

File No. 250603

Committee Item No. 14

Board Item No. 16

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Appropriations Committee Date June 25, 2025

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date July 8, 2025

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| • MYR Submission Letter 5/30/2025 | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>MYR Trailing Legislation List</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>MYR 30-Day Waiver Request 5/30/2025</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Presidential Action Memo – 30-Day Waiver 6/5/2025</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>CEQA Determination 6/4/2025</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>10-Day Fee Ad Notice 6/18/2025</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>CEQA Referral 6/3/2025</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>REC Presentation 6/20/2025</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Brent Jalipa Date June 20, 2025

Completed by: Brent Jalipa Date July 2, 2025

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 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
8 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
9 **Deletions to Codes** are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.
10 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
11 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
12 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
13 subsections or parts of tables.

11

12 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

13

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/PICKLEBALL 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
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- (2) Reservations made more than one week in advance:
- (A) Not-for-Profit Organization or Individual: \$20 per hour
- (B) For-Profit Organization: \$40 per hour

(b) The following hourly fees shall be charged for court reservations at the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center ~~upon completion of the renovations described in Board of Supervisors File No. 180464~~, subject to annual adjustment beginning with ~~f~~Fiscal ~~y~~Year 2018-2019 in accordance with Section 12.20:

* * * *

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

By: /s/
MANU PRADHAN
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
Funded Permanent Positions	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 unrelated to the former 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.

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

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

Program categories

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

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
Individual Benefit for <u>Youth, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities</u>	Up to 75%	Youth Swim Lessons: \$5 increase per lesson Youth Karate: \$3.80 increase per lesson
Individual Benefit for <u>Adults</u>	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 Adult
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.
 - 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**
 - 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.



Thank You



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)

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Angela Calvillo', is positioned above the printed name and title.

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

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. 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
EXM-3935408#



* A 0 0 0 0 0 7 1 2 1 7 6 1 *

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

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination
(*California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.*)
 - Ordinance / Resolution
 - Ballot Measure

Not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.
6/4/2025 *Joy Navarrete*
- 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*)
- 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.)
- Historic 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: [Janine Watson](#)
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: [Angelique Mahan](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts
Date: 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

Thank You

From: [Griffin Lee](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts
Date: 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

Thank You

From: [Sarah B McCourt](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts
Date: 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

Thank You

From: [Alex Dworetzky](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts
Date: 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

Thank You

From: [Julie Sonnen](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts
Date: 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](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
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

Thank You

From: [Lance Mock](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
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

Thank You

From: [Charles Chou](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
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

Thank You

From: [Jeff Gee](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
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

Thank You

From: [Susan Wheeler](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
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

Thank You

From: [Cassidy Trader](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
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

Thank You

From: [Christina Lim](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)
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

Thank You

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.

Thank You

From: [Jeff Fong](#)
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

From your constituent Jeff Fong
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!!!

Thank You

From: [Marie Hurabiell](#)
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.

Thank You

From: [Stephanie Lehman](#)
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 2:43:25 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 Pappas](#)
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.

Thank You

From: [Teresa Shaw](#)
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.

Thank You

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.

Thank You

From: [Linda Mathews](#)
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 Linda.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.

Thank You

From: [Judi Hurabiell](#)
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 4:18:21 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.

Thank You

From: [Kelly Vinther](#)
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.

Thank You

From: [Ann Iannuccillo](#)
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 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!

Thank You

From: [Keith Kandarian](#)
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 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.

Thank You

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.

Thank You

From: [Celeste Lee](#)
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 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.

Thank You

From: [Jennifer Z Yan](#)
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.

Thank You

From: [Tom Radulovich](#)
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.

Thank You

From: [Sonya Dreizler](#)
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: [Tom Radulovich](#)
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 take.

Thank you.

Nancy Jones

From: [hello now](#)
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: [frantz glasz](#)
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 (~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 (~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: [ken garcia](#)
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 (~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: [angie.glielmi](#)
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 (~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 (~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 (~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 (~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: [debbie you](#)
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 (~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: [Jennifer Leong](#)
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 (~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: [Helen Vasquez](#)
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 (~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 (~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: [Cyuaka Vu](#)
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 6:13:06 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 (~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 (~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

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Luisa Riccardi](#)
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: [Dave Hollenberg](#)
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 (~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: [Jimmy Lin](#)
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 (~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

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jimmy Lin](#)
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 (~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

Sent from my iPhone

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 (~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 (~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: [Tony Oliver](#)
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 (~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 (~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: [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 (~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, 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 5:29:11 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 (~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: [jennifer Lavins](#)
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 (~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: [jennifer Lavins](#)
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 5:26:30 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 (~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: [Carlo Wong](#)
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 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 (~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: maywcbb@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: 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 (~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

Sent from my iPhone

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](#); [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 (~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: [Carlos Casellas g](#)
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 (~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 (~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

Sent from my iPhone

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 (~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](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [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 (~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: [Farah Shirzadi](#)
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 (~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: [Marshall Lambertson](#)
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 (~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: [Vivienne 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: 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 (~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: [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 (~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
Frequent user of the Jackson Park tennis courts and Potrero Hill Recreation Center tennis courts

From: [Thejas Prasad](#)
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, 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 10:06:56 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 (~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: [Erica Santos](#)
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 (~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: [Jacob Anderson](#)
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: [Lance Zhou](#)
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 9:45:01 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 (~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, 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 9:15:41 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 (~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, 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 8:52:23 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 (~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: [Raaghav 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 (~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: [Hazel Sun](#)
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 8:14:35 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 (~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 (~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: [Jatin Bhatia](#)
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: [Miranda Chen](#)
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 8:07:55 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,

From: [Vince Wong](#)
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 8:06:04 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 (~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: [Clara Aguiar Benedett](#)
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

415 515 3878
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, 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 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 (~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: [Jina Zhu](#)
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 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 (~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](#)
Subject: 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

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, 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 5:41:18 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 (~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: [Stephen Chang](#)
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: [Juliana](#)
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 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 (~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: [Yajun Gao](#)
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: [Eva Sinha](#)
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 (~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 (~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](#); [SherrilStaff](#)
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: [Elizabeth Silvers](#)
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 (~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](#)
Subject: 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,

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,
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 (~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 (~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 (~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: [harris nash](#)
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 2:17:53 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 (~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 (~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: [Vanessa C](#)
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 1:14:10 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 (~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 (~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: [Julie Calnero](#)
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 (~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 (~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

From: [Indra Rucker](#)
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 (~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 (~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 (~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: [Jake Whinnery](#)
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 (~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: [Danny](#)
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: [Matthew Protacio](#)
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 11:43:33 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 (~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 (~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 (~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 O'Reilly

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 (~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 (~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: [Victor Levin](#)
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 (~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: [Collin Smith](#)
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 (~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](#); [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 (~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: [Christian Rhally](#)
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 (~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: [Sanuja Das](#)
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, 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 11:17:19 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.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Billy Kurniawan](#)
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 11:17:03 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 (~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: [Daniel 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 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 (~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: [Eric Jackson](#)
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 (~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, 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 11:11:02 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 (~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: [Arianna Aldebot](#)
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: [Arjun Rao](#)
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 Podell](#)
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 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 Podell](#)
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

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: [Ltw 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: 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 fee 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: [Ted Wint](#)
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: [Maurice Rivers](#)
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: 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



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 MAY 30 PM04:18

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 30th, 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 of materials.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in green ink, appearing to read "SK", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

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	Ordinance	250593
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	HOM	Continuing Prop J	Homelessness and Supportive Housing security services	Resolution	250615
25	HOM	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	HOM	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	MOHCD	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



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

RECEIVED **AK**
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 MAY 30 PM04:19

President Mandelman,


The Mayor's Office Respectfully requests 30-day hold waivers for the following pieces of trailing legislation:

- City Administrator's Office:
 - Administrative Code - City Hall Short Term License Fees
 - Administrative Code - Transferring Data Collection Oversight Duties from the City Administrator to the Human Rights Commission
 - Administrative Code - Treasure Island Development Authority
- Controller's Office:
 - Resolution Adjusting the Access Line Tax with the Consumer Price Index of 2025
 - Administrative Code - Eliminating Budget Savings Incentive Fund
 - 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
 - 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
 - Health Code - Patient Rates for Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027
- Department of Public Works:
 - 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
 - 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
 - Park Code - Court Reservations
 - Authorizing Paid Parking in Golden Gate Park
 - Park Code - Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields
 - 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 Board of Supervisors

Madam Clerk,

Pursuant to Board Rules, I am hereby:

Waiving 30-Day Rule (Board Rule No. 3.23)

File No.

(Primary Sponsor)

Title.

Transferring (Board Rule No 3.3)

File No.

(Primary Sponsor)

Title.

From:

Committee

To:

Committee

Assigning Temporary Committee Appointment (Board Rule No. 3.1)

Supervisor:

Replacing Supervisor:

For:

(Date)

(Committee)

Meeting

Start Time:

End Time:

Temporary Assignment: Partial

Full Meeting

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rafael Mandelman".

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

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination
(*California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.*)
 - Ordinance / Resolution
 - Ballot Measure

- 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*)

- 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.)

- Historic 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.

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
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 MAY 30 PM04:36

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.