiner

IN HOME

& GARDEN

HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS

TO ADVERTISE

**OXYGEN** - Anytime. Anywhere. No tanks to refill. No deliveries. The All-New Inogen One G4 is only 2.8 pounds! FAA approved! FREE info kit: CALL 833-650-0754

**PLACE YOUR AD** 

Call us at 415.359.2686 or e-mail classads@sfexaminer.com

San Francisco Examiner

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Cnsltnt, Envrnmntl Engr (San Francisco, CA) WSP USA: Dsgn DOT pipIns systms acrss pipIne Ifcycle incldng pipIne instlltn feasblty stdies (FEED) & route selctn, PipIne trnchlss dsgn, piplne cnstrctn fld engnrng srvcs & piplne deactvtn/demoltn plnning. Stnd corp benfts. \$106,163.00/yr. EOE. Reqs: Bach (or frgn equiv) in Cvl/Envrnmntl Engg or rltd + 3 yrs exp as a Muncpl Dsgnr, Envrnmntl Engr, or rltd. Email resume to jobs@wsp.com, Ref:

JOB OPPORTUNITIES **JOB OPPORTUNITIES** 

Joby Aero, Inc. (San Carlos, CA) F/T positions. Software Engineer: dvlp Agent-Based Simulat'n Capability(ASC)+migrat'n fr gRPC to GraphQL for ASC+cross-functnl collab+leadr shp&arch invlvment; req BS in CS or clsly rltd+18 months exp as SW Engr or clsly rltd+spec skills. \$156k-160k. Standard bene fits/401K. EOE. No Calls. Recruitment@joby. aero.

dsgn-FMEA efforts by wrkng w various func tionI teams; req MS in Reliability Engrng, ME Materials Sci Engrng, EE, Sys Engrng, or clsly rltd; 18 months exp as Materials Engrn, or rltd+spec skills. \$168,300.08-\$175k. Standard benefits/401K. EOE. No Calls. Recruitment@ <u>joby.aero</u>.

Joby Aero, Inc. (San Carlos, CA) F/T positions.

Senior Design for Reliability Engineer: drive

Card79 LLC is seeking Visual Designer to produce high-quality design solutions and create illustrations, and etc. Position requires a master's degree in Design or related, must have Knowledge of motion design, any interested applicants can mail their resume with code . 791 to: Card79 LLC. 3435 Cesar Chavez Street, Suite 221, San Francisco, CA 94110.

Model N, Inc. seeks a Solutions Architect, Cus-

tomer Supp in San Mateo, CA to act as lead, single POC for customers including escala-

tions & running customer calls as appropriate.

100% telework permitted w/in U.S. \$104,416 \$167,911 pr yr. Apply at www.jobpostingtoday. com Ref #93252 Joby Aero, Inc. (San Carlos, CA) F/T positions.

Senior Dimensional Quality Engineer lead de-vlpmnt of dimensional quality objectives. BS in EE, ME, or rltd. 5 yrs exp as eng. Or rltd. +spec skills: \$167,000 until \$168,000. Standard benefits/401K. EOE. No Calls. Recruitment@joby.aero

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Eliminate gutter cleaning forever! LeafFilter, the most advanced debris-blocking gutter protection. Schedule a FREE LeafFilter estimate today. 20% off Entire Purchase. Plus 10% Sénior & Military Discounts. Call 1-855-908-2495 (CDCN)

classify, and/or modify ads not consistent with the policies of this publication.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

PROFESSIONAL **SERVICES** 

The difference in winning and losing market share is how businesses use their advertising dollars. CNPA's Advertising Services power to connect to nearly 13 million of the state's readers who are an engaged audience, makes our services an indispensable marketing solution. For more info call Cecelia @ (916) 288-6011 or cecelia@cnpa.com

# **TO ADVERTISE** IN HOME & GARDEN

Call us at 415.359.2686

# San Francisco Examiner

REAL ESTATE SERVICES

REAL ESTATE SERVICES

Wesley Financial Group, LLC Timeshare Cancellation Experts. Over \$50,000,000 in timeshare debt and fees cancelled in 2019. Get free informational package and learn how to get rid of your timeshare! Free consultations. Over 450 positive reviews. Call 855-403-2314 (CDCN)

TAX/BOOKKEEPING

TAX/BOOKKEEPING

OWE UNDER 10K TO THE IRS? GET AFFORDABLE TAX HELP YOU DESERVE! START FOR JUST \$49/MO. CALL TAX RESPONSE CENTER 855-967-4531

**GOT TAX PROBLEMS?** 

# San Francisco Learniner $Public \ Notices$

Qualified for San Francisco and San Mateo Counties File & Publish New Business Name: Examiner.DBAstore.com Other Legal Notices: Examiner.LegalAdStore.com

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER . DALY CITY INDEPENDENT . SAN MATEO WEEKLY . REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE . ENQUIRER - BULLETIN . FOSTER CITY PROGRESS . MILLBRAE - SAN BRUNO SUN . BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER . EXAMINER - SO. SAN FRANCISCO . EXAMINER - SAN BRUNO

addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board or Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent. Jalipa @sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco EXM-3935423#

EXM-3935423#

NOTICE OF PUBLIC

HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of

GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 250605. Ordinance amending the Park Code to allow the Recreation and Park Department to set and Park Department to set fees for recreation programs based on the Department's operating costs for those programs and various other factors, including whether the program is designated for youth, seniors, or persons with disabilities, subject to approval of the Recreation and Park Commission; directing the Commission; directing the Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide for further discounts for recreation programs based certain clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination California under the Environmental Quality Act. this legislation passes, a \$100 deposit will be established to hold a reservation for each tent site or cabin reserved at Camp Mather. The remaining balance of the reservation fee shall be due 30 days prior to the start of the reservation. The proposed Ordinance would allow the Recreation and Park Department to set recreation program fees based on the estimated operating costs of those programs. The Department generally could set fees intended to cover the programs full operating costs, but for programs designated for youth or seniors or persons with disabilities could set fees that recovered only 75% of the operating costs. In addition, the Ordinance urges the Department to set fees for programs that benefit the community at large based on the Soft of the operating Soft of the operating Soft of the operating Soft of the Department to set fees for programs that benefit the community at large based on the Soft of the operating on the soft of the operating of the soft of the operating the shall soft of the operating of the shall soft of the operation of the shall s balance of the reservation fee programs that benefit the community at large based on only 50% of the operating costs. All fees would require approval from the Recreation and Park Commission and, once approved, would be published on the Department's website. The Ordinance also directs the Recreation and Park Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide Park Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide for further discounts for recreation programs based on financial need. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be

addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1

Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place.

Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov. org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations. the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent, Jalipa @ sfgov. org — (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco 

EXM-3935419#

NOTICE OF PUBLIC

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the
following proposal and said
public hearing will be held
as follows, at which time
all interested parties may
attend and be heard: File
No. 250604. Ordinance
amending the Park Code
to authorize the Recreation
and Park Department to add
a cost recovery surcharge to
the fees for the use of City
golf courses, outdoor event
facilities, picnic areas, and
athletic fields, to help cover
stormwater and other costs
related to maintaining those
City properties; and affirming related to maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation Quality Act. If this legislation passes, cost recovery fees will be established for each player using City Golf Courses of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, as an

additional surcharge to cover operating costs related to the Golf Courses; an additional surcharge of 10% for the use of the parks for outdoor surcharge of 10% for the use of the parks for outdoor events, to cover operating costs related to the outdoor event facilities; an additional surcharge of \$5 for picnics with up to 100 participants, and \$25 for picnics with more than 100 participants, to cover operating costs related to the picnic areas; and an additional surcharge of \$1 per hour for the use of the athletic fields to cover operating costs related to the athletic fields. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244. San Francisco. Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgovorg). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa

Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco EXM-3935411#

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WENNESDAY JUINE 18

OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 D.R. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the
following proposal and said
public hearing will be held
as follows, at which time
all interested parties may
attend and be heard: File No.
250603. Ordinance amending
the Park Code to authorize
the Recreation and Park
Department to charge fees
for reserving tennis/pickleball
courts at locations other
than the Golden Gate Park
Tennis Center; and affirming
the Planning Department's
determination under the
California Environmental
Quality Act. If this legislation
passes, a fee of \$5 will be
established to reserve tennis',
pickleball courts at locations
other than the Golden
Gate Park Tennis Center
by individuals not more
than one week in advance. Gate Park Tennis Center by individuals not more than one week in advance. It will also establish fees for reservations made more than one week in advance by Notfor-Profit Organizations or an individual at \$20 per hour, and \$40 per hour for For-Profit Organizations. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention as part of the ornical public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Cariton B, Goodleft Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of. supervisors @ stgov. org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative research-center-lirc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent Jalipa @ sfgov. org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

EXM-3935408#

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of
Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco's
Budget and Appropriations
Committee will hold a public
hearing to consider the
following proposal and said
public hearing will be held
as follows, at which time
all interested parties may
attend and be heard: File
No. 250599. Ordinance
amending the Administrative
Code to authorize fees for
vehicles registered to a San
Francisco address to fund law
enforcement programs related
to fincerprint identification of enforcement programs related to fingerprint identification of persons involved in crimes persons involved in crimes committed while operating motor vehicles, in accordance with California State law,

with California State law, and to establish the Police

Fingerprint Identification Fund to receive the fee revenue. If this legislation passes, a feo of \$2 will be imposed to be paid at the time of registration or renewal of registration for every vehicle registered to an address within the City and County of San Francisco, except those expressly exempted under State law; and the imposition of an additional fee of \$4 to be paid at the time of registration or renewal of every commercial motor vehicle registered to an address within the City and County of San Francisco. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://cfac.org/legistaive/fieles.pr.) or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa @sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco EXM-3935401# Agenda to this

NOTICE OF PUBLIC
HEARING
BUDGET AND
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,
2025 - 10:00 AM
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL

ROOM 250, CITY HALL 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
NOTICE IS HEREBY
GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the

realing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 250591. Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to modify the fees for the use of City Hall. If this legislation passes, Administrative Code, Section 4.1-2, will be modified to establish the short-term license or event fees for a party who enters into a Short Term License Agreement for the use of City Hall in accordance with the following fee schedule: \$1,200 for a one-hour wedding for 1-200 guests plus \$4 for each guest over 200; \$6,500 for 1-200 guests for events in the North and South Light Courts; \$12,000 for 1-499 guests in the Rotunda and one Light Court; Rotunda and both light Courts as follows: \$15,000 for 1,000 - 1,499 guests; \$1,000 per hour of weekday early access before 2 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and the Rotunday \$1,000 per hour of the North Light Court and the Rotunday \$1,000 per hour and the Rotunday \$1,000 per hour and the Rotunday \$1,000 per hour per room for weekende early access before 2 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and the Rotunday \$1,000 per hour per room for weekende early access before 2 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and the Rotunday \$1,000 per hour per room for weekende early access before 2 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the North Light Court and the Rotunday \$1,000 per hour per room for weekende early access before 2 p

hour after 12 p.m. for late access (Guest Event); \$500 per hour after 2 a.m. for late

access (Load-Out); 50% rental

fee for set-up day; \$5,000 for exterior lighting; \$3.00 per guest for insurance; \$7.50 per chivari chair; \$3.50 per folding chair; \$7.00 per easel; \$200 per stage with skirting; \$15 per pair of stanchions; \$7.50 per banquet table (6 feet by 18 inches, 8 feet by 30 inches, 8 feet by 18 inches, 8 feet by 30 inches), and \$7.50 per round table (60 inches). Beginning with Fiscal Year 2026-2027, the fees set pursuant to subsection (a) of this Section 4.1-2 shall be adjusted each year, without further action by the Board of Supervisors (the "Board"), to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Controller without further action by the Board. The Director of Administrative Services may charge fees for filming and photographing activities that do not exceed the Event Fees under Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors.

Written comments should be Angela Calvillo, addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board City Lie. addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board or the Board or the Board or the Speriors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-Irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent. Jalipa @sfgov.org - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco EXM-3935390#

**CIVIL** 

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME Case No. CNC-25-559877 Superior Court of California, County of SAN FRANCISCO Petition of: KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR for Change of

Petition of: KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR for Change of Name TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR filed a petition with this court for a decree changing names as follows: KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR to KAYLENE SUE MCCOLLAR to KAYLENE SUE FLYING WHITEBIRD The Court orders that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be why the petition should not be when the petition should not be with the petition at the petition should not be with the petition at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a

grant the petition without a hearing. Notice of Hearing: Date: JULY 22, 2025, Time: 9:00 A.M., Dept.: 103N, Room: 103N
The address of the court is 400 MCALLISTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 (To appear remotely, check in advance of the hearing for information about how to do so on the court's website. To find your court's website, go to www.courts.ca.go//find-my-court.htm.)

A copy of this Order to Show Cause must be published at must be published at

least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER EXAMINER
Date: JUNE 5, 2025
MICHELLE TONG
Judge of the Superior Court
6/15, 6/22, 6/29, 7/6/25
CNS-3937796# SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAMES

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS
NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-300629
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:
PENINSULA ORAL
SURGERY BURLINGAME,
1750 EL CAMINO REAL,
SUITE #403, BURLINGAME,
CA 94010 County of SAN
MATEO
M. ELDER, D.D.S.,

MATEO
M. ELDER, D.D.S.,
A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION, 12770
MERIT DRIVE, SUITE 800,
DALLAS, TX 75251 This business is conducted by: A CORPORATION STATE OF INCORPORATION: CALIFORNIA

The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)

S/ MAHR ELDER - PRESIDENT
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 05/15/2025. Mark Church, County Clerk 5/25, 6/1, 6/8, 6/15/25

NPEN-3930390#

EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & declare that all information

EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS
NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-300802
The following person(s) is
(are) doing business as:
DALE
PLUMBING
&
HEATING, 25 CROCKER
AVE, REDWOOD CITY, CA
94063 County of SAN MATEO
DALE
PLUMBING, INC, 25
CROCKER
AVE, REDWOOD
CITY, CA 94063
This business is conducted
by N/A
The registrant(s) commenced
to transact business under

to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A I declare that all information in this statement is true and

in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)
DALE PLUMBING, INC,
S/ TIMO SPOERL,
PRESIDENT
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/04/2025.
Mark Church, County Clerk [Deputy], Deputy Original 6/15, 6/22, 6/29, 7/6/25
NPEN-3928706#

NPEN-3928706# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE &

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS
NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-300668
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:
IRG STONE, 275 VALLEY
DR., BRISBANE, CA 94005,
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
INTEGRATED RESOURCES
GROUP, INC., 2314
WEBSTER STREET, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94115
This business is conducted by CORPORATION, STATE
OF INCORPORATION, STATE

INCORPORATION CALIFORNIA
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under

the fictitious business name or names listed above on 03/01/2025 I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.) S/ DILMOHAN S. CHADHA-PRESIDENT
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on MAY 20, 2025
Mark Church, County Clerk 6/1, 6/8, 6/15, 6/22/25
NPEN-3927268# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS
NAME STATEMENT
File No. M-300666
The following person(s) is
(are) doing business as:
CHIPFOUNDRY, 2705
DEBBIE CT, SAN CARLOS,
CA 94070, County of SAN
MATEO
U M B R A L O G I C
TECHNOLOGIES LLC, 2705
DEBBIE CT, SAN CARLOS,
CA 94070
This business is conducted

CA 94070
This business is conducted by LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, STATE OF ORGANIZATION: CALIFORNIA

OF ORGANIZATION:
CALIFORNIA
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 04/23/2025
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)
S/ JEFFREY DICORPO, MANAGER
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on MAY 20. Mateo County on MAY 20,

2025 Mark Church, County Clerk 6/1, 6/8, 6/15, 6/22/25 NPEN-3926372# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

**GOVERNMENT** 

PUBLIC HEARING
PUBLIC HEARING: FISCAL
YEAR 2025/26 ANNUAL
BUDGET
TREASURE ISLAND
MOBILITY MANAGEMENT
AGENCY
Tuesday, June 24, 2025;
9:30 AM
The following series is because

The following notice is hereby given: The Treasure Island Mobility

Management Agency (TIMMA) Board will hold a (TIIMĀ) Board will fiold a hearing to consider the proposed TIMMA Fiscal Year 2025/26 Budget at its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, June 24, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. The meeting will be held at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 250, San Francisco, California 94102. Members of the public may Members of the public may

Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above or may watch SF Cable Channel 26 or 99 (depending on your provider) or may visit the SFGOVTV website (www. SEGOVTV website (www.sfgovtv.org) to stream the live meeting or watch on demand. The meeting agenda will be posted at sfcta.org/events and will provide instructions for members of the public to provide public comment. The proposed budget is available. The proposed budget is available for public review through the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's website at sfcta. org/events. You may request a hard copy to be mailed to

you by emailing clerk@sfcta.
org or calling our office at 415522-4800.
6/15/25
CNS-3938644#
SAN FRANCISCO
EXAMINER

PUBLIC AUCTION/SALES

LIEN SALE NOTICE

Notice is hereby given pursuant to sections 3071 and 3072 of the Civil Code of the State of California, the undersigned, TEGSCO LLC 2650 BAYSHORE BLVD

DALY CITY CA 94014, will sell at public sale on: JUNE 25, 2025 10:00AM, the following 2023 10.10Am, interiolowing property:
2016 TOY COR LIC#
8KWH203 CA VIN#
5YFBURHE5GP453418
2010 TOY CAM LIC#
6KAY500 CA VIN#
4T1BF3EK1AU067974
2010 INFIN EX35 LIC#
8DCU336 CA VIN#
JN1AJ0HR6AM752769
2010 ACURA TL LIC#
6PTC252 CA VIN#

8DCU336 CA VIN#
JN1AJ0HR6AM752769
2010 ACURA TL LIC#
6PTC252 CA VIN#
19UUA8F51AA012056
2015 CHEV IMPLA
LIC# CG05J47 CA VIN#
2G1WB5E36F1162614
2005 HOND ELMNT
LIC# 5MTN492 CA VIN#
5J6YH27665L006337
2016 KIA RIO LIC#
9HUD204 CA VIN#
5HYD204 CA VIN#
5HYD205 CA VIN#
5HYD204 CA VIN#
5HYD204 CA VIN#
5HYD204 CA VIN#
5HYD205 CA VIN#
5HYD205 CA VIN#
5HYD205 CA VIN#
5HYD201 CA VIN#
5HYD201 CA VIN#
4T1BD1FKXCU044379
2011 HOND ACC LIC# NONE
VIN# 1HGC5IB74BA009757
6/15/25

6/15/25 NPEN-3937963# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

LIEN SALE NOTICE Notice is hereby pursuant to sections and 3072 of the Civil Code of the State of California, the undersigned, TEGSCO LLC 2650 BAYSHORE BLVD DALY CITY CA 94014, will sell at public sale on: JUNE 25, 2025 10:00AM, the following

2025 10:00AM, the following property: 2014 KIA OPT LIC# NONE VIN# 5XXGM4A79EG316539 2022 HOND HR-V LIC# 9MYR847 CA VIN# 3CZRU5H70NM718866 2017 MAZD 6 LIC# 8ACM222 CA VIN# JM 1GL 1X 57 H 11 13 5 4 4 2017 VW JETTA LIC# 7ZMX043 CA VIN# 3VWL17AJ7HM394466 2023 HOND CIV LIC# 9DQ7682 CA VIN# 2H GFE 2F 50 P H 50 18 89 2018 NISS VRSA LIC# 8DHY677 CA VIN# 3N 1C N 7AP 1J K 44 25 6 1 2015 TOY COR LIC# 8DHY677 CA VIN# 3N 1C N 7AP 1J K 44 25 6 1 2015 TOY COR LIC# 8KOJ255 CA VIN# 5Y F BU R HE OF P 3 3 3 8 4 7 2008 MBZ C300 LIC# 6DXN442 CA VIN# WD DGF5 4 X 98 R 0 16 9 4 1 2013 FIAT 500 LIC# AVIQ F LVIM# 3CFFARXDT 54 4 5 7 2024 CHEV MALBU LIC# BP 12402 CT VIN# 1G1ZESST2RF189122 6/15/25 NPEN-93937958#

NPEN-3937958# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER LIEN SALE NOTICE

LIEN SALE NOTICE
Notice is hereby given
pursuant to sections 3071
and 3072 of the Civil Code
of the State of California, the
undersigned, TEGSCO LLC
2650 BAYSHORE BLVD
DALY CITY CA 94014, will sell
at nublic sale on: JUNE 25, at public sale on: JUNE 25, 2025 10:00AM, the following property: 2010 JEEP COMNDR LIC# 10H9147 AL VIN# J44RG44GT7AC107194 2014 DODG CHRGR LIC# ESS115 MI VIN# 2C3CDXBG4EH259084 2014 HOND ACC LIC# GMN932 CA VIN# 1HGCR2F5XEA278392 2010 HOND CIV LIC# NONE VIN# 19XFA4F53AE000763 2011 PORS CAYEN LIC# 9BWF479 CA VIN# WP1AA2A20BLA00173 2015 BUICK ENCOR LIC# VV162JBSB1FB219660 2012 VOLVO S60 LIC# W047J0 LIC# VV1622FS1C2053317 2015 DODG DART LIC# SPNR381 CA VIN# LC3CDFBB4FD403065 2015 CHEV TRAX LIC# 7UVK906 CA VIN# 3GNCJTSB4FL231500 2013 BMW 740LI LIC# 7WSW474 CA VIN# WBAYF4C57DD127937 6/15/25 NPEN-3937953# at public sale on: JUNE 25, 2025 10:00AM, the following

NPEN-3937953# EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER

Real Estate & Design **Sundays in The Examiner** If you'd like to advertise, e-mail advertise@sfexaminer.com

# **BOARD of SUPERVISORS**



City Hall
1 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) 554-5227

# **MEMORANDUM**

Date:	June 2, 2025
То:	Planning Department / Commission
From:	Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Appropriations Committee
Subject:	Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 250603 Park Code - Court Reservations
(California ⊠ (California □ (California)	a Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination  a Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.)  Ordinance / Resolution  Ballot Measure  6/4/2025 Joy Navarrete  ent to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)
☐ Gene	ral Plan   Planning Code, Section 101.1   Planning Code, Section 302  ent to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning
	le 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)
(Charter, (Require subdivisi relocatio public he annu	Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53)  If for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; on of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or not public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for busing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; all capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital ment project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)
	Preservation Commission  Landmark (Planning Code, Section 1004.3)  Cultural Districts (Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23)  Mills Act Contract (Government Code, Section 50280)
□ .	Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings (Planning Code, Article 11)

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org.

From: <u>Janine Watson</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 5:44:45 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

As pickleball players, you want to charge \$5 for courts, many of which have no nets, no wind screen, lines we cannot make out as they are a light blue, no bathrooms, no water. So a piece of concrete. With no system for refunding in rain or wet fog that is fair and for charging seniors, children, and taxpayers already contributing to these parks. Vote no until a reasonable system can be applied. We are not against paying if fair.

the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Janine Watson

From: To: Subject: Date: Angelique Maha

ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)

Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts Wednesday, June 18, 2025 5:20:26 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Angelique Mahan

Email Angelmahan@hotmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From: Subject: Date:

Griffin Lee
ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)

Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts Wednesday, June 18, 2025 5:20:29 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Griffin Lee

Email griffin.gregory.lee@gmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From: To: Subject: Date: Sarah B McCourt

ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)

Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts Wednesday, June 18, 2025 5:35:28 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Sarah B McCourt

Email sarah@connectedsf.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From: Date:

ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)

Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts Wednesday, June 18, 2025 5:36:29 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Alex Dworetzky

Email alex.dworetzky@gmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From:

Julie Sonner

ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)

Subject: Date: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:00:35 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Julie Sonnen

Email aoicielo7@gmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

Thank You, Julie Sonnen From: Cecil Wong

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:30:26 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Cecil Wong

Email cec8719@gmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From: Lance Mock

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:45:23 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Lance Mock

Email I\_c mock@hotmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From:

ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; To:

Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:51:20 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Charles Chou

Email topspincc@gmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From: Jeff Gee

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 7:44:25 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Jeff Gee

Email jas1883@sbcglobal.net

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From:

ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; To:

Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 8:06:28 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Susan Wheeler

Email swheeler47@comcast.net

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From: <u>Cassidy Trade</u>

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 10:07:24 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Cassidy Trader

Email cassidygboobear@gmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From: Christina Lim

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 10:08:25 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Christina Lim

Email christinayn@gmail.com

# Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. If the ordinance moves forward, please include:

- Automatic exemption for nonprofits, youth-serving groups, and volunteer-led programs
- A racial and economic equity impact assessment
- A transparent public plan for how revenue will be

used

From: Roberta Economidis

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 7:14:48 AM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Roberta Economidis

Email reconomidis@yahoo.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: Jeff Fond

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 7:23:31 AM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

Email lindajeff2000@yahoo.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition (AGAIN !!!) to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer

dollars.

Please reject the fee..... AGAIN!!!

From: Marie Hurabiel

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 11:22:23 AM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Marie Hurabiell

Email mhurabie@yahoo.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: Stephanie Lehmar

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff
Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Te Date: Thursday, June 19, 2025 2:43:25 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Stephanie Lehman

Email slehman21@yahoo.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee. It's not the public's job to bail out an organization from the negative consequences of their fiscal irresponsibility. We are becoming our own worst enemy as a city.

Thank You,

Stephanie Lehman

From: Christina Pappa

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 2:46:20 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Christina Pappas

Email scoutca66@gmail.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: <u>Teresa Shaw</u>

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 2:53:29 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Teresa Shaw

Email tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: Mark Felix

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:43:28 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Mark Felix

Email mafelix86@yahoo.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: <u>Linda Mathews</u>

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:55:32 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Linda Mathews

Email IInda.mathews@yahoo.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: <u>Judi Hurabie</u>

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis **Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 4:18:21 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Judi Hurabiell

Email jmhurabiell1@gmail.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: Kelly Vinthe

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 4:29:24 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Kelly Vinther

Email kvercellino@sbcglobal.net

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: Ann Iannuccillo

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff
Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis **Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 5:01:26 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Ann Iannuccillo

Email aiannuccillo@hotmail.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee as it is unfair and unwarranted!

From: Keith Kandariar

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff
Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Ter **Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 5:27:23 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Keith Kandarian

Email tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

Please reject the fee.

From: Daphne Alden

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts **Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 11:23:34 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Daphne Alden

Email daphne.alden@me.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to

prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own

fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

From:

ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; To:

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 8:58:31 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Celeste Lee

Email cleebobroff@yahoo.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic

infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own

fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

From: <u>Jennifer Z Yar</u>

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 9:32:44 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Jennifer Z Yan

Email popcorn-kidder.3s@icloud.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic

infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city

departments from the consequences of their own

fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

From: <u>Tom Radulovich</u>

To: Chan, Connie (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS)

Cc: Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Bishop, Lamonte" (REC); Jalipa, Brent (BOS);

Madison.Tam@sfgov.org; Ildiko Polony; Peter Belden; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA); Eaken, Amanda (MTA)

Subject: Livable City supports Recreation and Parks" budget and revenue proposals, and R&P support community

stewardship

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 10:11:06 AM

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

#### Dear Supervisors,

As the City budget shrinks, it's crucial to preserve essential services for San Franciscans. Access to green spaces for active recreation, socializing, and quiet enjoyment of nature is essential for our physical and mental health. Public parks allow us to exercise our bodies, relax and reduce stress, and connect with people. Research shows we are biophilic by nature, and being around trees and plants is essential to human well-being.

We have reviewed the Recreation and Parks budget proposals, and are impressed by how the department has sought to preserve essential services consistent with San Francisco's equity, health, and environmental goals.

We are municipalists, and believe that City government should play a robust role in providing the public infrastructure and services essential for human and biospheric well-being. However it is important to distinguish between public goods, which should be provided to equitably and at high quality free of charge, and services which ought to be publicly provided on a fee-for-service or cost-recovery basis. The latter include services which have high costs, generate negative externalities, make large demands on limited resources. Everyone should be able to access green and well-maintained parks and open spaces within a short walk of one's home, and enjoy ample opportunities for recreation, connection with nature, and structured and unstructured play. However storing one's private car in a public park is not a public good. Cars are large and space in parks is limited. Cars create health, safety, and environmental liabilities for other users of public space. Charging for parking is both fair and effective. It recovers some of the public cost of providing and maintaining automobile infrastructure, reduces conflicts over limited space, and encourages people to choose sustainable transportation alternatives more often. We have been urging SFMTA, which has chosen to cut essential transit and sustainable mobility while refusing to consider greater cost recovery for private car storage, to follow Recreation and Parks's equitable and sustainable approach. Greater cost-recovery for golf courses is also fair - golf courses require enormous amounts of public space, water, chemicals, and maintenance and serve relatively few users.

San Francisco's park system is excellent – something we should all be proud of, and a model for how we should deliver other public services. It is made possible by the diligence of Recreation and Parks staff, and R&P staffing should not be cut. Thousands of San Franciscans contribute their time and their money to caring for and improving parks and natural areas. Stewardship of public places is good for us individually - it gets us outdoors moving our bodies. It builds community. It is good for the city as a whole, including the native plants and animals we share this place with. Community stewardship of public places is far more effective with city support, including staff support (gardeners, natural resource specialists, and the community garden program, etc), design, planning, and administrative support from professional staff, and grants which can be matched with donations, philanthropy, and volunteer labor and expertise. Community stewardship has taken a hit in the last year from corruption in the Community Challenge Grant program and the collapse of San Francisco Parks Alliance. It's essential that the City continue supporting community stewardship through its programs, Recreation and Parks' partnership division, and making grants available to community groups with minimal rigamarole. Even though budget times are tough, the City should do more, not less, to support community stewardship, understanding that it's an investment rather than an expense.

The R&P budget proposal is equitable and sustainable, maintains essential services for San Franciscans, and preserves the jobs of hard-working and effective public employees. It deserves your full support.

Sincerely,

Tom Radulovich Livable City From: Jane Gaito

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 11:51:33 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Jane Gaito

Email janeibrahimgaito@gmail.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own

fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

From: <u>Sonya Dreizler</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)

Cc: ChenStaff

**Subject:** Budget Public Comment

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 3:06:57 PM

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

Hello Budget Committee, and CCing Supervisor Chen (my supervisor),

I came to the budget committee meeting today to voice my support for Rec & Park. I arrived at 10am and had to leave before 2pm so did not get to provide comment in person. Below is a copy of my 1 minute of remarks I prepared. Thank you for including them in your consideration.

Kindly, Sonya

My name is Sonya Dreizler and I'm here to urge full financial support for Rec & Park programs. I have lived in The City for 23 years and raised a family here for the last 15 of those. When my kids were little we saw lots of families leave for the suburbs because they wanted a backyard, or more community, or they wanted their kids to join a swim team.

Like many other families, my family stayed. And Rec & Park has offered all of those amenities - and more - to our kids.

- The parks offer a **collective backyard** for all city families.
- The programs from art classes to rock climbing, summer camps to sports teams (even a **swim team!**) are amazing for both kids and adults.
- And the sense of **community** though hard to articulate may be the most valuable thing Rec & Park provides. All over the city, my kids see people they know from Rec & Park baseball teams, art camp, swim lessons, or Camp Mather. And the instructors and park staff know and look out for all the kids.

In a busy and increasingly tech focused city, Rec & Park programs and people foster *in real life* community and a deep sense of belonging. Please fully fund these people, programs, and places that make The City a great place to live.

Sonya Dreizler

she/ her sonyadreizler.com

From: <u>Tom Radulovich</u>

To: Sauter, Danny (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)

Cc: Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Madland, Sarah (REC); Bishop, Lamonte" (REC); Jalipa, Brent (BOS);

Madison.Tam@sfgov.org; Ildiko Polony; Peter Belden; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA); Eaken, Amanda (MTA)

Subject: Livable City supports Recreation and Parks" budget and revenue proposals, and R&P support community

stewardship

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 4:00:49 PM

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

#### Dear Supervisors,

As the City budget shrinks, it's crucial to preserve essential services for San Franciscans. Access to green spaces for active recreation, socializing, and quiet enjoyment of nature is essential for our physical and mental health. Public parks allow us to exercise our bodies, relax and reduce stress, and connect with people. Research shows we are biophilic by nature, and being around trees and plants is essential to human well-being.

We have reviewed the Recreation and Parks budget proposals, and are impressed by how the department has sought to preserve essential services consistent with San Francisco's equity, health, and environmental goals.

We are municipalists, and believe that City government should play a robust role in providing the public infrastructure and services essential for human and biospheric well-being. However it is important to distinguish between public goods, which should be provided to equitably and at high quality free of charge, and services which ought to be publicly provided on a fee-for-service or cost-recovery basis. The latter include services which have high costs, generate negative externalities, make large demands on limited resources. Everyone should be able to access green and well-maintained parks and open spaces within a short walk of one's home, and enjoy ample opportunities for recreation, connection with nature, and structured and unstructured play. However storing one's private car in a public park is not a public good. Cars are large and space in parks is limited. Cars create health, safety, and environmental liabilities for other users of public space. Charging for parking is both fair and effective. It recovers some of the public cost of providing and maintaining automobile infrastructure, reduces conflicts over limited space, and encourages people to choose sustainable transportation alternatives more often. We have been urging SFMTA, which has chosen to cut essential transit and sustainable mobility while refusing to consider greater cost recovery for private car storage, to follow Recreation and Parks's equitable and sustainable approach. Greater cost-recovery for golf courses is also fair - golf courses require enormous amounts of public space, water, chemicals, and maintenance and serve relatively few users.

San Francisco's park system is excellent – something we should all be proud of, and a model for how we should deliver other public services. It is made possible by the diligence of Recreation and Parks staff, and R&P staffing should not be cut. Thousands of San Franciscans contribute their time and their money to caring for and improving parks and natural areas. Stewardship of public places is good for us individually - it gets us outdoors moving our bodies. It builds community. It is good for the city as a whole, including the native plants and animals we share this place with. Community stewardship of public places is far more effective with city support, including staff support (gardeners, natural resource specialists, and the community garden program, etc), design, planning, and administrative support from professional staff, and grants which can be matched with donations, philanthropy, and volunteer labor and expertise. Community stewardship has taken a hit in the last year from corruption in the Community Challenge Grant program and the collapse of San Francisco Parks Alliance. It's essential that the City continue supporting community stewardship through its programs, Recreation and Parks' partnership division, and making grants available to community groups with minimal rigamarole. Even though budget times are tough, the City should do more, not less, to support community stewardship, understanding that it's an investment rather than an expense.

The R&P budget proposal is equitable and sustainable, maintains essential services for San Franciscans, and preserves the jobs of hard-working and effective public employees. It deserves your full support.

Sincerely,

Tom Radulovich Livable City From: Nancy Jones

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Tennis Courts But Not Grass Fields, Really Date: Friday, June 27, 2025 4:55:30 PM

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

To Mayor Lurie and the Board of Supervisors:

I hope you are not serious about a plan to charge residents of SF who use tennis/pickleball courts but not charge residents of SF who use the basketball courts or grass fields. I hope you realize that the tennis/pickleball courts require no maintenance. Grass fields used for soccer or baseball or running around require maintenance. Charge for the use of those fields, especially if you are going to charge to use tennis and/or pickleball courts. How did you decide to charge to use tennis/pickleball courts but not charge to use basketball courts or racquetball courts? If the answer is that those facilities do not require reservations, then remove the reservation system for tennis/pickleball courts.

OR charge for any RPD property that has a functional bathroom, e.g., Presidio Wall, Richmond, Parkside.

I heard that fees are being considered so there need not be layoffs. The places that use staff are the places that have facilities. Think about the Arboretum. Beautiful place that requires a lot of maintenance but is free to residents of San Francisco. That's a wonderful gift to residents of San Francisco, but it makes no sense to charge to use a concrete court that requires no maintenance and not charge for the arboretum that requires a tremendous amount of staff time.

Please think about the illogical step you plan to ta
--

Thank you.

Nancy Jones

From: hello nov

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts **Date:** Wednesday, June 25, 2025 12:46:24 PM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent hello now

Email hellonowforyou@gmail.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own

fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

Acquisition Method Mobilization Method

From: <u>frantz glasz</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:02:51 PM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: judith wing

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 11:42:22 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thank you,

Judy Wing
District 2 resident
159 Parker Ave
94118

From: Allison Stratton

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:48:20 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Allison Stratton

From: <u>ken garcia</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:10:18 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Mary DeVries

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 8:54:32 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Mary

Mary DeVries 415.307.6122

From: <u>angie.glielmi</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:54:55 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Angie Glielmi

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mary Kane

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:39:11 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Mary

From: Peter Mueller

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:20:25 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Peter Mueller

Sent from my iPad

From: Mary DeVries

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:51:39 PM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Mary

Mary DeVries 415.307.6122

From: Kelsey

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:30:34 PM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>debbie you</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 4:46:08 PM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Debbie

From: <u>Jennifer Leong</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 3:04:30 PM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Jennifer Leong

From: <u>Helen Vasquez</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 12:15:02 PM

**Attachments:** PastedGraphic-1.tiff

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

### BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Best, Helen Vasquez, RA, NCARB Associate | Project Manager



2325 3rd st. studio 426 san francisco, ca 94107 415.977.0194 x102 matthollis.com

From: Ellen Dai

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff, EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:35:01 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Ellen From: Margie Rogerson

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 9:51:26 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Margie Rogerson (415) 734-7305 cel (415) 921-4389 From: <u>Cyuaka Vu</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 6:13:06 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

Subject:

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Cyuaka

From: Billy Volkmann

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 6:11:06 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Billy Volkmann 1 Locust. SF CA 94118

From: <u>Luisa Riccardi</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:53:14 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>Dave Hollenberg</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:06:15 PM

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

# Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, June 20, 2025, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between maintaining employment and fees (specifically, court fees for tennis and pickleball). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

The presentation by RPD was made after public comment, and there was no opportunity for the public to respond. We are not against all the fees. We are against RPD unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) compared to the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in public comments, an adjustment of just **thirty (30)** cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke on Friday, including golf course employees, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

I continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations] Better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented to the BOS.

Thank you,

Dave Hollenberg
District 7 Resident
david.g.hollenberg@gmail.com | (203) 984-9764

From: <u>Jimmy Lin</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:33:29 PM

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

#### BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Jimmy

From: <u>Jimmy Lin</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:32:46 PM

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

#### BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Jimmy

From: Nancy Jones

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:29:43 PM

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

To Members of the Board of Supervisors

During the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on linking employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

RPD's presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Please take a moment to really consider this request to not charge fees for one type of recreation facility—tennis/pickleball courts.

Thank you. Nancy Jones From: Springer Teich

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:28:09 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Tony Oliver</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 7:45:45 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Mein En Lee

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 6:58:32 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: ANN CAPITAN

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 6:24:52 PM

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

### **BOS Members:**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks & please don't charge us for the use of public courts; it will cost you more to keep track of the small amount of fees you'll collect.

Sincerely,

Ann V. Capitan Native San Franciscan & Tennis Player From: shwang34@mail.ccsf.edu

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:33:01 PM

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

# Hello,

I do not feel it is fair to charge fees for use of the public courts. Technically the courts at GGP are public, and they already charge fees albeit with a nicely maintained facility. Paying for court fees I think would only be anywhere remotely fair IF all of the public courts for reservations are in good condition; some would need to be resurfaced. Having to pay the same amount for older courts and recently resurfaced courts makes no sense, there would be such an enormous discrepancy. Those are my two cents. Growing up as a kid I played on free public courts, it's just normal to me. But I digress. I don't want to be charged any court fees, and would only consider it marginally justifiable if older courts are resurfaced and all maintained to a high standard across the board.

#### ~ Sara

BOS Members In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs. We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented. Thanks,

From: Kim Fleming

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:29:11 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>jennifer Lavins</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:28:00 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Jennifer Lavins 1926 47th Avenue, SF, CA 94116 415-753-1140 From: <u>jennifer Lavins</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:26:30 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Jenn

From: <u>Carlo Wong</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 4:01:33 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Carlo

From: <u>maywcbb@gmail.com</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 3:57:32 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, May Chong

From: Louis Topper

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 3:10:39 PM

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

# BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Louis From: Suzette Safdie

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 2:55:13 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Carlos Casellas g</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:41:15 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Carlos Casellas Garza

From: Stacie Johnson

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:43:10 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Stacie

From: Sophia Luna

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:40:32 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Sophia

Envoyé de mon iPhone

From: Celina Fine

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

 $\underline{\text{MelgarStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{NorseyStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{MahmoodStaff; }} \underline{\text{EngardioStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{SauterStaff; }} \underline{\text{SherrillStaff}}$ 

Cc: sa207332@atsu.edu

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:31:39 AM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

# Thanks,

-Celina Fine PA-S 303-912-4580

Sa207332@atsu.edu or Celinafine@gmail.com

**Central Coast Physician Assistant Program** 

A.T. Still University School of Health Sciences Class of 2023

From: <u>Farah Shirzadi.</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:41:55 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Farah Shirzadi LinkedIn From: Amy Xu

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:37:31 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Marshall Lambertson</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:34:54 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Marshall lambertson

From: <u>Vivienne Chow</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:52:00 AM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Amadeia Rector

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:52:35 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Amadeia Rector

Resident of Potrero Hill

Frequenter of the Jackson Park tennis courts and Potrero Hill Recreation Center tennis courts

From: <u>Thejas Prasad</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:22:14 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Thejas From: Beth Bedel

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:08:31 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Beth From: Stacy Suen

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:06:56 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Best.

Stacy

From: <u>Erica Santos</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:48:34 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Jacob Anderson</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:47:45 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>Lance Zhou</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:45:01 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Lance Zhou

Lance Zhou

Email: lance.j.zhou@gmail.com | Phone: +1 857-210-6925 |

From: Brandon Martinez

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:41:55 PM

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

# **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Brandon Martinez, District 8 citizen From: Andrés Barraza

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:36:03 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Andrés Barraza

From: devin.r.liu@gmail.com

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:15:41 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Devin

From: Akshay Jha

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:52:23 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Akshay Jha From: Raaghavv Devgon

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:46:07 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: Arthur Lai

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:28:21 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>Hazel Sun</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:14:35 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Adriana Angelini

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:12:58 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Jatin Bhatia</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:10:25 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

From: <u>Miranda Chen</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:07:55 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

Subject:

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Vince Wong</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:06:04 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis and pickleball community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Clara Aguiar Benedett</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:22:06 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Clara Aguiar Benedett

claraabenedett@gmail.com

From: Riss D

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:04:55 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Peter Su

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

 $\underline{\text{MelgarStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{NorseyStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{MahmoodStaff; }} \underline{\text{EngardioStaff (BOS); }} \underline{\text{SauterStaff; }} \underline{\text{SherrillStaff}}$ 

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 6:34:55 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks.

Peter Su

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Jina Zhu</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 6:23:58 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Jina From: Sean Lee

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:51:39 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

Subject:

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Sean Lee From: Sophia Mola

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:41:18 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Stephen Chang</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:24:49 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Stephen Chang From: <u>Juliana</u>

Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff To:

(BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); FielderStaff; Engardio, Joel (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); Dorsey,

Matt (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); SherrillStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS)

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:24:13 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Yajun Gao</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:06:01 PM

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

### Hi BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Yajun From: <u>Eva Sinha</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:02:12 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: PC

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 4:38:36 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Patrick Colville 3565 Market St, San Francisco 94131 From: Toby Sachs-Quintana

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie, Daniel

(MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff

(BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:56:04 PM

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

# To the Esteemed Board Of Supervisors

I noticed that in the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). The revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting.

The framing is misleading; these points are not mutually exclusive. The RPD presentation occurred after public comment, with no chance for response. This denied the public a fair opportunity to address or rebut their statements.

As noted in public comment, raising Golden Gate parking meter rates by just 30 cents would replace all lost court fee revenue. This solution would protect jobs and preserve recreational programs. Please reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations] and consider alternatives that support community recreation.

Thanks, Toby From: <u>Elizabeth Silvers</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:42:09 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

All my best, Elizabeth From: Chris Wilson

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:31:10 PM

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

## BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Chris Wilson

From: Flávia Oliveira

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:27:31 PM

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

## BOS Members,

Subject:

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Flávia Oliveira Sent from my iPhone From: Danielle Fang

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:15:03 PM

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

#### Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Danielle Fang From: Benjamin Malone

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:47:21 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Ben

From: Mimi Dang

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:21:45 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Mimi From: <u>harris nash</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:17:53 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

harris nash

From: Kavya Ravikanti

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:21:37 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Kavya From: Anthony Bagnulo

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:19:05 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

-Anthony

From: <u>Vanessa C</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:14:10 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Morgan Scofield

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:05:49 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Morgan From: <u>Julie Calnero</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:36:38 PM

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

## **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Czero100

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:19:30 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Margot

From: Andre Natal

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:18:47 PM

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

### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,
Best,
André Natal
andrenatal.com

Thanks

From: <u>Indra Rucker</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:05:29 PM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Indra Rucker

From: Lindsey Murphy

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:03:57 PM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: judy chow

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:03:26 PM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: Magen Krage

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:01:49 PM

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

#### Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Magen Krage From: <u>Jake Whinnery</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:48:27 AM

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

#### BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Jake From: <u>Danny</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:44:13 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: <u>Matthew Protacio</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:43:33 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Matthew Protacio Protac7@gmail.com From: westleyc30@gmail.com

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:37:10 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Westley Cho

Sent from my iPhone

From: Christine Mai

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:36:53 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael O"Reilly

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:34:19 AM

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

BOS Members In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday,

RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs. We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thank you,

Michael OReilly

From: Christi Warren

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:29:47 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christi Warren Noe Valley From: Christi Warren

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:29:12 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christi Warren Noe Valley From: <u>Victor Levin</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:28:51 AM

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

#### Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just the tennis and pickleball court fees.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance-250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Victor Levin From: <u>Collin Smith</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:23:18 AM

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

#### BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond.

We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting.

As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,
Collin Smith

From: Sharon Wong

To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Lurie, Daniel (MYR); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff

(BOS); Major, Erica (BOS); FielderStaff; Engardio, Joel (BOS); MahmoodStaff; MandelmanStaff (BOS); Dorsey,

Matt (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); SherrillStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS)

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:20:49 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Anna Abrams

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Mallon (BOS); Mallon

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:19:31 AM

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

### Dear Board of Supervisors,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Anna Abrams Inner Sunset From: Bianca Alexis Villegas

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:18:57 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Bianca From: <u>Christian Rhally</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:18:07 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christian

From: <u>Sanuja Das</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:41 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks, Sunny From: Sanjay Prasad

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff</u>; <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff</u>;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:19 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: **Billy Kurniawan** 

Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie, To:

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:03 AM

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

BOS Members In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs. We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented. Thanks,

From: <u>Daniel Dang</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:16:42 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Eric Jackson</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:16:35 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

From: Nakul Chakrapani

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

<u>Daniel (MYR)</u>; <u>MandelmanStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>ChenStaff;</u> <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>; <u>Waltonstaff (BOS)</u>; <u>FielderStaff;</u>

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:11:02 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal ( $\sim$ 5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Nakul

Sent from my iPhone

From: <u>Arianna Aldebot</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:08:34 AM

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

Dear BOS Members.

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Arianna Aldebot, District 11

From: <u>Arjun Rao</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:26:58 AM

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

#### **BOS Members**

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke yesterday, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Arjun Rao

From: Rick Yee

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Recreation and Parks Department Fee Proposal

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 9:30:41 PM

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

### To Whom it May Concern,

I am against RPD's proposal to charge a 'reservation fee' to use public facilities, especially pickleball and tennis courts. I am especially put off by their idea to charge pickleball 4 times as much to use the same court as tennis players. My reasoning: A single tennis court can accommodate 4 pickleball courts. To reserve the tennis court will cost \$5, but using the same court for pickleball will cost \$20. I think this is very unfair.

This fee will have a disproportionate impact on low income residents and seniors. It will discourage people on a fixed income from using facilities for exercise, recreation and social activities.

Thank You for your time,

Ricky Yee

From: Nick Pode

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff
Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Date: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Date: 40.000 Monday, June 23, 2025 8:00:33 AM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Nick Podell

Email nick@podell.com

Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis

Courts

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own

fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

From: Leslie Pode

To: ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 7:59:32 AM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Leslie Podell

Email lusher heckle 0s@icloud.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts** 

Cou

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own

fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

From: <u>Ltw Jones</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Follow-up to Friday's discussion of RPD at the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, agenda items 13-16

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:11:34 PM

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

#### To the Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to request that you vote against RPD's proposal to charge feed for use of public tennis and pickleball courts. The proposed fee is prejudiced against one of many activities managed by RPD.

Charging for only one activity is unfair. Why not charge for use of basketball courts, the polo field, the track at Kezar, the grassy areas used for baseball and soccer (these require a lot of maintenance) and playgrounds?

Consider charging usage fees at facilities that have working bathrooms because a working bathroom requires staff to check for supplies and cleanliness.

Currently RPD provides no maintenance at standalone public tennis and pickleball courts. That is evidenced by users of these courts bringing their own brooms to sweep the courts. A net at the Stern Grove tennis/pickleball courts has been broken for two months despite frequent requests that it be fixed. There are not enough nets for the pickleball courts at Rossi or Buena Vista. Will money raised from court fees be used solely to maintain tennis and pickleball courts, or will the money go into the general fund and be eligible for all RPD services?

Please take the time to consider the inequity of RPD's request.

I urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations] because better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thank you.

From: <u>Ted Wint</u>

To: Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie,

Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff;

MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation

**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:10:55 PM

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 Marina and I'm writing to oppose the proposed fees on public tennis and pickleball courts.

Public courts provide affordable, accessible recreation and should not be the source of balancing the budget. I respectfully request that you vote against these fees at the upcoming meeting this Wednesday.

Thank you for your time and for keeping these public spaces free and open to everyone.

Sincerely,

Ted Wint



#### **Ted Wint**

hello@tedwint.com

510.493.1767 | tedwint.com

Sent via Superhuman iOS

From: **Danny Talavera** 

To:

Major, Erica (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); FielderStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; SherrillStaff

Subject: Please Keep Tennis Reservations Free for All Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:27:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I grew playing tennis with my dad and two brothers in the city. I would never had had such an opportunity if there were financial barriers to accessing the courts.

Please reject this proposed barrier to our public spaces and vote no on court reservation fees.

Thank you,

Danny

From:

ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; To:

MelgarStaff (BOS); SauterStaff; MahmoodStaff

Subject: Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts

Date: Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:26:29 AM

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

# Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Maurice Rivers

Email jumpstreet1983@gmail.com

**Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis** 

**Courts** 

Message: Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department

and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic

infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own

fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

Respectfully, Maurice Rivers

**OMI Cultural Participation Project** 

From: Celina

To: Major, Erica (BOS)
Subject: Tennis rec fee,

**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 2:27:27 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Celina Fine & I live in SF in district 5.

I wanted to communicate my high love for tennis & the court fee possibility,

I am one of 2k members of The Mission Athletic club, a volunteer led tennis club based in Mission SF. We have existed for >3yrs and are a club that focuses on community n& tennis.

Without tennis my mental health would be at risk, I am a primary care provider and being 1yr outside grad school & 1yr into living in SF my mental health, wellbeing and work success is due to this tennis club.

My dad also just passed about a month ago & this club has stepped up and been supportive -moving my body through exercise has also helped increase my guilt path when negative neurotransmitters would have otherwise taken over.

In addition the courts are free: this means the foster kids mentioned today to the elderly trying to stay fit to the common SF population use this as a free resource that provides a vital impact on health.

As a medical primary care provider I understand and preach the importance of exercise, community and happiness as a core role in health longevity. Exercise is highly impactful in preventing cardiac risks - as my dad just passed from a cardiac event I understand this importance.

Some research for you from the New England Journal of Medicine,

- exercise, laughing with friends increases positive neurotransmitters: dopamine, serotonin which contribute to improved mood, resilience and neuroprotection and also decrease cardiac risk and prevent dementia.
- regular exercise is associated with 20-30% decrease in risk of heart attacks
- regular positive social interactions and laughing is associated with 45% decrease in coronary heart disease in individuals.
- Improved mental health through positive social engagement and enhanced positive neurotransmitters lowered mortality causes of death by 19-31%.

Please consider my plea to vote no against the tennis court & park rec fees.

Thank you, Celina Fine PA-C Primary Care district 5

# OFFICE OF THE MAYOR SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE MAYOR

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director

Date: May 30, 2025

Re: Mayor's FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27 Budget Submission

RECEIVED AK
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 HAY 30 PNO4:19

#### Madam Clerk,

In accordance with City and County of San Francisco Charter, Article IX, Section 9.100, the Mayor's Office hereby submits the Mayor's proposed budget by May 30<sup>th</sup>, corresponding legislation, and related materials for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-26 and FY 2026-27.

In addition to the Mayor's Proposed FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27 Budget Book, the following items are included in the Mayor's submission:

- Proposed *Interim* Budget and Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO)
- Proposed *Interim* Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO)
- Proposed Budget and Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO)
- Proposed Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO)
- Administrative Provisions for both, but separate documents of the AAO and ASO, in tracked changes, and on pleading paper
- Proposed Budget for the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
- A Transfer of Function letter detailing the transfer of positions from one City department to another
- An Interim Exception letter to the ASO
- PUC Capital Amendment and Debt Authorization
- Prop J Certification Letters
- A letter addressing funding levels for consumer price index increases for nonprofit corporations or public entities for the coming two fiscal years
- 40 pieces of trailing legislation
- Memo to the Board President requesting for 30-day rule waivers on ordinances

Please note the following:

• Technical adjustments to the June 1 budget are being prepared, but are not submitted with this set

Sincerely,

Sophia Kittler

Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors Budget & Legislative Analyst's Office

Controller

No	DEPT	Item	Description	Type of Legislation	File #
1	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to modify the fees for the use of City Hall	Ordinance	250591
2	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to transfer responsibilities for oversight of the collection of sexual orientation and gender identity data from the City Administrator to the Human Rights Commission and removing obsolete reporting requirements	RECEIVED AK D OF SUPERVISO AN FRANCISCO Ordinance AD4:1	250502
3	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to clarify the status of the Treasure Island Development Authority ("TIDA") as a City department	Ordinance	250594
4	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Convention Facilities Management	Resolution	250615
5	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Security Services for RED Buildings	Resolution	250615
6	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Custodial Services for RED Buildings	Resolution	250615
7	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Security Guard Service at Central Shops	Resolution	250615
8	BOS	Continuing Prop J	Budget and Legislative Analyst Services	Resolution	250615
9	CON	Access Line Tax	Resolution concurring with the Controller's establishment of the Consumer Price Index for 2025, and adjusting the Access Line Tax by the same rate.	Resolution	250612
10	CON	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to eliminate the Budget Savings Incentive Fund	Ordinance	250595
11	CON	Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax	Adopting the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean- up Fund Tax designation ceiling for tax year 2025	Ordinance	250596
12	DBI	DBI Fee Changes	Amending the Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes to adjust fees charged by the Department of Building Inspection and to establish Subfunds within the Building Inspection Fund; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Ordinance	250592
13	DEC	Early Care and Education	Modifying the baseline funding requirements for early care and	Ordinance	250597

		Commercial Rents Tax Baseline	education programs in Fiscal Years (FYs) 2025-2026 and 2026- 2027, to enable the City to use the interest earned from the Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax for those baseline programs		cont'd 250597
14	DPH	State Recurring Grants FY25-36	Authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of Recurring State grant funds by the San Francisco Department of Public Health for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2026	Resolution	250618
15	DPH	CCE Expansion Grant	Grant Agreement - California Department of Social Services - Community Care Expansion Program - Anticipated Revenue to the City \$9,895,834	Resolution	250619
16	DPH	Code Amendment	Various Codes - Environmental Health Permit, Fee, and Penalties Revisions	Ordinance	250606
17	DPH	HHIP Grant	Delegation of 9.118 Authority - Accept and Expend Grant - San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Housing and Homelessness Incentive Program ("HHIP") Expanding San Francisco Department of Public Health Recuperative Care Community Supports - \$2,489,698.63	Resolution	250620
18	DPH	IPP Grant	Delegation of 9.118 Authority - Accept and Expend Grant - San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Incentive Payment Program ("IPP") San Francisco Department of Public Health Epic Enhancement Implementation Project - \$6,000,000	Resolution	250621
19	DPH	Patient Revenues	Amending the Health Code to set patient rates for services provided by the Department of Public Health (DPH), for Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027; and authorizing DPH to waive or reduce fees to meet the needs of low-income patients through its	Resolution Ordinance	250607

			provision of charity care and other discounted payment programs		cont'd 250607
20	DPH	Continuing Prop J	Healthcare Security at Primary Care Clinics	Resolution	250615
21	DPW	DPW Fee Changes	Public Works, Subdivision Codes - Fee Modification and Waiver	Ordinance	250608
22	DPW	Continuing Prop J	Yard Operations and Street Tree Nursery	Resolution	250615
23	HOM	Continuing Prop J	Security Services	Resolution	250615
24	НОМ	Continuing Prop J	Homelessness and Supportive Housing security services	Resolution	250615
25	НОМ	Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund	Approving the FYs 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 Expenditure Plan for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund	Resolution	250613
26	НОМ	Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax	Funding Reallocation - Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax - Services to Address Homelessness - \$88,495,000 Plus Future Revenue Through FY 2027-28	Ordinance	250609
27	LIB	Friends of the Library A&E	Annual Accept & Expend legislation for the SFPL's Friends of the Library Fund	Resolution	250614
28	МОНСО	Continuing Prop J	Treeline Security Inc services for City-owned properties in predevelopment for affordable housing sites	Resolution	250615
29	OCII	OCII Budget Resolution	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget	Resolution	250611
30	OCII	OCII Interim Budget Resolution	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Interim Budget	Resolution	250610
31	PDR	Crankstart Foundation Grant A&E	Accept and Expend Grant - Retroactive - Immigration Defense Unit - Crankstart Foundation - Amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance for FYs 2024-25 and 2025-26 - \$3,400,000	Ordinance	250598
32	POL	Code Amendment	Registration Fees and Fingerprint ID Fund	Ordinance	250599
33	PUC	Fixed Budget Amendment	Continues waiving certain small business first-year permit, license, and business registration fees	Ordinance	250602

34	REC	Bobo Estate A&E	Accept and Expend Bequest - Estate of William Benjamin Bobo - Benches, Park Furnishings and Park Improvements Across San Francisco - \$3,600,000	Resolution	250616
35	REC	Code Amendment	Amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Ordinance	250603
36	REC	Authorizing Paid Parking in Golden Gate Park	Authorizing the Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to set parking rates in Golden Gate Park in accordance with Park Code provisions that authorize SFMTA rate-setting on park property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Resolution	250617
37	REC	Code Amendment	PUC Cost Recovery Fee	Ordinance	250604
38	REC	Code Amendment	Scholarship Recovery Fee	Ordinance	250605
39	REG	Continuing Prop J	Assembly and mailing of vote-by-mail ballot packets	Resolution	250615
40	SHF	Continuing Prop J	Jail Food Service	Resolution	250615

# Office of the Mayor San Francisco



### DANIEL LURIE Mayor

RECEIVED AK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

SAN FRANCISCO 2025 MAY 30 PHO4:19

To: Rafael Mandelman, President of the Board of Supervisors

From: Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director

Date: May 30, 2025

Re: 30-Day Waiver Requests

#### President Mandelman,

The Mayor's Office Respectfully requests 30-day hold waivers for the following pieces of trailing legislation:

- City Administrator's Office:
  - o Administrative Code City Hall Short Term License Fees
  - Administrative Code Transferring Data Collection Oversight Duties from the City
     Administrator to the Human Rights Commission
  - o Administrative Code Treasure Island Development Authority
- Controller's Office:
  - o Resolution Adjusting the Access Line Tax with the Consumer Price Index of 2025
  - o Administrative Code Eliminating Budget Savings Incentive Fund
  - o Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax Designation Ceiling
- Department of Building Inspection:
  - Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes Fee Adjustment and Building Inspection Fund Subfunds
- Department of Early Childhood:
  - Business and Tax Regulations Code Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax Baseline - FY 2025-2026 and 2026-2027
- Department of Public Health:
  - Accept and Expend Grants Recurring State Grant Funds Department of Public Health -FY2025-2026
  - Grant Agreement California Department of Social Services Community Care Expansion Program - Anticipated Revenue to the City \$9,895,834
  - o Various Codes Environmental Health Permit, Fee, and Penalties Revisions
  - Delegation of 9.118 Authority Accept and Expend Grant San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Housing and Homelessness Incentive Program ("HHIP")
     Expanding San Francisco Department of Public Health Recuperative Care Community Supports - \$2,489,698.63
  - Delegation of 9.118 Authority Accept and Expend Grant San Francisco Health
    Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan
    ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") Incentive Payment Program ("IPP") San Francisco
    Department of Public Health Epic Enhancement Implementation Project \$6,000,000
  - o Health Code Patient Rates for Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027
- Department of Public Works:
  - o Public Works, Subdivision Codes Fee Modification and Waiver
- Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing:
  - Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund FYs 2025-2026 and 2026-2027
     Expenditure Plan

- Funding Reallocation Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Services to Address Homelessness - \$88,495,000 Plus Future Revenue Through FY 2027-28
- Public Library:
  - Accept and Expend Grant Friends of San Francisco Public Library Annual Grant Award - Up to \$1,072,600 of In-Kind Gifts, Services, and Cash Monies - FY2025-2026
- Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure:
  - Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget
  - o Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Interim Budget
- Office of the Public Defender:
  - Accept and Expend Grant Retroactive Immigration Defense Unit Crankstart
     Foundation Amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance for FYs 2024-25 and 2025-26
     \$3,400,000
- Police Department:
  - Administrative Code Vehicle Registration Fees and Police Fingerprint Identification
     Fund
- Public Utilities Commission:
  - De-appropriation San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Capital Projects Budget -\$86,916 - FY2025-2026
  - De-appropriation San Francisco Public Utilities Commission \$12,990,064 FY2025-2026
  - San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue Bond and Other Forms of Indebtedness Issuance Not to Exceed \$1,054,138,857
- Recreation and Parks Department:
  - Accept and Expend Bequest Estate of William Benjamin Bobo Benches, Park Furnishings and Park Improvements Across San Francisco - \$3,600,000
  - o Park Code Court Reservations
  - o Authorizing Paid Parking in Golden Gate Park
  - Park Code Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields
  - o Park Code Recreation Program Fees

Should you have any questions, please email Adam Thongsavat at adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Sophia Kittler Mayor's Budget Director

# President, District 8 BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

Tel. No. 554-6968 Fax No. 554-5163 TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

## RAFAEL MANDELMAN

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION						
Date:						
To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the B	oard of Supervisors					
Madam Clerk, Pursuant to Board Rules, I am hereby:						
Waiving 30-Day Rule (Board Rule No. 3.23)						
File No.						
Title.	(Primary Sponsor)					
Transferring (Board Rule No 3.3)						
File No.	(Deigna gen Caranasa)					
Title.	(Primary Sponsor)					
From:	Committee					
To:	Committee					
Assigning Temporary Committee Appointment (Board Rule No. 3.1)						
Supervisor: R	eplacing Supervisor:					
For:	Meeting					
(Date)	(Committee)					
Start Time: End Time:						
Temporary Assignment: Partial	Full Meeting					
	RUM					
	Rafael Mandelman, President					

Board of Supervisors

## BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 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) 554-5227

## **MEMORANDUM**

	Date:	June 2, 2025					
	To:	Planning Department / Commission					
	From:	Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Appropriations Committee					
	Subject:	Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 250603 Park Code - Court Reservations					
$\boxtimes$	(Californi ⊠	California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination (California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.)  Ordinance / Resolution					
		Ballot Measure					
	(Planning	Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  (Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)  □ General Plan □ Planning Code, Section 101.1 □ Planning Code, Section 302					
		Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning (Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)					
	(Charter, (Requires subdivision relocation public he annu	General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments (Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53) (Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)					

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org.

# Office of the Mayor san Francisco



### DANIEL LURIE Mayor

To:

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From:

Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director

Date:

May 30, 2025

Re:

Park Code - Court Reservations

RECEIVED AK BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BAN FRANCISCO 2025 MAY 30 PN04:36

Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Should you have any questions, please email Adam Thongsavat at adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org.