

FILE NO. 200472

Petitions and Communications received from April 30, 2020, through May 7, 2020, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on May 12, 2020.

Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information will not be redacted.

From the Health Officer of the Department of Public Health, issuing Directives of the Health Order Nos. 2020-02, 2020-03, 2020-02b, and 2020-03b. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the Office of the Mayor, submitting meeting authorizations. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Public Utilities Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 8B.125, regarding adopting a voluntary green tariff electric rate for Hetch Hetchy Power customers. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From President of the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.105, making the following nomination to the Planning Commission: Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

Deland Chan - term ending July 1, 2022

From the Police Commission, submitting a letter requesting a Commission meeting on May 13, 2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From Senator Dianne Feinstein, regarding proposed legislation on safe sleeping sites. File No. 200453. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From Stephen Martin-Pinto, regarding the appointment of a County Veteran Service Officer. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From Teri DiMarino, regarding pet grooming during the Shelter in Place order. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the Chamber of Commerce, regarding the proposed legislation to suspend Proposition D Enforcement. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the United States Tennis Associate, Northern CA Section, regarding restrictions on playing tennis during the COVID-19 crisis. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From various businesses pursuant to WARN Act, California Labor Code, Section 1401, submitting notice of plant closures and/or mass layoffs. 4 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Barbara Amato, regarding handing out tents to the homeless in San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Magick Altman, regarding the need for Commission meetings for oversight. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Kiely Hosmon, Director of the Youth Commission, regarding the proposed Charter Amendment on requirements for the Commission. File No. 200452. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From the Human Rights Commission, Latino Task Force COVID-19 Committee, regarding Family Relief Fund recommendations. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Michael Petrelis, regarding a fixed time for public comment during the Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Nancy Wuerfel, regarding the Certified Local Government Program (CLG) Annual Report presented at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Paul Simpson, regarding Senate Bill 902 and Senator Scott Wiener. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From GLIDE, regarding the proposed Emergency Ordinance on restroom and hand washing facilities for unsheltered people. File No. 200737. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From UNITE/HERE, Local 2, regarding proposed legislation amending the Planning and Administrative Codes on residential occupancy. File No. 191075. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From concerned citizens, regarding the hearing providing an update on hotel operations. File No. 200410. 4 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From concerned citizens, regarding the homeless in San Francisco. 3 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Eileen Boken, submitting communications for various files. File Nos. 191075, 200372, 200426, and 200427. 4 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, regarding advocates' recommendations for government transparency and accountability amid COVID-19 in San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Steve Ward, regarding the Planning Commission and the Outlands Planning Council. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Planning Department's plan to modify the California Environmental Quality Act's (CEQA) standard environmental requirement process. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Scott Bird, submitting a letter from the San Francisco Area of the League of Revolutionaries for a New America to Governor Gavin Newsom. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond. 9 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed Resolution urging implementation of statewide election reforms for the November Presidential Election while protecting voter access, ensure mass public education on voting, and focus on equity. File No. 200435. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed Emergency on the emergency response in parks. File No. 200453. 5 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed Resolution declaring May 6, 2020, as A. P. Giannini Day on his 150th birthday. File No. 200430. 7 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code on the County Jail No. 4 closure. File No. 200372. 3 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, MD, regarding PG&E closing its power plant in Hunters Point. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee, pursuant to Ordinance No. 45-15, submitting their 2019 Annual Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From Kim Wynn, regarding comments made to a newspaper by a member of the Board of Supervisors. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From Michael Papesh, regarding stolen bikes in San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From the Office of the Mayor, submitting a supplement to the Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency, dated February 25, 2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#)
Subject: FW: Final Directive Nos. 2020-02 and 2020-03 (blanket quarantine and isolation)
Date: Friday, May 1, 2020 5:40:00 PM
Attachments: [2020.05.01 FINAL Directive No. 2020-02 Blanket Quarantine Directive-signed.pdf](#)
[2020.05.01 FINAL Directive No. 2020-03 Blanket Isolation Directive-signed.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached Directives of the Health Order Nos. 2020-02 and 2020-03.

Thank you,

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

From: Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 5:37 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Final Directive Nos. 2020-02 and 2020-03 (blanket quarantine and isolation)

Hi Angela,

Please see the latest Health Order on Quarantine and Isolation attached.

Thanks,
Sneha

Sneha Patil, MPH

Director, Office of Policy and Planning

San Francisco Department of Public Health

sneha.patil@sfdph.org | 415-554-2795



DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-02

**DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING ALL
INDIVIDUALS EXPOSED TO A PERSON DIAGNOSED WITH OR
LIKELY TO HAVE COVID-19 TO SELF-QUARANTINE
(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY QUARANTINE DIRECTIVE)**

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: May 1, 2020

Summary: It is now well established that the virus that causes Coronavirus 2019 Disease (“COVID-19”) is easily transmitted, especially in group settings, and that the disease can be extremely serious. It can require long hospital stays, and in some instances cause long-term health consequences or death. It can impact not only those known to be at high risk but also other people, regardless of age or risk factors. This is a global pandemic causing untold societal, social, and economic harm. The spread of COVID-19 is a substantial danger to the health of the public within the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”). Individuals in close contact with a person diagnosed with or likely to have the virus that causes COVID-19 may themselves easily become infected and may then inadvertently spread it even if they have no symptoms or only have mild symptoms or before they become symptomatic. To help slow COVID-19’s spread, protect vulnerable individuals, and prevent the healthcare system in the City from becoming overwhelmed, it is necessary for the City’s Health Officer to require the self-quarantine of persons exposed to a person diagnosed with or likely to have the COVID-19 virus. Quarantine separates individuals who know that they have been exposed to the COVID-19 virus from others, until it is determined that they are not at risk for spreading the virus. This self-quarantine requirement protects everyone in the City, including people who are high risk for serious illness, such as older adults and people with weakened immune systems.

**UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE
SECTIONS 101040, 101085, 120175, 120215, 120220, AND 120225 THE HEALTH
OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (“HEALTH
OFFICER”) DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:**

- 1. All persons who know that they are a Close Contact of a Person With COVID-19 are required by this Directive to take the actions listed in this Section, unless exempt under Paragraph 7. Generally, this requires a person who knows that they have been in Close Contact with another person who has been diagnosed with or is likely to have the COVID-19 virus to separate from others for up to fourteen (14) days to avoid inadvertently exposing the public to the virus. The required actions are:**
 - a. The person must self-quarantine in that person’s residence or another residence, such as a hotel or motel. The self-quarantine must last until fourteen (14) days have passed from the last date that the person in self-quarantine was in Close Contact with the Person With COVID-19. The person in self-quarantine is required to quarantine for the entirety of the 14-day period because that individual is at high risk for developing the disease and spreading the COVID-19 virus, even if the individual does not have symptoms or has only mild symptoms.**



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-02

- b. The person must carefully review and closely follow all home quarantine guidelines listed in the “Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts” issued by the City’s Department of Public Health, a copy of which is attached to this Directive and which is available online here: <https://www.sfchcp.org/Home-Isolation-Quarantine-Guidelines>. For purposes of this Directive, any future changes provided online to the guidance listed in this subparagraph are automatically incorporated into this Directive by this reference without any need to amend or revise this Directive.

If the person in quarantine becomes sick with onset or worsening of fever, respiratory symptoms such as coughing, difficulty breathing, or shortness of breath, chills, muscle pain, sore throat, new loss of the sense of smell or taste, or other symptoms of COVID-19 (even if their symptoms are very mild), that person should isolate at home or another residence, such as a hotel or motel, away from other people in the household who are not ill, and follow the home isolation guidelines listed in the “Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts” issued by the City’s Department of Public Health. For purposes of this Directive, any future changes provided online to the isolation guidance listed in this subparagraph are automatically incorporated into this Directive by this reference without any need to amend or revise this Directive. Isolation is necessary to protect others from possible infection because once a person in quarantine begins experiencing these symptoms, it is likely they have the COVID-19 virus, and if they do, they can spread the virus to others. The person in self-quarantine who experiences COVID-19 symptoms should also consult their regular healthcare provider via telephone or other remote methods and, in the case of a medical emergency, seek emergency medical care.

2. The intent of this Directive is to ensure that any Close Contact of a Person With COVID-19 avoids contact with others to slow the spread of the COVID-19 virus and mitigate the impact of the virus on members of the public and on the delivery of critical healthcare services to those in need. All provisions of this Directive must be interpreted to effectuate this intent.
3. This Directive is issued based on evidence of increasing occurrence of COVID-19 within the City, the Bay Area, and the United States of America, scientific evidence and best practices regarding the most effective approaches to slow the transmission of communicable diseases generally and COVID-19 specifically, and evidence that the age, condition, and health of a significant portion of the population of the City places it at risk for serious health complications, including death, from COVID-19. The virus can also have a serious impact on other people, regardless of age or other risk factors. Due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 virus in the general public, which is now a pandemic according to the World Health Organization, there is a public health emergency throughout the City. Making the problem worse, some individuals who contract the virus causing COVID-19 have no symptoms or have mild symptoms, which means they may not be aware they carry the virus and can inadvertently transmit it to others. Because even people without symptoms can



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-02

transmit the infection, and because evidence shows the infection is easily spread, gatherings and other interpersonal interactions can result in preventable transmission of the virus.

4. This Directive is also issued in light of the existence, as of May 1, 2020, of 1,523 cases of infection by the COVID-19 virus in the City, including a significant number of cases of community transmission. The Health Officer will continue to assess the quickly evolving situation and may modify or extend this Directive, or issue additional directives, related to COVID-19, as changing circumstances dictate.
5. This Directive is also issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the March 12, 2020 Executive Order (Executive Order N-25-20) issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by Mayor London Breed Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency (as supplemented several times after its issuance), the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as each has been and may be supplemented.
6. If an individual who is subject to this Directive fails to comply with it in willful disregard of public safety, the Health Officer may take additional action(s), which may include issuing an individualized quarantine or isolation order and seeking civil detention at a health facility or other location, as necessary to protect the public's health.
7. Definitions and Exemptions.
 - a. All minor children and individuals with special needs who require specialized care are categorically exempt from this Directive.
 - b. Essential COVID-19 Response Workers are categorically exempt from this Directive. These workers should consult with their employers about the procedures and precautions they should follow if they are a Close Contact of a Person with COVID-19.
 - c. For purposes of this Directive, "Essential COVID-19 Response Workers" means:
 - i. Healthcare workers, including but not limited to physicians, registered nurses, respiratory therapists, and all other ancillary hospital and medical clinic support staff;
 - ii. Laboratory personnel collecting or handling specimens from known or suspected COVID-19 patients;
 - iii. Morgue workers;
 - iv. First responders, including police and sheriff personnel, firefighters, medical examiners, paramedics and Emergency Medical Technicians;
 - v. Law enforcement, including custodial officers in jails and prisons;
 - vi. Emergency management personnel, including emergency dispatchers;
 - vii. Public sanitation workers;
 - viii. 911 and 311 Operations personnel;



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-02

- ix. Individuals who work in long-term care facilities;
 - x. Individuals who work in homeless shelters; and
 - xi. Individuals assigned to work as Disaster Service Workers under California Government Code section 3100 *et seq.*, including volunteers certified by the City Emergency Volunteer Center.
- d. For the purposes of this Directive, a “Close Contact” of a Person With COVID-19 means a person who was identified as a close contact by a health care provider or public health official, or who knowingly had any of the following contact with a Person With COVID-19 within 48 hours before the Person With COVID-19’s symptoms began (or the date of their positive test if the Person With COVID-19 had no symptoms):
- i. Lived in or stayed at the same residence as the Person With COVID-19; OR
 - ii. Was an intimate sexual partner of the Person With COVID-19; OR
 - iii. Stayed within 6 feet of the Person With COVID-19 for 10 minutes or more while the Person With COVID-19 was not wearing a face mask; OR
 - iv. Had direct contact for any amount of time with the body fluids and/or secretions of the Person With COVID-19 (*e.g.*, was coughed or sneezed on, shared utensils with, or was provided care or provided care for them without wearing a mask, gown, and gloves).
- e. For the purposes of this Directive, “Person With COVID-19” means a person who meets any of the following criteria:
- i. The person has a positive lab test for the COVID-19 virus; OR
 - ii. The person has symptoms that are consistent with COVID-19 that are not explained by another preexisting condition within 14 days of knowingly being in Close Contact with another Person With COVID-19; OR
 - iii. The person has been informed by a healthcare provider that the person has or is likely to have COVID-19.

A person is no longer considered a Person With COVID-19 once (a) at least three (3) days (72 hours) have passed since recovery, defined as resolution of fever without use of fever-reducing medications and improvement of respiratory symptoms, AND (b) at least seven (7) days have passed since symptoms first appeared. A person who tested positive for COVID-19 but never had symptoms is no longer considered a Person With COVID-19 seven (7) days after the date of their first positive test.

8. This Directive shall become effective at 11:59 p.m. on May 1, 2020 and will continue to be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer.

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

May 1, 2020



Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts

- 1) If you have a test confirmation or a doctor's diagnosis of COVID-19, you are subject to Health Officer Isolation Directive, which is available at <https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/files/Blanket-Isolation-Directive-05.2020.pdf>
- 2) If you are in a household that has COVID-19 or you have had close contact with a person who has COVID-19, you are subject to Health Officer Quarantine Directive, which is available at <https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/files/Blanket-Quarantine-Directive-05.2020.pdf>
- 3) If you are awaiting test results, follow the Home Isolation Steps (below) until results arrive. If your results are negative, check with your doctor before you stop following the Home Isolation Steps.

Home Isolation Steps

If you have been diagnosed with COVID-19 **or** you are awaiting COVID-19 test results, you must follow these Home Isolation Steps to prevent the spread of disease.

Stay home until you have recovered

- Most people with COVID-19 have mild illness and can recover at home. If you are 60 years or older, pregnant, or have a condition such as heart, lung, or kidney disease, diabetes, high blood pressure, or a weakened immune system, you are at higher risk of getting more seriously ill.
- Do not go to work, school, or public areas.
- Stay home until recovered. Recovery means: your fever is gone for the past 72 hours without the use of fever-reducing medicine like acetaminophen (Tylenol®) **and** your cough or trouble breathing has improved, **and** it's been at least 7 days after your first symptoms. If you had a positive COVID-19 test but never had symptoms, stay home for at least 7 days after the date of your test.

Close Contacts

- People in your home, your sex partners, and people who take care of you or who you take care of, are considered "close contacts." Also considered close contacts are people who you can identify who stayed within 6 feet of you for more than 10 minutes while you were not wearing a facemask, or who had direct contact with your body fluids or secretions while they were not wearing a facemask, gown, and gloves.
- If you have a test confirmation or doctor's diagnosis of COVID-19, then everyone who you had close contact with from 48 hours before your symptoms began until you self-isolated, should follow the Home Quarantine Steps. Please share this document with them. To request help in notifying your Close Contacts without revealing your identity to them, please call 415-554-2830.

What if you can't separate yourself from others?

- Anyone who continues to be in close contact with you will need to begin a new quarantine cycle of 14 full days after the last day that person had close contact with you, or from the date that your isolation ends.

Which groups do not have to self-isolate?

- Minor children and individuals with special needs who require specialized care

Home Quarantine Steps

If you live in a household with **or** had close contact with someone diagnosed with COVID-19 (including contact from 48 hours before that person had any symptoms, until they self-isolated) you must follow these Home Quarantine Steps. It can take up to 14 days to develop symptoms if you become infected with COVID-19. You must stay home and monitor your own health during this time to prevent passing infection to anyone else.

Stay home to see if you develop symptoms

- You must stay in home quarantine for 14 full days after you were last in close contact with the person with COVID-19.
- Close contact with a person with COVID-19 is described in the column to the left.
- If you are unable to avoid close contact with the person with COVID-19, you must stay in quarantine for 14 full days after the day that person completed their self-isolation. This is likely to be at least 21 days total.

What if you develop symptoms?

- COVID-19 symptoms include fever, chills, cough, shortness of breath, sore throat, runny nose, or muscle pain, headache, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, or losing the sense of smell or taste.
- If you develop any of the above symptoms, and they are new symptoms that you don't usually have in daily life, then you may have COVID-19 and you must follow the Home Isolation Steps.
- Monitor your symptoms closely and seek medical advice or medical care if symptoms worsen, especially if you are at a higher risk of serious illness.
- Check with your medical provider or seek COVID-19 diagnostic testing to confirm the diagnosis.

Which groups do not have to quarantine?

- Minor children and individuals with special needs who require specialized care
- Essential COVID-19 Response Workers* (check employer's policy; try to follow Home Quarantine Steps while not at work)

*Essential COVID-19 Response Workers includes healthcare workers, laboratory personnel handling COVID-19 specimens, morgue workers, first responders, law enforcement, sanitation workers, 911 and 311 operators, emergency management personnel, individuals assigned to work as Disaster Service Workers, and individuals who work in long-term care facilities or homeless shelters.



Restrictions and Information that Apply to BOTH Home Isolation and Home Quarantine

- Stay home except to seek medical care. Do not go to work, school, or public areas.
- Do not use public transportation, ride shares or taxis.
- Separate yourself from others in your home, especially people who are at higher risk of serious illness.
- Stay in a specific room and away from other people in your home as much as possible. Use a separate bathroom, if available.
- Do not prepare or serve food to others.
- Do not allow visitors into your home.
- Limit your contact with pets.


If you cannot meet the requirements for Isolation or Quarantine where you currently live, you can contact 3-1-1 to request assistance with housing, food, or other needs.

Prevent the spread:

- Wear a face covering or mask if you are in the same room with others. If you are unable to wear a face covering or mask, others should wear a face covering or mask if they share or enter the room.
- Cover your coughs and sneezes. Cover your mouth and nose with a tissue or sneeze into your sleeve -- not into your hands -- then throw away the tissue into a lined trashcan and immediately wash hands.
- Wash your hands often and thoroughly with soap and water for at least 20 seconds - especially after coughing, sneezing, or blowing your nose, or after going to the bathroom. Alcohol-based hand sanitizer with a minimum content of 60% alcohol can be used instead of soap and water if the hands are not visibly dirty.
- Do not share household items such as dishes, cups, utensils, towels, bedding with other people. After using these items, wash them thoroughly with soap and water. Laundry may be washed in a standard washing machine with warm water and detergent; bleach may be added but is not necessary.
- Clean and disinfect all "high-touch" surfaces every day (including counters, tabletops, doorknobs, faucets, toilets, phones, tv remotes, keys, keyboards), and especially any surfaces that may have body fluids on them. Use household cleaning and disinfectant sprays or wipes, according to the product label instructions. More info: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cleaning-disinfection.html>

Practice home care:

- Rest and drink plenty of fluids. You may take acetaminophen (Tylenol®) to reduce fever and pain.
 - Do not give children younger than age 2 years any medications without first checking with a doctor.
 - Note that medicines do not "cure" COVID-19 and do not stop you from spreading the virus.
- Seek medical care if your symptoms get worse, especially if you are at a higher risk of serious illness.
- **Symptoms that indicate you should seek medical care include:**



- If possible, call ahead before going to your doctor's office or hospital and tell them you are in Isolation for COVID-19 to prepare health care personnel for your arrival and protect others from getting infected.
 - Do not wait in any waiting rooms and do wear a face covering or mask at all times if possible.
 - Do not use public transportation.
 - If you call 911, first notify the dispatch and paramedics that you are under isolation for COVID-19.

Copies of these Guidelines and answers to common questions are available in multiple languages. Visit <http://www.sfgdcp.org/covid19> under **Isolation and Quarantine Directives** or call 3-1-1.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important public health matter.



DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-03

**DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING ALL
INDIVIDUALS DIAGNOSED WITH OR LIKELY TO HAVE COVID-19
TO SELF-ISOLATE**

(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY ISOLATION DIRECTIVE)

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: May 1, 2020

Summary: It is now well established that the virus that causes Coronavirus 2019 Disease (“COVID-19”) is easily transmitted, especially in group settings, and that the disease can be extremely serious. It can require long hospital stays, and in some instances cause long-term health consequences or death. It can impact not only those known to be at high risk but also other people, regardless of age or risk factors. This is a global pandemic causing untold societal, social, and economic harm. The spread of COVID-19 is a substantial danger to the health of the public within the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”). To help slow COVID-19’s spread, protect vulnerable individuals, and prevent the healthcare system in the City from becoming overwhelmed, it is necessary for the City’s Health Officer to require individuals who have been diagnosed with, or are likely to have, the COVID-19 virus to self-isolate. This self-isolation requirement protects everyone in the City, including people who are high risk for serious illness, such as older adults and people with weakened immune systems.

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTIONS 101040, 101085, 120175, 120215, 120220, AND 120225 THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (“HEALTH OFFICER”) DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Any person, other than a minor child or individual with special needs who requires specialized care, who meets any of the following criteria is required by this Directive to self-isolate and take the other actions listed in Section 2:**
 - a. The person has a positive lab test for the COVID-19 virus; OR**
 - b. The person has signs and symptoms that are consistent with COVID-19 that are not explained by another preexisting condition within 14 days of knowingly being in Close Contact with another person who had or was believed to have had COVID-19; OR**
 - c. The person has been informed by a healthcare provider that they are likely to have COVID-19; OR**
 - d. The person has signs and symptoms that are consistent with COVID-19 and is awaiting results of testing for COVID-19.**

- 2. Any person who meets any of the criteria set forth in Section 1 must do all of the following:**



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-03

- a. **The person must immediately self-isolate in that person’s residence or another residence, such as a hotel or motel, until both of the following criteria are met:**
 - i. **At least three (3) days (72 hours) have passed since recovery, defined as the resolution of fever without use of fever-reducing medications and improvement of respiratory symptoms (e.g., cough, shortness of breath), AND**
 - ii. **At least seven (7) days have passed since symptoms first appeared, or if the person never had symptoms, then at least 7 days have passed since the date they had their first positive COVID-19 test.**
 - b. **The person must carefully review and closely follow all home isolation guidelines listed in the “Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts” issued by the City’s Department of Public Health, a copy of which is attached to this Directive and which is available online here: <https://www.sfcdep.org/Home-Isolation-Quarantine-Guidelines>. For purposes of this Directive, any future changes provided online to the guidance listed in this subparagraph are automatically incorporated into this Directive by this reference without any need to amend or revise this Directive.**
 - c. **The person must notify any Close Contact that they need to self-quarantine for fourteen (14) days pursuant to Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02. The person should refer their Close Contacts to Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02 and to the “Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts” issued by the City’s Department of Public Health, a copy of which is attached to this Directive and which is available online here: <https://www.sfcdep.org/Home-Isolation-Quarantine-Guidelines>. This is necessary because Close Contacts of a person who has been diagnosed with or is likely to have the COVID-19 virus have likely themselves been exposed to COVID-19 and, if infected, can easily spread it to others, even if they have only mild symptoms or no symptoms at all.**
3. **The intent of this Directive is to ensure that any person who has been diagnosed with or is likely to have COVID-19 avoids contact with others to slow the spread of the COVID-19 virus and mitigate the impact of the virus on members of the public and on the delivery of critical healthcare services to those in need. All provisions of this Directive must be interpreted to effectuate this intent.**
 4. **This Directive is issued based on evidence of increasing occurrence of COVID-19 within the City, the Bay Area, and the United States of America, scientific evidence and best practices regarding the most effective approaches to slow the transmission of communicable diseases generally and COVID-19 specifically, and evidence that**



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-03

the age, condition, and health of a significant portion of the population of the City places it at risk for serious health complications, including death, from COVID-19. The virus can also have a serious impact on other people, regardless of age or other risk factors. Due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 virus in the general public, which is now a pandemic according to the World Health Organization, there is a public health emergency throughout the City. Making the problem worse, some individuals who contract the virus causing COVID-19 have no symptoms or have mild symptoms, which means they may not be aware they carry the virus and can inadvertently transmit it to others. Because even people without symptoms can transmit the infection, and because evidence shows the infection is easily spread, gatherings and other interpersonal interactions can result in preventable transmission of the virus.

5. This Directive is also issued in light of the existence, as of May 1, 2020, of 1,523 cases of infection by the COVID-19 virus in the City, including a significant number of cases of community transmission and likely further significant increases in transmission. This Directive is necessary to slow the rate of spread, and the Health Officer will continue to assess the quickly evolving situation and may modify or extend this Directive, or issue additional directives, related to COVID-19, as changing circumstances dictate.
6. This Directive is also issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the March 12, 2020 Executive Order (Executive Order N-25-20) issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by Mayor London Breed Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency (as supplemented several times after its issuance), the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as each of them have been and may be supplemented.
7. If an individual who is subject to this Directive fails to comply with it in willful disregard of public safety, the Health Officer may take additional action(s), which may include issuing an individualized isolation order and seeking civil detention at a health facility or other location, as necessary to protect the public's health.
8. Definitions.
 - a. For the purposes of this Directive, a "Close Contact" means a person who:
 - i. Lived in or stayed at the same residence as the person with COVID-19; OR
 - ii. Was an intimate sexual partner of the person with COVID-19; OR



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-03

- iii. Stayed within 6 feet of the person with COVID-19 for 10 minutes or more while the person with COVID-19 was not wearing a face mask;
OR
- iv. Had direct contact for any amount of time with the body fluids and/or secretions of the person with COVID-19 (*e.g.*, was coughed or sneezed on, shared utensils with, or was provided care by or provided care for them without wearing a mask, gown, and gloves)

at any time during the period starting 48 hours before the person with COVID-19's symptoms began (or the date of their positive test if the person with COVID-19 had no symptoms).

- 9. This Directive shall become effective at 11:59 p.m. on May 1, 2020 and will continue to be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Tomás Aragón".

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

May 1, 2020



Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts

- 1) If you have a test confirmation or a doctor's diagnosis of COVID-19, you are subject to Health Officer Isolation Directive, which is available at <https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/files/Blanket-Isolation-Directive-05.2020.pdf>
- 2) If you are in a household that has COVID-19 or you have had close contact with a person who has COVID-19, you are subject to Health Officer Quarantine Directive, which is available at <https://www.sfdph.org/dph/alerts/files/Blanket-Quarantine-Directive-05.2020.pdf>
- 3) If you are awaiting test results, follow the Home Isolation Steps (below) until results arrive. If your results are negative, check with your doctor before you stop following the Home Isolation Steps.

Home Isolation Steps

If you have been diagnosed with COVID-19 **or** you are awaiting COVID-19 test results, you must follow these Home Isolation Steps to prevent the spread of disease.

Stay home until you have recovered

- Most people with COVID-19 have mild illness and can recover at home. If you are 60 years or older, pregnant, or have a condition such as heart, lung, or kidney disease, diabetes, high blood pressure, or a weakened immune system, you are at higher risk of getting more seriously ill.
- Do not go to work, school, or public areas.
- Stay home until recovered. Recovery means: your fever is gone for the past 72 hours without the use of fever-reducing medicine like acetaminophen (Tylenol®) **and** your cough or trouble breathing has improved, **and** it's been at least 7 days after your first symptoms. If you had a positive COVID-19 test but never had symptoms, stay home for at least 7 days after the date of your test.

Close Contacts

- People in your home, your sex partners, and people who take care of you or who you take care of, are considered "close contacts." Also considered close contacts are people who you can identify who stayed within 6 feet of you for more than 10 minutes while you were not wearing a facemask, or who had direct contact with your body fluids or secretions while they were not wearing a facemask, gown, and gloves.
- If you have a test confirmation or doctor's diagnosis of COVID-19, then everyone who you had close contact with from 48 hours before your symptoms began until you self-isolated, should follow the Home Quarantine Steps. Please share this document with them. To request help in notifying your Close Contacts without revealing your identity to them, please call 415-554-2830.

What if you can't separate yourself from others?

- Anyone who continues to be in close contact with you will need to begin a new quarantine cycle of 14 full days after the last day that person had close contact with you, or from the date that your isolation ends.

Which groups do not have to self-isolate?

- Minor children and individuals with special needs who require specialized care

Home Quarantine Steps

If you live in a household with **or** had close contact with someone diagnosed with COVID-19 (including contact from 48 hours before that person had any symptoms, until they self-isolated) you must follow these Home Quarantine Steps. It can take up to 14 days to develop symptoms if you become infected with COVID-19. You must stay home and monitor your own health during this time to prevent passing infection to anyone else.

Stay home to see if you develop symptoms

- You must stay in home quarantine for 14 full days after you were last in close contact with the person with COVID-19.
- Close contact with a person with COVID-19 is described in the column to the left.
- If you are unable to avoid close contact with the person with COVID-19, you must stay in quarantine for 14 full days after the day that person completed their self-isolation. This is likely to be at least 21 days total.

What if you develop symptoms?

- COVID-19 symptoms include fever, chills, cough, shortness of breath, sore throat, runny nose, or muscle pain, headache, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, or losing the sense of smell or taste.
- If you develop any of the above symptoms, and they are new symptoms that you don't usually have in daily life, then you may have COVID-19 and you must follow the Home Isolation Steps.
- Monitor your symptoms closely and seek medical advice or medical care if symptoms worsen, especially if you are at a higher risk of serious illness.
- Check with your medical provider or seek COVID-19 diagnostic testing to confirm the diagnosis.

Which groups do not have to quarantine?

- Minor children and individuals with special needs who require specialized care
- Essential COVID-19 Response Workers* (check employer's policy; try to follow Home Quarantine Steps while not at work)

*Essential COVID-19 Response Workers includes healthcare workers, laboratory personnel handling COVID-19 specimens, morgue workers, first responders, law enforcement, sanitation workers, 911 and 311 operators, emergency management personnel, individuals assigned to work as Disaster Service Workers, and individuals who work in long-term care facilities or homeless shelters.



Restrictions and Information that Apply to BOTH Home Isolation and Home Quarantine

- Stay home except to seek medical care. Do not go to work, school, or public areas.
- Do not use public transportation, ride shares or taxis.
- Separate yourself from others in your home, especially people who are at higher risk of serious illness.
- Stay in a specific room and away from other people in your home as much as possible. Use a separate bathroom, if available.
- Do not prepare or serve food to others.
- Do not allow visitors into your home.
- Limit your contact with pets.

If you cannot meet the requirements for Isolation or Quarantine where you currently live, you can contact 3-1-1 to request assistance with housing, food, or other needs.

Prevent the spread:

- Wear a face covering or mask if you are in the same room with others. If you are unable to wear a face covering or mask, others should wear a face covering or mask if they share or enter the room.
- Cover your coughs and sneezes. Cover your mouth and nose with a tissue or sneeze into your sleeve -- not into your hands -- then throw away the tissue into a lined trashcan and immediately wash hands.
- Wash your hands often and thoroughly with soap and water for at least 20 seconds - especially after coughing, sneezing, or blowing your nose, or after going to the bathroom. Alcohol-based hand sanitizer with a minimum content of 60% alcohol can be used instead of soap and water if the hands are not visibly dirty.
- Do not share household items such as dishes, cups, utensils, towels, bedding with other people. After using these items, wash them thoroughly with soap and water. Laundry may be washed in a standard washing machine with warm water and detergent; bleach may be added but is not necessary.
- Clean and disinfect all "high-touch" surfaces every day (including counters, tabletops, doorknobs, faucets, toilets, phones, tv remotes, keys, keyboards), and especially any surfaces that may have body fluids on them. Use household cleaning and disinfectant sprays or wipes, according to the product label instructions. More info: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cleaning-disinfection.html>

Practice home care:

- Rest and drink plenty of fluids. You may take acetaminophen (Tylenol®) to reduce fever and pain.
 - Do not give children younger than age 2 years any medications without first checking with a doctor.
 - Note that medicines do not "cure" COVID-19 and do not stop you from spreading the virus.
- Seek medical care if your symptoms get worse, especially if you are at a higher risk of serious illness.
- **Symptoms that indicate you should seek medical care include:**



- If possible, call ahead before going to your doctor's office or hospital and tell them you are in Isolation for COVID-19 to prepare health care personnel for your arrival and protect others from getting infected.
 - Do not wait in any waiting rooms and do wear a face covering or mask at all times if possible.
 - Do not use public transportation.
 - If you call 911, first notify the dispatch and paramedics that you are under isolation for COVID-19.

Copies of these Guidelines and answers to common questions are available in multiple languages. Visit <http://www.sfgdcp.org/covid19> under **Isolation and Quarantine Directives** or call 3-1-1.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important public health matter.

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#)
Subject: FW: Update Final Directive Nos. 2020-02 and 2020-03 (blanket quarantine and isolation)
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:14:00 PM
Attachments: [2020.05.04 FINAL Directive No. 2020-02b Blanket Quarantine Directive-signed.pdf](#)
[2020.05.04 FINAL Directive No. 2020-03b Blanket Isolation Directive-signed.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached Directive of the Health Office Nos. 2020-02b and 2020-03b.

Thank you,

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

From: Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:38 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: Update Final Directive Nos. 2020-02 and 2020-03 (blanket quarantine and isolation)

Hi Angela,

Please see attached updated orders on isolation and quarantine. Since I shared these with you on Friday, CDC updated its guidance regarding when someone who is positive for COVID-19 has recovered, by changing the time from seven days to ten days. These updated orders go into effect at 11:59 p.m. tonight.

Thanks,
Sneha

Sneha Patil, MPH

Director, Office of Policy and Planning

San Francisco Department of Public Health

sneha.patil@sfdph.org | 415-554-2795



DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-02b

**DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING ALL
INDIVIDUALS EXPOSED TO A PERSON DIAGNOSED WITH OR
LIKELY TO HAVE COVID-19 TO SELF-QUARANTINE
(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY QUARANTINE DIRECTIVE)**

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: May 4, 2020

Summary: It is now well established that the virus that causes Coronavirus 2019 Disease (“COVID-19”) is easily transmitted, especially in group settings, and that the disease can be extremely serious. It can require long hospital stays, and in some instances cause long-term health consequences or death. It can impact not only those known to be at high risk but also other people, regardless of age or risk factors. This is a global pandemic causing untold societal, social, and economic harm. The spread of COVID-19 is a substantial danger to the health of the public within the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”). Individuals in close contact with a person diagnosed with or likely to have the virus that causes COVID-19 may themselves easily become infected and may then inadvertently spread it even if they have no symptoms or only have mild symptoms or before they become symptomatic. To help slow COVID-19’s spread, protect vulnerable individuals, and prevent the healthcare system in the City from becoming overwhelmed, it is necessary for the City’s Health Officer to require the self-quarantine of persons exposed to a person diagnosed with or likely to have the COVID-19 virus. Quarantine separates individuals who know that they have been exposed to the COVID-19 virus from others, until it is determined that they are not at risk for spreading the virus. This self-quarantine requirement protects everyone in the City, including people who are high risk for serious illness, such as older adults and people with weakened immune systems. This Directive was updated on May 4, 2020, to incorporate new guidance from the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

**UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE
SECTIONS 101040, 101085, 120175, 120215, 120220, AND 120225 THE HEALTH
OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (“HEALTH
OFFICER”) DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:**

- 1. All persons who know that they are a Close Contact of a Person With COVID-19 are required by this Directive to take the actions listed in this Section, unless exempt under Paragraph 7. Generally, this requires a person who knows that they have been in Close Contact with another person who has been diagnosed with or is likely to have the COVID-19 virus to separate from others for up to fourteen (14) days to avoid inadvertently exposing the public to the virus. The required actions are:**
 - a. The person must self-quarantine in that person’s residence or another residence, such as a hotel or motel. The self-quarantine must last until fourteen (14) days have passed from the last date that the person in self-quarantine was in Close Contact with the Person With COVID-19. The person in self-quarantine is required to quarantine for the entirety of the 14-day period because that**



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-02b

individual is at high risk for developing the disease and spreading the COVID-19 virus, even if the individual does not have symptoms or has only mild symptoms.

- b. The person must carefully review and closely follow all home quarantine guidelines listed in the “Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts” issued by the City’s Department of Public Health, a copy of which is attached to this Directive and which is available online here: <https://www.sfchcp.org/Home-Isolation-Quarantine-Guidelines>. For purposes of this Directive, any future changes provided online to the guidance listed in this subparagraph are automatically incorporated into this Directive by this reference without any need to amend or revise this Directive.

If the person in quarantine becomes sick with onset or worsening of fever, respiratory symptoms such as coughing, difficulty breathing, or shortness of breath, chills, muscle pain, sore throat, new loss of the sense of smell or taste, or other symptoms of COVID-19 (even if their symptoms are very mild), that person should isolate at home or another residence, such as a hotel or motel, away from other people in the household who are not ill, and follow the home isolation guidelines listed in the “Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts” issued by the City’s Department of Public Health. For purposes of this Directive, any future changes provided online to the isolation guidance listed in this subparagraph are automatically incorporated into this Directive by this reference without any need to amend or revise this Directive. Isolation is necessary to protect others from possible infection because once a person in quarantine begins experiencing these symptoms, it is likely they have the COVID-19 virus, and if they do, they can spread the virus to others. The person in self-quarantine who experiences COVID-19 symptoms should also consult their regular healthcare provider via telephone or other remote methods and, in the case of a medical emergency, seek emergency medical care.

2. The intent of this Directive is to ensure that any Close Contact of a Person With COVID-19 avoids contact with others to slow the spread of the COVID-19 virus and mitigate the impact of the virus on members of the public and on the delivery of critical healthcare services to those in need. All provisions of this Directive must be interpreted to effectuate this intent.
3. This Directive is issued based on evidence of increasing occurrence of COVID-19 within the City, the Bay Area, and the United States of America, scientific evidence and best practices regarding the most effective approaches to slow the transmission of communicable diseases generally and COVID-19 specifically, and evidence that the age, condition, and health of a significant portion of the population of the City places it at risk for serious health complications, including death, from COVID-19. The virus can also have a serious impact on other people, regardless of age or other risk factors. Due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 virus in the general public, which is now a pandemic according to the World Health Organization, there is a public health emergency throughout the City. Making the problem worse, some individuals who contract the virus causing COVID-19 have no symptoms or have mild symptoms,



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-02b

which means they may not be aware they carry the virus and can inadvertently transmit it to others. Because even people without symptoms can transmit the infection, and because evidence shows the infection is easily spread, gatherings and other interpersonal interactions can result in preventable transmission of the virus.

4. This Directive is also issued in light of the existence, as of May 4, 2020, of 1,624 cases of infection by the COVID-19 virus in the City, including a significant number of cases of community transmission. The Health Officer will continue to assess the quickly evolving situation and may modify or extend this Directive, or issue additional directives, related to COVID-19, as changing circumstances dictate.
5. This Directive is also issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the March 12, 2020 Executive Order (Executive Order N-25-20) issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by Mayor London Breed Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency (as supplemented several times after its issuance), the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as each has been and may be supplemented.
6. If an individual who is subject to this Directive fails to comply with it in willful disregard of public safety, the Health Officer may take additional action(s), which may include issuing an individualized quarantine or isolation order and seeking civil detention at a health facility or other location, as necessary to protect the public's health.
7. Definitions and Exemptions.
 - a. All minor children and individuals with special needs who require specialized care are categorically exempt from this Directive.
 - b. Essential COVID-19 Response Workers are categorically exempt from this Directive. These workers should consult with their employers about the procedures and precautions they should follow if they are a Close Contact of a Person with COVID-19.
 - c. For purposes of this Directive, "Essential COVID-19 Response Workers" means:
 - i. Healthcare workers, including but not limited to physicians, registered nurses, respiratory therapists, and all other ancillary hospital and medical clinic support staff;
 - ii. Laboratory personnel collecting or handling specimens from known or suspected COVID-19 patients;
 - iii. Morgue workers;
 - iv. First responders, including police and sheriff personnel, firefighters, medical examiners, paramedics and Emergency Medical Technicians;
 - v. Law enforcement, including custodial officers in jails and prisons;
 - vi. Emergency management personnel, including emergency dispatchers;
 - vii. Public sanitation workers;
 - viii. 911 and 311 Operations personnel;



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-02b

- ix. Individuals who work in long-term care facilities;
 - x. Individuals who work in homeless shelters; and
 - xi. Individuals assigned to work as Disaster Service Workers under California Government Code section 3100 *et seq.*, including volunteers certified by the City Emergency Volunteer Center.
- d. For the purposes of this Directive, a “Close Contact” of a Person With COVID-19 means a person who was identified as a close contact by a health care provider or public health official, or who knowingly had any of the following contact with a Person With COVID-19 within 48 hours before the Person With COVID-19’s symptoms began (or the date of their positive test if the Person With COVID-19 had no symptoms):
- i. Lived in or stayed at the same residence as the Person With COVID-19; OR
 - ii. Was an intimate sexual partner of the Person With COVID-19; OR
 - iii. Stayed within 6 feet of the Person With COVID-19 for 10 minutes or more while the Person With COVID-19 was not wearing a face mask; OR
 - iv. Had direct contact for any amount of time with the body fluids and/or secretions of the Person With COVID-19 (*e.g.*, was coughed or sneezed on, shared utensils with, or was provided care or provided care for them without wearing a mask, gown, and gloves).
- e. For the purposes of this Directive, “Person With COVID-19” means a person who meets any of the following criteria:
- i. The person has a positive lab test for the COVID-19 virus; OR
 - ii. The person has symptoms that are consistent with COVID-19 that are not explained by another preexisting condition within 14 days of knowingly being in Close Contact with another Person With COVID-19; OR
 - iii. The person has been informed by a healthcare provider that the person has or is likely to have COVID-19.

A person is no longer considered a Person With COVID-19 once (a) at least three (3) days (72 hours) have passed since recovery, defined as resolution of fever without use of fever-reducing medications and improvement of respiratory symptoms, AND (b) at least ten (10) days have passed since symptoms first appeared. A person who tested positive for COVID-19 but never had symptoms is no longer considered a Person With COVID-19 ten (10) days after the date of their first positive test.

8. This Directive shall become effective at 11:59 p.m. on May 4, 2020 and will continue to be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer. Also effective as of 11:59 p.m. on May 4, 2020, this Directive revises and replaces Directive Number 2020-02, issued May 1, 2020.

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

May 4, 2020



DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. 2020-03b

**DIRECTIVE OF THE HEALTH OFFICER
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DIRECTING ALL
INDIVIDUALS DIAGNOSED WITH OR LIKELY TO HAVE COVID-19
TO SELF-ISOLATE**

(PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY ISOLATION DIRECTIVE)

DATE OF DIRECTIVE: May 4, 2020

Summary: It is now well established that the virus that causes Coronavirus 2019 Disease (“COVID-19”) is easily transmitted, especially in group settings, and that the disease can be extremely serious. It can require long hospital stays, and in some instances cause long-term health consequences or death. It can impact not only those known to be at high risk but also other people, regardless of age or risk factors. This is a global pandemic causing untold societal, social, and economic harm. The spread of COVID-19 is a substantial danger to the health of the public within the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”). To help slow COVID-19’s spread, protect vulnerable individuals, and prevent the healthcare system in the City from becoming overwhelmed, it is necessary for the City’s Health Officer to require individuals who have been diagnosed with, or are likely to have, the COVID-19 virus to self-isolate. This self-isolation requirement protects everyone in the City, including people who are high risk for serious illness, such as older adults and people with weakened immune systems. This Directive was updated on May 4, 2020, to incorporate changes to the self-isolation protocol based on new guidance from the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

**UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE
SECTIONS 101040, 101085, 120175, 120215, 120220, AND 120225 THE HEALTH
OFFICER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (“HEALTH
OFFICER”) DIRECTS AS FOLLOWS:**

- 1. Any person, other than a minor child or individual with special needs who requires specialized care, who meets any of the following criteria is required by this Directive to self-isolate and take the other actions listed in Section 2:**
 - a. The person has a positive lab test for the COVID-19 virus; OR**
 - b. The person has signs and symptoms that are consistent with COVID-19 that are not explained by another preexisting condition within 14 days of knowingly being in Close Contact with another person who had or was believed to have had COVID-19; OR**
 - c. The person has been informed by a healthcare provider that they are likely to have COVID-19; OR**
 - d. The person has signs and symptoms that are consistent with COVID-19 and is awaiting results of testing for COVID-19.**



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-03b

- 2. Any person who meets any of the criteria set forth in Section 1 must do all of the following:**
 - a. The person must immediately self-isolate in that person’s residence or another residence, such as a hotel or motel, until both of the following criteria are met:**
 - i. At least three (3) days (72 hours) have passed since recovery, defined as the resolution of fever without use of fever-reducing medications and improvement of respiratory symptoms (e.g., cough, shortness of breath), AND**
 - ii. At least ten (10) days have passed since symptoms first appeared, or if the person never had symptoms, then at least ten (10) days have passed since the date they had their first positive COVID-19 test.**
 - b. The person must carefully review and closely follow all home isolation guidelines listed in the “Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts” issued by the City’s Department of Public Health, a copy of which is attached to this Directive and which is available online here: <https://www.sfdcp.org/Home-Isolation-Quarantine-Guidelines>. For purposes of this Directive, any future changes provided online to the guidance listed in this subparagraph are automatically incorporated into this Directive by this reference without any need to amend or revise this Directive.**
 - c. The person must notify any Close Contact that they need to self-quarantine for fourteen (14) days pursuant to Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02b. The person should refer their Close Contacts to Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02b and to the “Home Isolation and Quarantine Guidelines for People with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) Infection and their Household or Close Contacts” issued by the City’s Department of Public Health, a copy of which is attached to this Directive and which is available online here: <https://www.sfdcp.org/Home-Isolation-Quarantine-Guidelines>. This is necessary because Close Contacts of a person who has been diagnosed with or is likely to have the COVID-19 virus have likely themselves been exposed to COVID-19 and, if infected, can easily spread it to others, even if they have only mild symptoms or no symptoms at all.**
- 3. The intent of this Directive is to ensure that any person who has been diagnosed with or is likely to have COVID-19 avoids contact with others to slow the spread of the COVID-19 virus and mitigate the impact of the virus on members of the public and on the delivery of critical healthcare services to those in need. All provisions of this Directive must be interpreted to effectuate this intent.**



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-03b

- 4. This Directive is issued based on evidence of increasing occurrence of COVID-19 within the City, the Bay Area, and the United States of America, scientific evidence and best practices regarding the most effective approaches to slow the transmission of communicable diseases generally and COVID-19 specifically, and evidence that the age, condition, and health of a significant portion of the population of the City places it at risk for serious health complications, including death, from COVID-19. The virus can also have a serious impact on other people, regardless of age or other risk factors. Due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 virus in the general public, which is now a pandemic according to the World Health Organization, there is a public health emergency throughout the City. Making the problem worse, some individuals who contract the virus causing COVID-19 have no symptoms or have mild symptoms, which means they may not be aware they carry the virus and can inadvertently transmit it to others. Because even people without symptoms can transmit the infection, and because evidence shows the infection is easily spread, gatherings and other interpersonal interactions can result in preventable transmission of the virus.**
- 5. This Directive is also issued in light of the existence, as of May 4, 2020, of 1,624 cases of infection by the COVID-19 virus in the City, including a significant number of cases of community transmission and likely further significant increases in transmission. This Directive is necessary to slow the rate of spread, and the Health Officer will continue to assess the quickly evolving situation and may modify or extend this Directive, or issue additional directives, related to COVID-19, as changing circumstances dictate.**
- 6. This Directive is also issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the March 12, 2020 Executive Order (Executive Order N-25-20) issued by Governor Gavin Newsom, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by Mayor London Breed Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency (as supplemented several times after its issuance), the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as each of them have been and may be supplemented.**
- 7. If an individual who is subject to this Directive fails to comply with it in willful disregard of public safety, the Health Officer may take additional action(s), which may include issuing an individualized isolation order and seeking civil detention at a health facility or other location, as necessary to protect the public's health.**
- 8. Definitions.**

 - a. For the purposes of this Directive, a "Close Contact" means a person who:**



HEALTH OFFICER DIRECTIVE No. 2020-03b

- i. Lived in or stayed at the same residence as the person with COVID-19; OR**
- ii. Was an intimate sexual partner of the person with COVID-19; OR**
- iii. Stayed within 6 feet of the person with COVID-19 for 10 minutes or more while the person with COVID-19 was not wearing a face mask; OR**
- iv. Had direct contact for any amount of time with the body fluids and/or secretions of the person with COVID-19 (e.g., was coughed or sneezed on, shared utensils with, or was provided care by or provided care for them without wearing a mask, gown, and gloves)**

at any time during the period starting 48 hours before the person with COVID-19's symptoms began (or the date of their positive test if the person with COVID-19 had no symptoms).

- 9. This Directive shall become effective at 11:59 p.m. on May 4, 2020 and will continue to be in effect until it is extended, rescinded, superseded, or amended in writing by the Health Officer. Also effective as of 11:59 p.m. on May 4, 2020, this Directive revises and replaces Directive Number 2020-03, issued May 1, 2020.**

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Tomás Aragón".

Tomás J. Aragón, MD, DrPH,
Health Officer of the
City and County of San Francisco

May 4, 2020

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Hickey, Jacqueline \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Commission Authorizations for the week of 5/11/20
Date: Friday, May 8, 2020 9:35:08 AM
Attachments: [05.11.2020 Commission Authorizations.pdf](#)

From: Peacock, Rebecca (MYR) <rebecca.peacock@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 4:54 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Cc: Power, Andres (MYR) <andres.power@sfgov.org>; Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Donovan, Dominica (ECN) <dominica.donovan@sfgov.org>; Dick-Endrizzi, Regina (ECN) <regina.dick-endrizzi@sfgov.org>; Ruiz-Cornejo, Victor (MYR) <victor.ruiz-cornejo@sfgov.org>; Torres, Joaquin (ECN) <joaquin.torres@sfgov.org>; Varner, Christina (RNT) <christina.varner@sfgov.org>; Collins, Robert (RNT) <robert.collins@sfgov.org>; Olivieri, Victor (VAC) <victor.olivieri.vac@sfgov.org>; Ishikata, George (VAC) <george.ishikata.vac@sfgov.org>; Huish, Jay (RET) <jay.huish@sfgov.org>; Armanino, Darlene (RET) <darlene.armanino@sfgov.org>; Austin, Kate (ADM) <kate.austin@sfgov.org>; Beck, Bob (MYR) <bob.beck@sfgov.org>; Hood, Donna (PUC) <DHood@sfgov.org>
Subject: Commission Authorizations for the week of 5/11/20

Dear Clerk Calvillo and Deputy Clerk Somera,

Please see attached the weekly commissions authorization letter. We will keep you informed of any updates.

Rebecca Peacock ([they/she](#))
(415) 554-6982 | Rebecca.Peacock@sfgov.org
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City & County of San Francisco

*** I am working remotely. Please call me at 267-663-8648 with any questions ****



Wednesday 6, 2020

President Norman Yee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear President Yee,

Pursuant to the Twelfth Supplement to the Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency Dated February 25, 2020, as the Mayor's designee, I authorize the following commissions to hold public meetings the week of May 11, 2020:

- Small Business Commission on Monday, May 11, 2020 at 11:00 a.m. to discuss and review recovery and rebuilding recommendations from the small business community. These recommendations may be sent to the Economic Recovery Task Force;
- San Francisco Community Investment Fund on Monday, May 11, 2020 at 3:30 p.m. to consider allocation of New Market Tax Credits to Mission Neighborhood Centers and possible reserve releases for the Community Benefits Agreement status report of the ACT/Strand theatre and the Renoir/Proper Hotel;
- Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board on Tuesday, May 12, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. to consider items related to the payment of rent increases that were effective prior to the recently-enacted temporary rent freeze introduced on April 7, 2020 and enacted on April 24, 2020, general operations of adjudicatory capacity, and essential operations of the department;
- Veterans' Affairs Commission on Tuesday, May 12, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. to address the interim appointment of the County Veterans Service Officer (CVSO) and staffing of the office, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the veteran community;
- Retirement Board on Wednesday, May 13, 2020 at 1:00 p.m. to consider investment recommendations to protect the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System Trust and ensure its fiscal soundness during the volatile financial markets resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. These are legally required fiduciary duties necessary for essential government operations; and
- Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) Board of Directors on Wednesday, May 13, 2020 at 1:30 p.m. to consider items related to the funding of affordable housing, approval of service contracts, and approval of the TIDA FY2020-21 Budget.

The following policy bodies are authorized to continue meetings on an on-going basis:

- Assessment Appeals Boards 1, 2, and 3
- Board of Appeals
- Planning Commission
- Port Commission
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission



These meetings are authorized on the following conditions:

- The meetings must occur by teleconference or other electronic means without providing a physical meeting place, and the Commissions must comply with all rules governing public meetings during the emergency, including allowing public observation and participation;
- If technological issues prevent commission members from discussing business, or prevent or limit the public from giving adequate public comment, such items should be continued later in the meeting, or continued to a meeting on a different date;
- The Commissions may consider other items but must prioritize the urgent action items necessary for public health, safety, and essential government function; and
- The Commissions shall not require the time of staff who are otherwise deployed or participating in the City's response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andres Power".

Andres Power
Policy Director

cc. Members of the Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: 2020 PUC Rates and Charges 5.1.20
Date: Friday, May 1, 2020 7:21:00 PM
Attachments: [2020 PUC Rates and Charges 5.1.20.pdf](#)
[1. Bos Transmittal Letter Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff Rates.pdf](#)
[2. SFPUC Reso 20-0081.pdf](#)
[3. Agenda Item for SFPUC Resolution 20-0081.pdf](#)
[3a. Agenda Item attachment 1 - Statutory Exemption Concurrence.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

The SFPUC has submitted the attached rate change, pursuant to Charter, Section 8B.125. If you wish to hold a hearing on this matter, please let the Clerk know, in writing, by May, 8, 2020.

Thank you,

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

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 1, 2020
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *AOC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)
Adoption a voluntary green tariff electric rate for Hetch Hetchy Power customers

On May 1, 2020, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) submitted the attached resolution adopting a voluntary green tariff electric rate for Hetch Hetchy Power customers., pursuant to Charter, Section 8B.125.

Under San Francisco Charter Section 8B.125, the SFPUC “shall set rates, fees and charges in connection with providing the utility services under its jurisdiction, subject to rejection – within 30 days (May 31, 2020) of submission – by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board fails to act within 30 days, the rates shall become effective without further action.”

If you would like to hold a hearing on this matter, please let me know in writing by 12:00 p.m. on Friday, May 8, 2020. Please note, the hearing timeframe is compressed as the current Board meeting schedule has the May 26, 2020 regularly scheduled Board of Supervisors meeting cancelled for the Memorial Day Holiday.

c: Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney
Sophia Kittler - Mayor’s Legislative Liaison



May 1, 2020

Ms. Angela Calvillo
 Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
 City Hall, Room 244
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
 San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: Notice of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Adoption of Voluntary Green Tariff Electric Rate for Hetch Hetchy Power Customers

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

In accordance with section 8B.125 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, the SFPUC “shall set rates, fees and other charges in connection with providing the utility services under its jurisdiction, subject to rejection – within 30 days of submission – by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors fails to act within 30 days, the rates shall become effective without further action.”

The SFPUC is submitting the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s April 28, 2020, Resolution No. 20-0081 adopting a voluntary green tariff electric rate for Hetch Hetchy Power customers. The anticipated effective date of adopted Voluntary Green Tariff Electric Rate for Hetch Hetchy Power Customers is June 1, 2020.

Please find attached copies of the following documents relating to this rates action by the Commission:

1. Resolution No. 20-0081 – SFPUC Agenda Item Adopting a Voluntary Green Tariff Electric Rate for Hetch Hetchy Power Customers

Should you have any questions, please contact Eric Sandler, SFPUC Chief Financial Officer, at 415-934-5707.

Sincerely,

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.
 General Manager

Attachments: a/s

- London N. Breed**
Mayor
- Ann Moller Caen**
President
- Francesca Vietor**
Vice President
- Anson Moran**
Commissioner
- Sophie Maxwell**
Commissioner
- Tim Paulson**
Commissioner
- Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.**
General Manager



PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

City and County of San Francisco

RESOLUTION NO. 20-0081

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Charter Section 8B.121 grants the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) exclusive charge of all energy supplies and utilities of the City, and the SFPUC is the governing body for the publicly owned electric utility (Power Enterprise); and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Charter Section 8B.125, the Commission sets the rates, fees and other charges in connection with providing utility services under its jurisdiction, subject to rejection – within 30 days of submission – by resolution of the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, Hetch Hetchy Power desires to offer a green tariff option of generation qualifying under California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) in order to meet customer demand, provide competitive utility offerings, and allow customers to maximize the value of credits offered under California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) program; and

WHEREAS, The proposed green tariff set forth in Schedule G attached to this Resolution is intended to maximize the financial value of Hetch Hetchy Power's generation resources in alignment with the Hetch Hetchy Power business strategy, and would do so by segregating Kirkwood Powerhouse's RPS-eligible generation and offering it at a price premium; and

WHEREAS, Using generation from Kirkwood Powerhouse, an existing resource, provides Hetch Hetchy Power with the most cost-effective way to meet its green tariff demand, improves utilization of this resource, and by Hetch Hetchy Power leveraging additional financial value from its existing GHG-free generation resources, better ensures their continued operation; and

WHEREAS, On September 12, 2017, by Resolution No. 17-0199, this Commission authorized the SFPUC to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) to implement a LCFS program through a Pilot Green Renewable Energy Program, with SFMTA as a customer; and

WHEREAS, The new green tariff would replace the existing Pilot Program for SFMTA; and

WHEREAS, The proposed green tariff allows Hetch Hetchy Power to share in the revenues generated by the sale of LCFS credits, which are increased by the use of zero-carbon-intensity electricity such as is provided under this offering; and

WHEREAS, Use of Kirkwood Powerhouse generation is the only Hetch Hetchy Power resource that is already on-line and large enough to meet Hetch Hetchy Power's need for green tariff and LCFS zero-CI energy, allowing San Francisco to immediately assist California in achieving its goal to reduce transportation fuel-related GHG emissions 20% by 2030; and

WHEREAS, This the green tariff's proposed charge is sufficient to cover the market value of the GHG-free generation attributes that Kirkwood generation otherwise would generate, plus administration costs, and the rate is comparable that of other investor-owned utilities and publicly owned utilities; and

WHEREAS, On December 3, 2019, the Rate Fairness Board reviewed the detail of this rate proposal and expressed support of the proposal; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Charter Section 16.112, a Notice of hearing on the proposal to adopt a Hetch Hetchy Green Tariff was published in the official newspaper on April 10, 12, 15, 16, and 17, 2020, and posted on the SFPUC website and at the San Francisco Public Library, for a public hearing on April 28, 2020; and


WHEREAS, On February 4, 2020, the Planning Department determined that this rate action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That this Commission hereby adopts the rates and charges set forth in Exhibit 1: Schedule G Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff attached hereto, to take effect 30 days after April 28, 2020 unless rejected by the Board of Supervisors by resolution, and to remain in effect until amended by the Commission; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That this Commission determines that the Kirkwood Power Plant is the only resource capable of providing a sufficient amount of RPS-eligible energy, in the most cost-effective and quickest manner, to meet Hetch Hetchy Power's green tariff and LCFS program needs; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, That this Commission directs the General Manager to submit these rates and charges to the Board of Supervisors, as required by Charter Section 8B.125.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Public Utilities Commission at its meeting of April 28, 2020.



Secretary, Public Utilities Commission



AGENDA ITEM

Public Utilities Commission

City and County of San Francisco



DEPARTMENT Financial Services AGENDA NO. 14
 MEETING DATE April 28, 2020

Public Hearing: Adopt a Voluntary Green Tariff Electric Rate for Hetch Hetchy Power
Customers: Regular Calendar
Project Manager: Kristina Cordero

| | |
|---|---|
| Summary of Proposed Commission Action: | Public Hearing: Discussion and possible action to adopt a new, optional electric generation tariff for Hetch Hetchy Power customers called a “green tariff” that qualifies as renewable energy generation under California’s Renewable Portfolio Standard regulations. This “green tariff” would be voluntary, requiring customers to opt in, and be made available for a premium charge on top of the customer’s otherwise applicable existing rate. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. |
| Background: | <p>Overview: Hetch Hetchy Power generates, schedules, purchases, sells, transmits and distributes electricity to meet the needs of more than 3,300 retail and wholesale customers or locations. The Power Enterprise’s customers include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal departments, including the City’s fire houses, hospitals, municipal transit system, water and wastewater treatment facilities, San Francisco Airport (SFO), recreational facilities, maritime facilities, public housing, and all City streetlights and traffic signals; • Tenants in City-owned properties, including tenants of the Port and SFO; and • Retail residential, commercial, and industrial customers in locations where the Power Enterprise is the energy provider. <p>Electric utilities commonly offer green tariffs to provide their customers with an option for renewable energy generation. Solar Choice and SuperGreen, offered by PG&E and CleanPowerSF, respectively, are examples of such green energy products.</p> <p>Green Tariff Purpose and Applicability Hetch Hetchy Power, through the SFPUC Power Enterprise, already provides its customers with 100 percent renewable greenhouse gas free electricity, primarily through three power generation facilities: Kirkwood, Holm, and Moccasin. Of these three, only Kirkwood generation qualifies as “renewable” electricity under</p> |

APPROVAL: _____

COMMISSION SECRETARY Donna Hood

California’s Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) regulations. By devoting a portion (up to 200,000 MWh per year as discussed below) of Kirkwood generation to enrollees in this green tariff, Hetch Hetchy Power is offering its customers the opportunity to receive 100 percent renewable energy that meets California’s RPS standards. This offering meets demand from HHP customers for an RPS-eligible electricity option.

This green tariff for RPS-eligible electricity also will allow HHP customers participating in the California Air Resources Board’s Low-Carbon Fuel Standard (“LCFS”) Program to use a “zero-carbon-intensity electric energy pathway” under that program. The LCFS program incentivizes transportation electrification by awarding saleable LCFS Credits to electric-transportation providers. By using zero-carbon-intensity electricity, transportation-provider LCFS credits are increased by approximately 40%. HHP is already providing SFMTA with zero-carbon-intensity electricity. Under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) authorized by the Commission under Resolution No. 17-0199 on September 12, 2017, the Commission and SFMTA agreed to work together to implement the LCFS program. As part of this effort, Hetch Hetchy Power established the Pilot Green Renewable Energy Program for SFMTA; this new green tariff would replace the temporary rate for RPS-eligible generation included in that pilot.

Eligibility

All Hetch Hetchy Power electricity customers are eligible to enroll in this green tariff on a first come, first served basis, subject to the enrollment cap described below. Special rates and conditions apply to accounts that will participate in the LCFS program.

Proposed Green Tariff Rates

Electric rates for this green tariff were developed by Power Enterprise’s Risk Management and Business Analysis team, in consultation with Financial Services staff. The proposal was reviewed by the Electric Rates Steering Committee, an internal working group focused on rate proposals for Hetch Hetchy Power and CleanPowerSF. The proposed green tariff’s charge is sufficient to cover the market value of the Greenhouse Gas (GHG)-free attributes that Kirkwood generation otherwise would generate, plus administration costs. The rate is comparable to other utilities’ green tariff offerings.

As a voluntary tariff, the green tariff rate is a premium charge that will be added to the customer’s otherwise applicable rate schedule. The green tariff rate premium is set forth as a new “Schedule G,” a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1 to this staff report. The premium is as follows:

1. **General:** \$8 per MWh (\$0.008 per kWh) for all energy usage that is not otherwise covered by Section 2, below.
2. **For Schedule M-2 (GUSE) customers, Schedule SS (Shoreside power) customers, and Municipal Enterprise Departments only:** \$0 per MWh (\$0.000 per kWh) for all energy usage that is specified as

participating in the LCSF Program subject to the following revenue sharing requirement:

3.

a. Schedule M-2 (GUSE) customers (General Fund rate):

Customer must share 50% of the revenues from the sale of LCFS credits with Hetch Hetchy Power.

b. Schedule SS (Shoreside power) customers and Municipal Enterprise Departments (that are not paying a GUSE rate):

Customer must share 20% of the revenues from the sale of LCFS credits with Hetch Hetchy Power.

Note: These customer accounts (i.e., Schedule M-2, Schedule SS Schedule, or Municipal Enterprise Departments), if participating in the LCFS Program, are not eligible for this tariff unless they share revenues with Hetch Hetchy Power, as required above.

The sharing of revenues from the sale of LCFS credits between City departments and Hetch Hetchy Power is expected to bring in significantly more revenue than the otherwise applicable premium of \$8 per MWh (\$0.008 per kWh).

For municipal customers that choose to enroll in the green tariff, these charges will result in cost increases to the affected City departments, except in cases where an eligible customer account is participating in the LCFS program. SFPUC staff will notify customers of the availability of this rate upon approval once this tariff is effective.

Hetch Hetchy Power may also offer an equivalent version of the green tariff, through a separate contract, to its wholesale customers if advantageous to do so.

Green Tariff Resources and Enrollment Cap

Hetch Hetchy Power will provide electricity to green tariff customers from the Kirkwood Powerhouse Units 1, 2, and 3 and Hetch Hetchy Power solar facilities. Hetch Hetchy Power may substitute or supplement electricity from other California Energy Commission (CEC)-certified RPS-eligible renewable energy projects. (Electricity sourced under this green tariff will not include electricity generated from biomass, biomethane, geothermal, or municipal solid waste. Electric energy from these sources does not meet CARB's definition of a zero-carbon intensity ("zero-CI") resource under the LCFS program.)

Using generation from Kirkwood Powerhouse, an existing resource, provides Hetch Hetchy Power with the most cost-effective way to meet both green tariff and LCFS demand. First, Kirkwood's RPS-eligible generation is surplus to Hetch Hetchy Power's RPS compliance obligations eliminating the need to acquire additional RPS-resources for the green tariff program. Second, using this generation for the green tariff provides critical revenues for Kirkwood to cover costs needed for its upkeep and for continued future operation of this

GHG-free resource. Third, the incremental revenues from the LCFS and green tariff programs are particularly important given the significant capital needs identified in the SFPUC's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP); these demands on capital would make it difficult for SFPUC to develop alternative renewable generation resources as an alternative to Kirkwood.

Under this proposed rate structure, the green tariff's cumulative enrollment would be limited to 200,000 MWh per year, based on HHP's estimate of enrolled customers' annual electricity use. Customers will be enrolled on a first-come first served basis until and unless the enrollment limit is set.

Kirkwood's generation averages 450,000 MWh per year. This 200,000 MWh cap sizes the green tariff offering to fully utilize potential surplus RPS generation while ensuring Hetch Hetchy Power will meet its requirements under Renewable Portfolio Standard, Assembly Bill 1110 (Greenhouse gases emissions intensity reporting: retail electricity suppliers) and City GHG policies with current year resources (except drought years). Most green tariff enrollees are expected to be existing Hetch Hetchy Power customers, and the need for additional RPS purchases is considered unlikely.

Use of Kirkwood generation is the only Hetch Hetchy Power resource that is already on-line and large enough to meet Hetch Hetchy Power's need for green tariff and LCFS zero-CI energy. Provision of LCFS zero-CI energy to SFMTA and other transportation customers allows San Francisco to immediately assist California in achieving its goal to reduce transportation fuel-related GHG emissions 20% by 2030. Kirkwood meets CARB's requirements that RPS-eligible generation used to serve LCFS load must be within a California balancing authority. While Hetch Hetchy Power continues to develop in-city renewable solar resources, the high cost of these resources, Hetch Hetchy Power budget constraints, and the lack of large sites capable of providing significant amounts of generation all support the use of Kirkwood to meet green tariff and LCFS needs.

Public Hearing Notice

Pursuant to Charter Section 16.112, a Notice of Public Hearing on the Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff was published in the official newspaper April 10, 12, 15, 16, and 17, 2020, and posted on the SFPUC website and at the San Francisco Public Library, for a public hearing on April 28, 2020, with possible Commission action on this date. If approved by the Commission, this Hetch Hetchy Green Tariff will be subject to rejection by the Board of Supervisors (BOS), as provided in Charter section 8B.125, within 30 days following notification to the BOS. If approved and not rejected by the Board of Supervisors, this rate will remain effective until revised.

Rate Fairness Board

The proposed green tariff has been presented to and discussed by the Rate Fairness Board on December 3, 2019, which expressed its support of the proposal.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Rate Adoption Process If approved by the Commission, the green tariff would take effect after 30 days, unless rejected by the Board of Supervisors, as provided in Charter section 8B.125.</p> |
| | |
| <p>Environmental Review</p> | <p>The Bureau of Environmental Management recommended and on February 4, 2020, the Planning Department concurred that this rate action is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 (Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges) related to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges. This statutory exemption and concurrence message are attached. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.</p> |
| | |
| <p>Result of Inaction:</p> | <p>A delay or denial approving this agenda item may adversely impact Hetch Hetchy Power’s ability to provide a competitive green tariff to customers. In addition, denial would impact Hetch Hetchy Power’s ability to maximize the financial value of its generation resources, as well as reducing revenues to City departments participating in the LCFS program.</p> |
| | |
| <p>Budget & Revenues</p> | <p>This green tariff offering is consistent with Hetch Hetchy Power’s business strategy to maximize the financial value of its generation resources.</p> <p>Hetch Hetchy Power’s share of LCFS credit sales under this proposed rate is estimated to be approximately \$6 million in the first year (due to previously accumulated LCFS credits) and approximately \$2 million per year thereafter.</p> <p>Non-LCFS-related customer accounts paying the premium charge of \$8 per MWh could generate an estimated \$1 million additional revenues annually if the 200,000 MWh cap is fully subscribed.</p> |
| | |
| <p>Recommendation:</p> | <p>SFPUC staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached resolution.</p> |
| | |
| <p>Attachments:</p> | <p>Exhibit 1. Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff Exhibit 2. Statutory Exemption and Concurrence Message</p> |

Exhibit 1:

Schedule G: Hetchy Hetchy Power Green Tariff (adopted by Commission Resolution No. 20-XXXXXX on April 28, 2020)

Hetch Hetchy Power (“HHP”), under the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Power Enterprise, already provides its customers with 100 percent renewable greenhouse gas free electricity. Through this Green Tariff, HHP is offering its customers – on a first come, first served basis -- the opportunity to receive 100 percent renewable energy that meets California’s Renewable Portfolio Standards (“RPS”). The combined total of all enrolled customers in this tariff is limited to 200,000 megawatt-hours per year.

This Green Tariff will allow Hetch Hetchy Power customers participating in the California Air Resources Board Low-Carbon Fuel Standard (“LCFS”) Program to be considered as a zero-carbon-intensity electric energy pathway under that program.

OPT-IN ELIGIBILITY: All HHP electricity customers are eligible to enroll in this voluntary Green Tariff on a first-come first served basis, subject to the 200,000 megawatt-hours per year cap. Customers must request to be enrolled, except that SFMTA accounts previously enrolled in the Pilot Green Renewable Energy Program will be automatically enrolled in the Green Tariff on the next billing cycle after the effective date of this tariff.

GREEN TARIFF

- A. Green Tariff rate is a premium charge that will be added to the customer’s otherwise applicable rate schedule. The premium for each rate schedule is as follows:
 - i. General: \$8 per MWh (\$0.008 per kWh) for all energy usage that is not otherwise covered in Section ii, below.
 - ii. Schedule M-2 (GUSE) customers, Schedule SS (Shoreside power) customers, and Municipal Enterprise Departments only: \$0 per MWh (\$0.000 per kWh) for all energy usage that is specified as participating in the LCSF Program subject to the following mandatory revenue sharing requirement:
 1. Schedule M-2 (GUSE) customers: Customer must share 50% of the revenues from the sale of LCFS credit with HHP.
 2. Schedule SS (Shoreside power) customers and Municipal Enterprise Departments (that are not paying a GUSE rate): Customer must share 20% of the revenues from the sale of LCFS credits with HHP.

Johnston, Timothy (CPC)

From: Kern, Chris (CPC)
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2020 5:35 PM
To: Revelli, Lindsay (PUC)
Cc: Johnston, Timothy (CPC)
Subject: RE: SFPUC Statutory Exemption Request - Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff Electric Rate

The Planning Department has determined that the proposed electric rate schedule for Hetch Hetchy Power customers is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 (Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges) related to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges.

This is Planning Department case number 2020-001485ENV.

Chris Kern, Principal Planner
Environmental Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-9037 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: Revelli, Lindsay <LRevelli@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, February 3, 2020 1:32 PM
To: CPC.EPIntake <CPC.EPIntake@sfgov.org>
Cc: Kern, Chris (CPC) <chris.kern@sfgov.org>; Johnston, Timothy (CPC) <timothy.johnston@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFPUC Statutory Exemption Request - Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff Electric Rate

Hello – Thank you for your assistance with this SFPUC request for environmental review. Attached please find the Statutory Exemption Request for the Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff Electric Rate.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Thanks,

Lindsay

Lindsay Lane Revelli
Environmental Project Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Bureau of Environmental Management
525 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102
D 415-554-1823 F 415-934-5750



February 3, 2020

Chris Kern, Principal Planner
Environmental Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: CEQA Statutory Exemption Request
Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff Electric Rate

Dear Chris,

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) proposes to adopt a new electric rate schedule for Hetch Hetchy Power customers. The Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff would provide customers with the option of an electric generation tariff that qualifies as renewable energy generation under California's Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard (RPS) regulations. The Bureau of Environmental Management recommends the proposed adoption of the voluntary green tariff by the Commission is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 (Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges) related to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges.

BACKGROUND

Hetch Hetchy Power (HHP) generates, schedules, purchases, sells, transmits and distributes electricity to meet the needs of more than 3,300 retail and wholesale customers including municipal departments and tenants in City-owned properties. Green tariffs are a common rate offering by electric utilities to provide their customers with an option for renewable energy generation. Solar Choice and SuperGreen, offered by Pacific Gas & Electric and CleanPowerSF, respectively, are examples of such green energy products.

London N. Breed
Mayor

Ann Moller Caen
President

Francesca Vietor
Vice President

Anson Moran
Commissioner

Sophie Maxwell
Commissioner

Tim Paulson
Commissioner

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.
General Manager



HHP through the SFPUC Power Enterprise, already provides its customers with 100 percent renewable greenhouse gas free electricity, primarily through three power generation facilities: Kirkwood, Holm, and Moccasin. Of these three, Kirkwood generation also qualifies as “Power Content Category 1” electricity under California’s RPS regulations. By devoting Kirkwood generation to enrollees in this green tariff, HHP is offering its customers the opportunity to receive 100 percent renewable energy. This offering meets demand from customers for an RPS-compliant electricity option. In addition, by earning a premium for its RPS-eligible Kirkwood generation, HHP can leverage additional financial value from its existing generation resources. This green tariff for RPS-compliant electricity also will allow HHP customers participating in the California Air Resources Board Low-Carbon Fuel Standard Program to be allowed to use a “zero-carbon-intensity electric energy pathway” under that program.

Electric rates for this green tariff were developed by Power Enterprise’s Risk Management and Business Analysis team, in consultation with Financial Services staff. The proposal was reviewed by the Electric Rates Steering Committee, an internal working group focused on rate proposals for HHP and CleanPowerSF. The green tariff’s proposed charge is sufficient to cover the market value of the Green House Gas (GHG) free generation attributes that Kirkwood generation otherwise would generate, plus administration costs. The rate is comparable to other utilities.

The proposed green tariff has been presented to and discussed by the Rate Fairness Board on December 3, 2019, which expressed its support of the proposal.

Adoption of the action is scheduled for hearing before the Commission on February 25, 2020. If approved by the Commission and not rejected by the Board of Supervisors, the proposed HHP Green Tariff would take effect after 30 days, as provided in Charter Section 8B.125.


CEQA COMPLIANCE RECOMMENDATION

Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15273 (Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges) Subsection (a)(1) provides a statutory exemption from CEQA for the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges by public

Chris Kern, Principal Planner
Environmental Planning Division, San Francisco Planning Department
CEQA Exemption Request
Hetch Hetchy Power Green Tariff Electric Rate
February 3, 2020
Page 3

agencies for the purposes of meeting operating expenses. Thank you for your concurrence with this request.

Sincerely,



Irina P. Torrey, AICP, Bureau Manager
Bureau of Environmental Management

Cc: Kristina Cordero, SFPUC Director of Financial Planning
Charles Perl, SFPUC Deputy CFO
Timothy Johnston, SF Planning Department Senior Environmental
Planner
Lindsay Revelli, SFPUC Environmental Project Manager

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Presidential Nomination - Deland Chan
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 5:22:00 PM
Attachments: [Yee - Presidential Memo - Planning Commission Nomination - Deland Chan 5.4.2020.pdf](#)
[Deland Chan - Application - Planning Commission.pdf](#)
[DelandChan Resume 04292020.pdf](#)
[DelandChan Form 700 2019.2020.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached memorandum from the President nominating Deland Chan to the Planning Commission. This nomination will be scheduled before the Rules Committee. The sensitive information provided in the above package will be redacted for the file.

Thank you,

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



NOMINATION MEMO

DATE: May 4, 2020

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: President Norman Yee *NY*

CC: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Board Legislative Aides

SUBJECT: **Planning Commission Nomination – Deland Chan**

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.105, I hereby nominate Deland Chan for Seat 3 to serve on the Planning Commission for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending July 1, 2022.

Deland Chan's address is:

████████████████████
San Francisco, CA ██████████

Attachments:

Application
Resume
Form 700

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Letter to Mayor from Commissioners Dejesus and Hamasaki
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:26:00 PM
Attachments: [200504 Commission Meet letter.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see the attached letter form the San Francisco Police Commissioners Dejesus and Hamasaki.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: SFPD, Commission (POL) <SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 4:53 PM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Letter to Mayor from Commissioners Dejesus and Hamasaki

Honorable Mayor Breed and Members of the Board,

Please see attached letter.

Thank you,

SF Police Commission
1245 Third Street, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158
415-837-7070

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

From: John Hamasaki <john@hamasakilaw.com>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 4:05 PM
To: SFPD, Commission (POL) <SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org>

Cc: Lohaus, Phillip (POL) <phillip.lohaus@sfgov.org>; Tom, Risa (POL) <risa.tom@sfgov.org>; Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Kilshaw, Rachael (POL) <rachael.kilshaw@sfgov.org>; Hamasaki, John (POL) <john.hamasaki@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter to Mayor from Commissioners Dejesus and Hamasaki

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

Please distribute the attached letter to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

Regards,

John


534 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
Tel: [\(415\) 525-4245](tel:(415)525-4245)
Fax: [\(415\) 276-2871](tel:(415)276-2871)
hamasakilaw.com

This email and any attachments is intended exclusively for the use of the addressee, and may contain information which is LEGALLY PRIVILEGED, PROPRIETARY IN NATURE, OR OTHERWISE PROTECTED BY LAW FROM DISCLOSURE. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return email, or by the number listed above, and destroy all copies and delete the email from your inbox and server.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Office of the Mayor
Mayor London N. Breed
City Hall, Room 200
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor London Breed:

We, the undersigned Police Commissioners, are requesting that you grant the Police Commission an exemption from the April 1, 2020 declaration “Eighth Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency Dated February 25, 2020,” in which you extended the March 17, 2020 “Third Supplement,” prohibiting the Police Commission, along with other policy and advisory boards, from meeting, until your office makes a determination that the Commission “has an urgent need to take action to ensure public health, safety, or essential government operations.”

The mission of the San Francisco Police Commission is to set policy for the Police Department and to conduct disciplinary hearings on charges of police misconduct filed by the Chief of Police of the Director of the Department of Police Accountability, impose discipline in such cases as warranted, and hear police officers’ appeals from discipline imposed by the Chief of Police. (Charter §§ 4.102, 4.109)

The Commission’s last meeting was held on February 19, 2020. Since that time, the Police Commission has been prohibited from meeting while the City is in the midst of a public health and public safety crisis. While the Commission has been prohibited from meeting, the following has occurred in our City:

- **Study finds SFPD Patrol Staffing ‘Severely Inadequate’:** Study ordered by Board of Supervisors President Norman Yee found that SFPD’s patrol staffing is severely inadequate. (March 10, 2020)
- **SFPD Officer Arrested on Suspicion of Rape, Domestic Violence:** A 22-year veteran of the Department was arrested on suspicion of rape and Domestic Violence. (April 10, 2020)
- **Off-Duty Officer Involved Shooting:** An off-duty SFPD officer was involved in shooting a car-jacking suspect who was later killed. (April 12, 2020)
- **SFPD Officer Involved Shooting:** A SFPD officer shot and injured a suspect in an aggravated assault. (April 21, 2020)
- **SFPD Officers Responding to Protest Wearing POA Blue Lives Matter masks:** SFPD officers arrived at a protest wearing matching masks with POA insignia and controversial Blue Lives Matter symbol. (May 1, 2020)



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

In addition, there were multiple substantial revisions to Department General Orders (“DGO”) that had been calendared for the Commission prior to the shelter-in-place order. Critically, the Bias Free Policing DGO 5.17 was one of the orders identified by the Department of Justice as needing revisions, especially in light of the history of biased policing issues in San Francisco. (See DOJ Recommendation 25.1) This DGO has gone through a long working group process to reach the draft that has been calendared for the Commission to adopt. Without adoption, our officers are only required to follow the order that the DOJ identified as needing revision.

The following DGO’s were also calendared for March:

1. **Deaf and Hard of Hearing DGO.** This DGO went through a nearly 2 year working group with members of the deaf and hard of hearing community, experts, the Commission, the Department of Police Accountability, and the Department. Every day that this DGO is not in effect places our deaf and hard of hearing residents and visitors in danger. (Previously calendared for March 11, 2020)
2. **Bias Free Policing (DGO 5.17):** Calendared for March 2, 2020.
3. **Investigative Detention Policy (DGO 5.03):** This policy establishes the policies and procedures for police to detain and investigate individuals. (Calendared for March 2020)

Further, the Commission was scheduled to have presentation of what is known as the 96A Report, which details the data on use of force and stop data. This is a critical public safety monitoring presentation based on the history of excessive use of force and inordinate stops of minority individuals by SFPD.

Commissioner John Hamasaki has raised this with Acting President Damali Taylor who stated that because of technical issues, the Commission would not be scheduling any meetings. Commissioner Taylor also relayed that the Mayor’s Office had denied a request to meet on April 15, 2020, and any future meetings, until the technical issues are resolved. However, numerous other commissions have been granted exceptions to meet with the same technical limitations, including:

- **Planning Commission**
- **Disability and Aging Services Commission**
- **Historic Preservation Commission**
- **Recreation and Park Commission’s Capital Committee**
- **Children and Families Commission**
- **Airport Commission.**

In fact, the Planning Commission has been meeting since April 9, 2020. While we support the ability of our fellow commissions to meet, one has to ask: Is approval of a West Elm Formula Retail Store (Planning Commission Agenda, May 7, 2020), more important than the health and safety of our residents and visitors? We think the answer is clearly, no.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

We respect and admire the way the City has come together during the COVID-19 crisis and adapted to the guidance of public health professionals. As our City's law enforcement oversight commission, we believe that our City's public safety requires us to begin meeting on May 13, 2020.

Sincerely,

Petra DeJesus
John Hamasaki
San Francisco Police Commission

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter from Senator Feinstein RE: Proposed Golden Gate Park encampment
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 1:22:00 PM
Attachments: [DF - GGP encampent.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see the attached letter from Senator Dianne Feinstein in regards to potential legislation on Safe Sleeping Sites.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Vaden, Zac (Feinstein) <Zac_Vaden@feinstein.senate.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 4:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lazarus, Jim (Feinstein) <Jim_Lazarus@feinstein.senate.gov>
Subject: Letter from Senator Feinstein RE: Proposed Golden Gate Park encampment

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

To Whom it May Concern:

Please see attached a letter from Senator Dianne Feinstein regarding proposed Safe Sleeping Sites in Golden Gate Park.

Zac Vaden | Field Representative
Office of U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein
San Francisco | 415-393-0712

DIANNE FEINSTEIN
CALIFORNIA



COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY - RANKING MEMBER
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

United States Senate

May 4, 2020

The Honorable Norman Yee
President
Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear President Yee:

I write to express my concern regarding reports that the Board of Supervisors may act to compel the Recreation and Park Department to permit homeless encampments within Golden Gate Park, especially as there are available alternatives.

I certainly believe all city resources need to be on the table to protect the safety of the residents of San Francisco. Providing safe housing options for our homeless population, especially those living in group housing or shelters, has to be a priority.

San Francisco has numerous options to deal with the critical shortage of safe shelter: continuing the Mayor's hotel program, enforcing social distancing and healthy conduct in group housing and shelters, and expanding RV programs and temporary shelters. This could include tents on unused parking lots and closed schoolyards, as well as public facilities such as the Cow Palace and Port property. These locations are available, have utilities, and can be more easily restored to original uses than can Park lands.

We are all aware that our city, state, and country has a homeless crisis that has been intensified by COVID-19. However, encouraging tent encampments on the streets of the Tenderloin or in Golden Gate Park is not a viable solution.

Please be assured that, while I disagree with this proposed use of Golden Gate Park, I will continue my work in Congress to help the City acquire the federal resources necessary to fight the spread of COVID-19.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dianne Feinstein".

Dianne Feinstein
United States Senator

DF/jll

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: APPOINTMENT OF COUNTY VETERAN SERVICE OFFICER
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 1:47:00 PM

From: Martin-Pinto, Stephen (VAC) <stephen.martin-pinto.vac@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 3:22 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: APPOINTMENT OF COUNTY VETERAN SERVICE OFFICER

Board of Supervisors,

My name is Stephen Martin-Pinto, and I'm a 5th generation San Franciscan and a 17 year veteran of the US Marine Corps Reserve. I'm also a member of the Veteran's Affairs Commission.

I am writing to you today because I'm unable to call in due to work conflicts. I strongly urge you to immediately appoint an interim County Veteran Service Officer (CVSO).

This is extremely urgent, as this position has remained vacant for over a year, despite numerous contacts with the city administrator's office notifying them of the absence of an appointed person in this position. The CVSO is an extremely valuable and under-rated resource for veterans, including homeless veterans, to access basic needs such as health care, housing, and job opportunities. Currently the lack of CVSO is a detriment to the over 27000 veterans in San Francisco, including myself and all members of the Veterans Affairs Commission. Currently, staff members in the CVS Office are working extremely long hours with huge caseloads to meet the needs of the veterans currently using the CVS Office. Veterans are experiencing long wait times in excess of 3 hours for services, which far exceeds the wait times for services other veterans have in other CVSOs around the state. We have one of the smallest budgets relative to our population of any municipality in the state. As our veteran population is aging and experiencing the pandemic we are all experiencing, it is more crucial than ever that the CVSO position be filled as it is required by city ordinance.

thank you

Stephen Martin-Pinto
Veteran's Affairs Commissioner

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Pet Grooming
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 12:27:00 PM

From: Teri DiMarino <teridimarino@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 3, 2020 4:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Pet Grooming

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

It's hard to believe there is anyone in California who does not care for animals and their welfare. Pets are an important part of life for many California residents, especially in this time of Shelter in Place. They are our companions and our comfort. We want them to remain healthy and happy. We want nothing but the best for these four-legged family members.

Then why, may we ask, have the health benefits of routine, regular grooming been taken away from them and their owners?

Pet groomers play an integral part in the lives of many California residents by keeping their pets clean and healthy. Grooming is so much more than just a cute haircut and bows. Keeping the pets clean and well-groomed not only helps the pets stay healthy, but aids the owners as well. It is unfortunate at this time that many pets grooming needs are being neglected, as owners lack the appropriate tools and knowledge to carry out the task safely. Many owners who have allergies, asthma or are immunocompromised need their pets to stay clean as not to instigate breathing issues or other health problems. And some residents are being forced to distance themselves from their beloved pets due to their lack of grooming.

Flea and tick season is upon us and pets risk bringing these disease-carrying pests indoors to their owners. Foxtails and burrs are a very real health hazard to our pets and anyone who has had to pick through their pet's coat for these invaders knows the problems that these can cause. Veterinary bills are easily avoided by routine grooming.

The average pet is professionally groomed every four to six weeks. Waiting

longer that that compounds simple issues. Small tangles become large mats, pulling at the pets skin, causing sores and hot spots. Overgrown nails are a discomfort to the pet as well as a health hazard. Ears that are not properly attended to can become painfully infected.

We would like to call your attention to the newest version of the Federal *CISA Guidance on the Essential Critical Infrastructure Workforce* guide for essential services, Version 3.0 (April 17, 2020)

Please refer to a new addition on page 16, the last entry of the "Other Community- or government-based operations and essential functions" category, just above the "Critical Manufacturing" category.

It states as essential "Workers performing services to animals in human care, including zoos and aquariums."

Pet grooming falls under this designation of essential, as the pets we serve are, after all, "in human care".

Grooming involves minimal human contact between the owner and groomer and all are well prepared to follow *CDC* as well as guidelines composed and proposed by the *California Professional Pet Groomers Association, Inc.*, and protocol for safe social distancing as well as sanitation. Please see *CPPGA* guidelines on our homepage at www.cppga.org.

We implore you to please, officially, recognize pet grooming as the essential service it is and allow the professional groomers of California to do their work and help the citizens of California keep their pets clean and healthy. Shelter in Place with a dirty pet is not only unpleasant, but is unhealthy for the pet and human alike.

Pet Groomers exemplify small business. Many "Mom and Pop" grooming businesses are confused as to why the larger chain stores are permitted to groom, while they are forced to close. **There is no consistency in this mandate. Independent groomers want, and need, to get back to work and help the pets.**

We do not understand why this important piece of the average pets life has been taken away. Please officially deem us the essential business we are so we

can continue to care for the pets we all love.

Respectfully,

Teri DiMarino

President

California Professional Pet Groomers Association, Inc.

cppginfo@gmail.com

951-769-4349

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Thank you Supervisor Peskin - San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 12:20:00 PM
Attachments: [ThankYou_Peskin_PropDSuspension.pdf](#)

From: Emily Abraham <eabraham@sfchamber.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 11:15 AM
To: Emily Abraham <eabraham@sfchamber.com>
Cc: Jay Cheng <jcheng@sfchamber.com>; Rodney Fong <rfong@sfchamber.com>
Subject: Thank you Supervisor Peskin - San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Good afternoon,

On behalf of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, I have attached a letter to Supervisor Peskin thanking him for his **introduction of the suspension of Proposition D**.

Thank you all for your dedication and service during this time.

Stay well,

Emily

Emily Abraham

Public Policy Manager
SF Chamber of Commerce



235 Montgomery St., Ste. 760, San Francisco, CA 94104
tel: 415.352.4520 • fax: 415.392.0485
sfchamber.com • twitter: @sf_chamber

May 6, 2020

Supervisor Aaron Peskin
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Suspension of Proposition D Enforcement

Dear Supervisor Peskin,

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, representing hundreds of local businesses, sincerely thank you for your introduction of the suspension of Proposition D, the recent voter-passed “Excise Tax on Keeping Commercial Property Vacant.” We deeply appreciate how the legislation prioritizes the need to provide pathways for relief and recovery for San Francisco businesses.

We are all living in a new reality, and so much is out of the business owner’s hands. We are grateful for your leadership around helping create a regulatory environment that allows for the unprecedented. It is our goal to make sure businesses in San Francisco have the opportunities to recover and continue to contribute to our great city. Our small business members are struggling immensely and will be for some time. Your legislation provides timely, necessary relief for the small business community to stay afloat through this pandemic.

On behalf of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, I sincerely thank you all for your continued service during this public health crisis.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rodney Fong", written over a faint circular stamp or watermark.

Rodney Fong
President and CEO

CC: Mayor London N. Breed, Clerk of the Board, the full Board of Supervisors

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Requesting this letter/attachment be submitted for public comments at next meeting
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 11:31:00 AM
Attachments: [Board of Supervisors Letter from USTA NorCalJason Scalese.pdf](#)

From: Jason Scalese <scalese.jason@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2020 10:37 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Requesting this letter/attachment be submitted for public comments at next meeting

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

Good Morning,

I'm writing on behalf of the United States Tennis Association, Northern CA Section. I'm the Vice President/President-Elect of the org.

We know some counties have started to loosen the restrictions on tennis, but as the policies are all over the map we are submitting this letter for your public comments at your next BOS meeting requesting the sport of tennis be allowed in full in San Francisco County if it is not already.

Thank you for your leadership during these chaotic times, best of health to you!

Jason Scalese
Burlingame, CA
Vice President/President-Elect
United States Tennis Association, Northern California Section



NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

1920 North Loop Road
Alameda, CA 94502
(510) 748-7373
(510) 748-8108 fax
www.usta.com/norcal

President
Kevin Pope

Vice President,
President-Elect
Jason Scalese

Secretary
Anoosh Davoudzadeh

Treasurer
Joshua Conlin

Delegate
Alvin Hom

2020 Directors
Joshua Conlin
Steve Cornell
Suzy Cossette
Anoosh Davoudzadeh
Mark Fairchilds
Larry Olmstead
Bryn Powell
Lynne Rolley
Jason Scalese
Pam Sloan
Jim Swansiger
Sandy Tompkins
Spencer Travalino
Jack Walker
Keith Wheeler

Past Presidents
Lisbeth Blum
Margie Campbell
Phil Cello
Michael Cooke
Robert A Cookson
Hunter Delatour, Jr.
John Frank
Kim Fuller
Alvin Hom
Don Jacobus
Dwight Johnson
Paul Kepler
Gary Lee
Walter Machette
Mark Manning
George Maze
Mike Mee
Judith Patterson
Marjorie Peterman
Dennis Shepherd
Tony Silveria
Lee Tucker

Executive Director, Interim
Kevin Craig

Legal Counsel &
Parliamentarian
Les Hausrath

Advisory Directors
Rosie Bareis
Jon Toney

May 4, 2020

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

My name is Jason Scalese, I am a 22 year resident of Northern California (Burlingame) with my wife and two children, 7 and 5.

I am proud to serve as the Vice President/President-Elect of the United States Tennis Association, Northern California Section. The USTA is the national governing body for the sport of tennis and the recognized leader in promoting and developing the sport's growth on every level in the U.S. The Northern California Section alone boasts 42,072 individual members. Tens of thousands of additional players enjoy this sport here in California.

As Supervisors, you are on the front line of the COVID-19 battleground, emphasizing the importance of your roles as community leaders more than ever before. We are thankful for your leadership during all of this chaos. As these are indeed unprecedented times, it's important that industry leaders work with local governments as we begin to reopen the Golden State.

I write to you today on behalf of USTA NorCal asking that you please consider allowing tennis play, both at public and private facilities, as soon as possible with the expectation that proper social distancing policies will be in place.

Let's face it, few sports allow the great exercise that tennis does that still meet the requirements of social distancing. Additionally, other concerns related to the sport are easily addressed.

Please consider there is increasing evidence that COVID-19 is spreading very little outside especially in warm weather. It is rare that people participate in tennis that are not familiar with their partners, allowing for more efficient "vetting" of other participants than many of the activities already allowed both outside and inside. Let's face it, how often do you go to a big box store and know everyone around that might be touching similar items that you touch? In tennis, it's pretty safe to say that 95% of recreational play includes people we know and we have a more clear understanding of their activity in the last 60 days than the average passerby at a store, on the beach or on a hiking trail.

Even prior to the "Shelter-In-Place" orders, many tennis facilities had already mastered the safety precautions related to the "shared equipment" involved in tennis. For example:

- Wearing masks.
- Wearing gloves on the non-dominant hand for picking up tennis balls.
- Using unique cans of tennis balls per server.

Additionally, instructors and instructional facilities:

- Agreed to the above if it meant keeping income and will continue to do so.
- Sanitize and cleanse equipment, even when not shared in between lessons and overnight.
- Sanitize and cleanse entryways, door knobs, benches, net posts etc...
- Provide wipes and hand sanitizer for players.
- Disallow players to collect or handle the tennis balls.

In addition, when referring to the impact of the "SIP" on the professional teaching wing of our beloved sport, many tennis instructors are contract workers who like many industries have been decimated during this time, but are not receiving the type of unemployment wages W-2 employees may be receiving. We don't want them to get back to work for the sake of the sport, but for their own benefit. That said, we would never encourage it if it meant compromising their health and safety and their students.

After reviewing the list of approved activities by the state and recognizing that some counties have begun to allow tennis, we hope our county will agree to allow this great source of exercise, stress relief, and activity once again as we emerge from the COVID-19 crisis.

Thank you for your consideration, we wish you good health!

Sincerely,
Jason Scalese

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: WARN Notice
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:58:00 AM
Attachments: [WARN Mountain View and SF.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

From: Tracey Bye <Tracey.Bye@nortonlifelock.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 4:33 PM
To: Tracey Bye <Tracey.Bye@nortonlifelock.com>
Subject: WARN Notice

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

Hello, attached is a WARN notice regarding a recent elimination of positions at NortonLifeLock, Inc. (*formerly known as Symantec Corporation*).

Thank you,

Tracey Bye
Sr. Paralegal, Employment Law
O: 650 527 5081
tracey_bye@symantec.com
NortonLifeLock.com



Symantec Corporation and its related Consumer Division (Norton and LifeLock) are now NortonLifeLock Inc. – a standalone company dedicated to consumer Cyber Safety. Email addresses will change in February 2020.

May 5, 2020

Sent via e-Mail

Mayor Lisa Matichak
City Hall
500 Castro Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Lisa.matichak@mountainview.gov

Mayor London Breed
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 941023
mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org

NOVA Consortium (North Santa Clara)
Ms. Kristan Stadelman, Director
North Valley Job Training Consortium (NOVA)
505 W. Olive, Suite 550
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
business@novaworks.org

San Francisco City/County Workforce Development
Mr. Joshua Arce, Director
1 South Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Workforce.development@sfgov.org

County of Santa Clara
Santa Clara Board of Supervisors
70 West Hedding Street, 10th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110
Cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org

County of San Francisco
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place #244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

WARN Act Coordinator
Program Support Unit
Workforce Services Division
Employment Development Department
722 Capitol Mall, MIC 50/Room 5099
Sacramento, CA 95814
eddwarnnotice@edd.ca.gov

Re. Notice of Layoff: Mountain View, California and San Francisco, California

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to notify you that NortonLifeLock Inc. (formerly known as Symantec Corporation) ("NortonLifeLock") will be permanently eliminating the positions of 65 employees in or associated with the Mountain View and San Francisco, California offices.

In the event the Federal Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act and/or any corollary state law is applicable, we hereby provide you with the following information:

1. Location of Mountain View, California and San Francisco, California facilities:

NortonLifeLock Inc.
350 Ellis Street
Mountain View, California 94043

NortonLifeLock Inc.
795 Folsom Street, 1st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

2. Expected dates of layoff:

With limited potential variation, employees were notified April 29, 2020 and the termination date will either be July 1, 2020 or July 22, 2020. Layoffs are expected to be permanent.

3. Bumping rights:

None of the affected employees are represented by a union, and no bumping rights exist.


4. Job titles of positions to be affected, the number of affected employees in each job, associated location, and noticed term date:

See Attachment A.

5. For further information, please contact:

Talin Danayan
NortonLifeLock Inc
Human Resources
60 E. Rio Salado Pkwy. Suite 400
Tempe, AZ 85281
480-457-2107

Any assistance that the State might provide to NortonLifeLock employees who will be losing their employment with this action would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Tracey Bye
Sr. Paralegal

ATTACHMENT A

| April 2020 Notifications | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------|
| Job Title | Headcount | Job Location | Term Dates |
| Assoc Mgr, Global Customer Service | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Dir, Accounting | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Dir, Development | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Dir, Finance | 3 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Dir, Internal Audit | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Dir, IT | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Dir, IT | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Dir, Trade Compliance | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Director, Corporate Responsibility | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Information Security Analyst | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| IT Project Manager | 2 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| IT Service Management Director | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| IT Service Manager | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Logistics Specialist | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Mgr, Controllership | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Mgr, Global Customer Service | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Mgr, Pricing & Licensing | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Princ Financial Analyst | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Princ IT Applications Spec | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Princ IT Business Analyst | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Princ IT INF Specialist | 3 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Princ IT INF Specialist | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Princ Logistics Specialist | 2 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Software Development Engineer 4 | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Software Development Engineer 5 | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Accountant | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr Dir, Finance | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr Dir, IT | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Dir, Order Operations | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Financial Specialist | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr IT Architect | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr IT Architect | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr IT Program Manager | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr Mgr, Gen Acctg & Reporting | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr Mgr, Information Security | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Mgr, IT | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr Mgr, IT | 2 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |



| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------|-----------|
| Sr Mgr, Online Programs | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Mgr, Proc & Sourcing | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr Princ IT Applications Spec | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Sr Princ IT Business Analyst | 2 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Princ IT Developer | 2 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Princ IT INF Spec | 3 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Princ Web Developer | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Product Manager | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| Sr Web Producer | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| SVP, Product Management | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 6/15/2020 |
| Technical Director | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| VP, Information Technology | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| VP, Legal | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 6/30/2020 |
| VP, Supply Chain Management | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/1/2020 |
| VP, Tax | 1 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |
| Dir, Facilities | 2 | Mountain View, CA | 7/22/2020 |

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Follow-up correspondence regarding Hakkasan Restaurant
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:07:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Follow-up re HKSF permanent layoffs.pdf](#)

From: Deanna Brinkerhoff <DBrinkerhoff@hakkasangroup.com>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 2:39 PM
To: eddwarnnotice@edd.ca.gov; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Development, Workforce (ECN) <workforce.development@sfgov.org>
Subject: Follow-up correspondence regarding Hakkasan Restaurant

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

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached follow-up correspondence regarding Hakkasan Restaurant.

Thank you,

Deanna Brinkerhoff
Executive Director of Legal Affairs

HAKKASAN
GROUP

Hakkasan Group
6385 S Rainbow Blvd // Suite 800
Las Vegas
NV 89118
+1 702 212 8804 EXT. 228 // Phone
+1 702 415 3237 // Cell
DBrinkerhoff@hakkasangroup.com
hakkasangroup.com

This email is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us immediately and delete it and do not copy, use or disclose its contents.

HAKKASAN GROUP

CRAFTING REMARKABLE EXPERIENCES

May 1, 2020

WARN Act Coordinator
Statewide Services Unit
Workforce Services Division
Employment Development Department
P.O. Box 826880, MIC 69/Room 3099
Sacramento, CA 94280
[Via e-mail (eddwarnnotice@edd.ca.gov)]

San Francisco County Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
[Via e-mail (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)]

Office of the Mayor
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
[Via e-mail (MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org)]

Workforce Development Division of the
Office of Economic & Workforce Development
1 South Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
[Via e-mail (workforce.development@sfgov.org)]

Re: Follow-up Correspondence Regarding Hakkasan Restaurant

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter serves as a follow-up to Hakkasan Holdings, LLC d/b/a Hakkasan Group's correspondence dated March 16, 2020, regarding layoffs at Hakkasan Restaurant, located at 1 Kearny Street, San Francisco, CA, 94108. Unfortunately, due to the unforeseen business circumstances caused by COVID 19 and its resulting unforeseen economic impacts, the closure of Hakkasan Restaurant and accompanying layoffs will be permanent.

You may direct any further inquiries regarding this matter to me at (702) 212-8804 ext. 228 or via e-mail at dbrinkerhoff@hakkasangroup.com.

Regards,

/s/ Deanna Brinkerhoff

Deanna Brinkerhoff
Executive Director of Legal Affairs

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Follow-up correspondence regarding Hakkasan San Francisco closure
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:28:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Second follow-up re HKSF permanent layoffs.pdf](#)

From: Deanna Brinkerhoff <DBrinkerhoff@hakkasangroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 2:29 PM
To: eddwarnnotice@edd.ca.gov; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Development, Workforce (ECN) <workforce.development@sfgov.org>
Subject: Follow-up correspondence regarding Hakkasan San Francisco closure

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

Good afternoon,

Attached please find correspondence regarding additional layoffs at Hakkasan San Francisco.

Thank you,

Deanna Brinkerhoff
Executive Director of Legal Affairs

HAKKASAN
GROUP

Hakkasan Group
6385 S Rainbow Blvd // Suite 800
Las Vegas
NV 89118
+1 702 212 8804 EXT. 228 // Phone
+1 702 415 3237 // Cell
DBrinkerhoff@hakkasangroup.com
hakkasangroup.com

This email is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient please notify us immediately and delete it and do not copy, use or disclose its contents.

HAKKASAN GROUP

CRAFTING REMARKABLE EXPERIENCES

May 5, 2020

WARN Act Coordinator
Statewide Services Unit
Workforce Services Division
Employment Development Department
P.O. Box 826880, MIC 69/Room 3099
Sacramento, CA 94280
[Via e-mail (eddwarnnotice@edd.ca.gov)]

San Francisco County Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
[Via e-mail (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)]

Office of the Mayor
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
[Via e-mail (MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org)]

Workforce Development Division of the
Office of Economic & Workforce Development
1 South Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
[Via e-mail (workforce.development@sfgov.org)]

Re: Follow-up Correspondence Regarding Hakkasan Restaurant

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter serves as a follow-up to Hakkasan Holdings, LLC d/b/a Hakkasan Group's correspondence dated March 16, 2020, regarding layoffs at Hakkasan Restaurant, located at 1 Kearny Street, San Francisco, CA, 94108. Unfortunately, due to the unforeseen business circumstances caused by COVID 19 and its resulting unforeseen economic impacts, the closure of Hakkasan Restaurant and accompanying layoffs will be permanent. As a result, two additional individuals are being laid off – a General Manager and an Executive Chef. The Executive Chef will be laid off on May 6, 2020, and the General Manager is expected to be laid off later this month. Neither employee is covered by a collective bargaining agreement, and there are no bumping rights.

You may direct any further inquiries regarding this matter to me at (702) 212-8804 ext. 228 or via e-mail at dbrinkerhoff@hakkasangroup.com.

Regards,

/s/ Deanna Brinkerhoff

Deanna Brinkerhoff
Executive Director of Legal Affairs



11-303-11

1375 Blossom Hill Road, Ste. 49
San Jose, CA 95118
(408) 440-8335

April 22, 2020

Warn Act Coordinator (by email only)
Statewide Services Unit
Workforce Services Division
Employment Development Department
722 Capitol Mall, MIC 69/Room 3099
Sacramento, CA 95814
eddwarnnotice@edd.ca.gov

Mayor Sam Liccardo
City of San Jose
200 East Santa Clara St., 18th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors
70 West Hedding St., 10th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110

Ms. Monique Melchor (by email only)
Work2future - Executive Director
5730 Chambertin Drive
San Jose, CA 95118
Monique.melchor@sanjoseca.gov

[Additional receipts noted below]

Re: Termination of Employees at Action Urgent Care

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of Action Urgent Care, I am writing to inform you that the Company has terminated 53 employees at various facilities in California as the result of unforeseen business circumstances arising from the COVID-19 virus and related shelter-in-place orders. The Company has terminated 9 Medical Assistants, 39 Licensed Vocational Nurses and 5 Providers. The impacted locations are as follows:

1. 1366 East Ave., Chico, CA 95926
2. 3100 N. Fowler Ave., Clovis, CA 93611
3. 555 E. Calaveras Blvd., Milpitas, CA 95035
4. 235 Tennant Station, Morgan Hill, CA 95037
5. 5720 Nave Drive, Novato, CA 94949
6. 10635 Folsom Blvd., Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
7. 1814 19th Street, Sacramento, CA 95811
8. 735 7th Ave., San Francisco, CA 94118
9. 670 River Oaks Pwky, Ste. H, San Jose, CA 95134
10. 3970 Rivermark Plaza, Santa Clara CA 95054

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2020 APR 30 PM 4:14
BY _____



1375 Blossom Hill Road, Ste. 49
San Jose, CA 95118
(408) 440-8335

11. 477 W. Napa Street, Sonoma, CA 95476

The affected employees do not have bumping rights and are not represented by a union.

Action Urgent Care will continue essential operations as permitted by applicable orders and law.

For further information, you may contact Genevieve Hismatullin at 408-646-0261 or Genevieve.L@actionurgentcare.com.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Hismatullin
COO

Additional Recipients

| | |
|--|--|
| Ann Schwab, Mayor Chico City Council PO Box 3420 Chico, CA 95927 | County of Butte, Board of Supervisors 25 County Center Drive, Suite 200 Oroville, CA 95965 |
| Mr. Michael Cross, Executive Director Northern Rural Training Employment Consortium 525 Wall Street Chico, CA 95928 | County of Fresno, Board of Supervisors 2281 Tulare Street Fresno, CA 93724 |
| Mr. Blake G. Konczal, Executive Officer Fresno Area Workforce Development Corporation 2125 Kern Street, Suite 208 Fresno, CA 93721 | Bob Whalen, Mayor City of Clovis 1033 Fifth Street Clovis, CA 93612 |
| Ms. Kristan Stadelman, Director NOVA Workforce Board 505 West Olive, Suite 550 Sunnyvale, CA 94086 | Rich Tran, Mayor City of Milpitas 455 E. Calaveras Blvd. Milpitas, CA 95035 |
| Rich Constantine, Mayor City of Morgan Hill 17575 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill, CA 95037 | County of Marin, Board of Supervisors 3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 329 San Rafael, CA 94903 |
| Denise Athas, Mayor City of Novato 922 Machin Avenue Novato, CA 94945 | Mr. Bruce Wilson, Executive Director Workforce Alliance of the North Bay 1546 First Street Napa, CA 94559 |



1375 Blossom Hill Road, Ste. 49
San Jose, CA 95118
(408) 440-8335

| | |
|--|---|
| David M. Sander, Mayor City of Rancho Cordova 2729 Prospect Park Drive Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 | Ms. Kathy Kossick, Executive Director Sacramento Employment and Training Agency 925 Del Paso Boulevard, Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95815 |
| County of Sacramento, Board of Supervisors 700 H. Street, Suite 1450 Sacramento, CA 95814 | Darrell Steinberg, Mayor City of Sacramento 915 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814 |
| Mr. Joshua Arce, Director, Workforce Development 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103 | London Breed, Mayor City Hall, Room 200 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102 |
| County of San Francisco, Board of Supervisors 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102 | Lisa M. Gillmor, Mayor 1500 Warburton Avenue Santa Clara, CA 95050 |
| Logan Harvey, Mayor City of Sonoma No. 1 The Plaza Sonoma, CA 95476 | Mrs. Katie Greaves, Director Sonoma County Workforce Development Board 2227 Capricorn Way, Suite 100 Santa Rosa, CA 95407 |
| County of Sonoma, Board of Supervisors 575 Administration, Room 100A Santa Rosa, CA 95403 | |

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Someone needs to get fired
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:53:00 AM

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

From: Barbara Amato <queenbee_941@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 2:09 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Someone needs to get fired

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I read in the SF Chronicle this morning that homeless advocates have handed out 1,000 new tents to the homeless. What is going on? It's no secret that the homeless are coming into SF in droves to get a hotel room. By giving them tents you are encouraging this behavior. Have you seen those pictures of the tenderloin!! It's worse than ever and growing daily. You must be very upset yourselves. It's is time to FIRE the obviously incompetent homeless advocates. They are more interested in keeping their jobs than in caring about the well being of the City. We are a laughing stock of liberalism gone terribly wrong.

Sincerely,
Barbara Amato
1725 Dolores Street

Sent from my iPad

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Calling on you to respond ASAP!
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:38:06 AM

From: Magick Altman <magicktarot11@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 4:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Calling on you to respond ASAP!

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

Board of Supervisors, I request that this email be responded to by all Supervisors so please make sure they all receive this.

I just spoke during public comment and I want to know what will be done in response to my requests for

Commission oversight.

I have written to the Police Comm. no response. The mayor no response.

We need to be able to have direct lines to all of you.

Here are my words:

Supervisors, we need to have Commissions meeting for oversight.

Interesting that the Planning Comm and Permits are open, so those continuing to see our city as a place of profits over people can keep doing business.

This Board approved housing at the Lucky Penny site at Geary and Masonic with Zero Affordable housing let alone low-income. Apparently, the profit margin wasn't big enough.

Thank you, Dean Preston for trying to put the breaks on this.

At a time when housing is desperately needed this is a shocking development.

Also, the Police Comm. needs to oversee the Police actions such as the POA attempt to denigrate the Black lives Matter by giving them Blue line face masks which is of course in violation of the law. I witnessed on video 4 masked officers takedown a woman holding a teddy bear at an action to create more homes for the unhoused. This same kind of action in Oakland has resulted in more housing, not just arrests.

The League of Women Voters has also called for the Police Comm. to meet.

We aspire to only reopening when there is a remedy for the glaring failures of our current system. Universal health care, A moratorium that actually forgives all rent and mortgage payments not merely delaying payment. A moratorium on all luxury housing. And free food, childcare, and living wages.

We need the Sunshine Task Force and Ethics to meet to oversee this new form of meetings and public access to our representatives and get the technology needed to do so.

No one is answering the phones. Paul, asst to the Mayor told me directly that you can't transfer government phones to private numbers.

Although he informed that he has found a way to have a phone that does just that. Supervisors, we need direct lines to all of you that are answered by a humans.

Also, we need the Immigrant Rights Comm. to take actions immediately to find a way to close the camps by urging the Gov to use his emergency powers to close these privately owned detention camps that are now becoming death camps.

Our DA Boudin stated at a press conference that he legally has that power.

This virus cannot be used as a cover for business as usual.

When will the Commissions meet? Oversight is needed more than ever.

Yours in Truth,

Magick

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Public Comment - Legislation Introduced
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:28:00 AM
Attachments: [Public Comment Youth Commission May 5, 2020.docx \(1\).pdf](#)

From: Hosmon, Kiely (BOS) <kiely.hosmon@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 1:59 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hosmon, Kiely (BOS) <kiely.hosmon@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment - Legislation Introduced

YOUTH COMMISSION - Public Comment

ard of Supervisors

Kiely Hosmon, Director, Youth Commission

Tuesday, May 5, 2020

ion Introduced - Charter Amendment - Requirements for Commission Membership

Hello Board of Supervisors,

My name is Kiely Hosmon and I'm the Director of the San Francisco Youth Commission. I am extremely excited to hear that Supervisor Yee and Supervisor Walton are introducing **Charter Amendment - Requirements for Commission Membership** legislation.

The Youth Commission is the only chartered youth-led advising body in San

Francisco. We have had to tell numerous young people and organizations that we can't accept applications or recommend appointments for those who are undocumented. This is incredibly disheartening and unjust to know that young people want to hold elected officials accountable and to be involved in youth led policy - but are unable because they are denied access to commission seats based on their citizenship status.

The Youth Commission desires to have seats made available to undocumented young people. This legislation will make that possible. Thank you.

Do you and/or your organization support the local Vote16SF movement that would expand voting rights to 16 & 17 year olds? Fill out this [endorsement form](#) if you do!

Whether you're just getting started or already have a plan in action, we want you to [#JoinTheYouthCommission](#). Have a seat at the table and bring your ideas forward. [Apply now](#). [Join a Meet and Greet Session](#).

Kiely Hosmon, M.A.

Director

San Francisco Youth Commission

Office: 415.554.6464 | Fax: 415.554.6140

Pronouns Used: she & her

Visit the official [Youth Commission site](#) and [YC facebook](#) page.

Sign up for [our newsletter](#).

Complete a Board of Supervisors [Customer Satisfaction form](#).

Youth Commission
City Hall ~ Room 345
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4532



(415) 554-6446
(415) 554-6140 FAX
www.sfgov.org/youth_commission

YOUTH COMMISSION - Public Comment

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Kiely Hosmon, Director, Youth Commission
DATE: Tuesday, May 5, 2020
RE: Legislation Introduced - Charter Amendment - Requirements for Commission Membership

Hello Board of Supervisors,

My name is Kiely Hosmon and I'm the Director of the San Francisco Youth Commission. I am extremely excited to hear that Supervisor Yee and Supervisor Walton are introducing **Charter Amendment - Requirements for Commission Membership** legislation.

The Youth Commission is the only chartered youth-led advising body in San Francisco. We have had to tell numerous young people and organizations that we can't accept applications or recommend appointments for those who are undocumented. This is incredibly disheartening and unjust to know that young people want to hold elected officials accountable and to be involved in youth led policy - but are unable because they are denied access to commission seats based on their citizenship status.

The Youth Commission desires to have seats made available to undocumented young people. This legislation will make that possible. Thank you.



From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Family Relief Fund Recommendations
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 8:27:00 AM
Attachments: [Family Relief Fund Recommendations.pdf](#)

From: Garcia, Veronica (HRC) <veronica.garcia@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 11:18 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Family Relief Fund Recommendations

April 30, 2020

Board of Supervisors

Attn: Angela Calvillo

1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl #244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Family Relief Fund Recommendations

Dear Board of Supervisors:

With the Coronavirus thrusting the county into a public health and economic crisis, the Latino Taskforce COVID-19 applauds the Board of Supervisors leadership in taking immediate actions to protect the health and safety of those most impacted by the pandemic. The Family Income Relief Fund which will provide a monthly income relief of \$500 for San Francisco residents with children 0-18 years of age who do not qualify for federal or state stimulus plans will create a critical safety net for our most vulnerable populations during this crisis.

In order to ensure equity and privacy in the application and distribution process, the Latino Task Force COVID-19 offers the following recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and Human Rights Commission:

- The distribution of this fund must be equitable and counter persistent racial and structural inequities by prioritize the most vulnerable populations. The Latino population is most affected by the pandemic, overrepresented in the vulnerable population, # of cases in the city, and experiencing the negative health and economic

impacts. Our Latino families, as other low income people of color, are struggling to meet their basic needs due to the loss of employment, food insecurity, and unstable safe shelter. There is immediate need to get financial resources directly into the hands of families that have limited or no other means of support.

- We appreciate the Board of Supervisors and SF Human Rights Commission for adopting a strategy of working with the network of community based organizations and service providers in the distribution of the fund to community. CBOs are best positioned as trusted partners for families to receive support with eligibility screening and application process. CBOs can build on their established relationships with community to reach the most disenfranchised. As the system for the distribution of this fund is designed, we recommend HRC to work with and learn from existing community based models and best practices of partners with experience managing and distributing family relief funds for this population such as; La Raza Community Resource Center, Dolores Street Community Services, Central American Resource Center, Good Samaritan, Mission Asset Fund, Instituto Familiar de la Raza, Homeless Prenatal Program, and others.
- It is of utmost importance to build a secure platform and process based on the highest standards to ensure client privacy. The application and documentation process must maintain confidentiality using ID codes so no personal names are documented to protect privacy and all stored data is secured. The reality is that community members have valid fears in having their names documented that can come up in their immigration/asylum cases. Therefore, it is imperative for applicants to be reassured that this fund is not considered within public charge.
- We encourage a coordinated effort among similar public and community-based economic relief funds such as UndocuFund, Give2SF, Mission Asset Fund, etc. to ensure all possible opportunities are accessed by the targeted populations most impacted by COVID-19 for each fund.

As service providers and advocates working with our Latino community, we are committed to working with our local government partners to keep in the forefront the needs of the most disenfranchised populations in the development of short-term and long-term strategies in response and recovery to this public health crisis.

Respectfully,

Gloria Romero

Chair, CBO Committee

Latino Task Force COVID-19

April 30, 2020

Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl #244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Family Relief Fund Recommendations

Dear Board of Supervisors:

With the Coronavirus thrusting the county into a public health and economic crisis, the Latino Taskforce COVID-19 applauds the Board of Supervisors leadership in taking immediate actions to protect the health and safety of those most impacted by the pandemic. The Family Income Relief Fund which will provide a monthly income relief of \$500 for San Francisco residents with children 0-18 years of age who do not qualify for federal or state stimulus plans will create a critical safety net for our most vulnerable populations during this crisis.

In order to ensure equity and privacy in the application and distribution process, the Latino Task Force COVID-19 offers the following recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and Human Rights Commission:

- The distribution of this fund must be equitable and counter persistent racial and structural inequities by prioritize the most vulnerable populations. The Latino population is most affected by the pandemic, overrepresented in the vulnerable population, # of cases in the city, and experiencing the negative health and economic impacts. Our Latino families, as other low income people of color, are struggling to meet their basic needs due to the loss of employment, food insecurity, and unstable safe shelter. There is immediate need to get financial resources directly into the hands of families that have limited or no other means of support.
- We appreciate the Board of Supervisors and SF Human Rights Commission for adopting a strategy of working with the network of community based organizations and service providers in the distribution of the fund to community. CBOs are best positioned as trusted partners for families to receive support with eligibility screening and application process. CBOs can build on their established relationships with community to reach the most disenfranchised. As the system for the distribution of this fund is designed, we recommend HRC to work with and learn from existing community based models and best practices of partners with experience managing and distributing family relief funds for this population such as; La Raza Community Resource Center, Dolores Street Community Services, Central American Resource Center, Good Samaritan, Mission Asset Fund, Instituto Familiar de la Raza, Homeless Prenatal Program, and others.

- It is of utmost importance to build a secure platform and process based on the highest standards to ensure client privacy. The application and documentation process must maintain confidentiality using ID codes so no personal names are documented to protect privacy and all stored data is secured. The reality is that community members have valid fears in having their names documented that can come up in their immigration/asylum cases. Therefore, it is imperative for applicants to be reassured that this fund is not considered within public charge.
- We encourage a coordinated effort among similar public and community-based economic relief funds such as UndocuFund, Give2SF, Mission Asset Fund, etc. to ensure all possible opportunities are accessed by the targeted populations most impacted by COVID-19 for each fund.

As service providers and advocates working with our Latino community, we are committed to working with our local government partners to keep in the forefront the needs of the most disenfranchised populations in the development of short-term and long-term strategies in response and recovery to this public health crisis.

Respectfully,

Gloria Romero
Chair, CBO Committee
Latino Task Force COVID-19

From: [MICHAEL PETRELIS](#)
To: [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Quan, Daisy \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Wright, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Huang, Jenny \(BOS\)](#); [RivamonteMesa, Abigail \(BOS\)](#); [Mcdonald, Courtney \(BOS\)](#); [Mahogany, Honey \(BOS\)](#); [Zou, Han \(BOS\)](#); [Snyder, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Kilgore, Preston \(BOS\)](#); [Yu, Avery \(BOS\)](#); [Monge, Paul \(BOS\)](#); [Beinart, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Lerma, Santiago \(BOS\)](#); [Li-D9, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Herzstein, Daniel \(BOS\)](#); [Bennett, Samuel \(BOS\)](#); [Mullan, Andrew \(BOS\)](#); [Falzon, Frankie \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Maybaum, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Vejby, Caitlin \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Temprano, Tom \(BOS\)](#); [Mundy, Erin \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Adkins, Joe \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Koeppel, Geri \(BOS\)](#); [Yu, Angelina \(BOS\)](#); [Fregosi, Ian \(BOS\)](#); [Boilard, Chelsea \(BOS\)](#); [Thornhill, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Sandoval, Suhagey \(BOS\)](#); [Ho, Tim \(BOS\)](#); [Chinchilla, Monica \(BOS\)](#); [Berenson, Samuel \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#); [Evans, Abe \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reply needed - Re: SF BOS public comment *before* roll call intros needed.
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 5:23:36 PM

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

Hello City Hall leaders,

A response is requested. Let's make easy changes to improve how public comment is handled at Tuesday meetings!

Best,
Michael Petrelis

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

From: MICHAEL PETRELIS <mpetrelis@aol.com>
To: Matt.Haney@sfgov.org <Matt.Haney@sfgov.org>; Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org <Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org>; Dean.Preston@sfgov.org <Dean.Preston@sfgov.org>; Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>; Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org <Norman.Yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org <MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org>; Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>; sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org <sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org>; Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>; Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>; angela.calvillo@sfgov.org <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tue, May 5, 2020 3:07 pm
Subject: SF BOS public comment *before* roll call intros needed.

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco, CA

Dear Members,

I am submitting a written request to you regarding setting a fixed time for public comment and that time for we, the people to speak come before your roll call introductions.

A few speakers during your virtual meetings have made this request, and it's been a long-standing desire of good government advocates for many years when you were meeting at City Hall.

We want the voices of citizens heard at a set time and before you all speak offering remarks about your resolutions and other matter.

Will you commit to making these changes, which, in my opinion, are not radical and quite reasonable?

I ask for a response from you or your staff by the close of business today.

Sincerely,
Michael Petrelis
Public Advocate

From: [Nancy Wuerfel](#)
To: [aaron.hyland.hpc](#); [dianematsuda](#); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [RSEJohns](#); [jonathan.pearlman.hpc](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [mooreurban@aol.com](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [sue.diamond@sfgov.org](#); [jonas.ionin](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Continue item 6 Annual Report at the May 6 HPC meeting
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 4:37:45 PM

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

Commissioners:

I request that item 6 Certified Local Government Program (CLG) Annual Report be continued and not approved that this time. The reason for continuance is that this 2019 draft report is deficient because it does not include reference in the "Summary of Local Preservation Programs" to the existence of the city's Landmark Tree Program authorized by Public Works Code Article 16, Section 810, in the Administrative Code since 1995 and updated through to 2015.

This program has landmarked over 20 trees in San Francisco, yet none of them are listed as cultural and/or historic resources by Planning staff. All landmarked trees are designated as such by a Board of Supervisors ordinance. The Board considers the age, size, shape, species, location, historical association, visual quality, and other contributions to the City's character, as set forth in Article 16 Section 810(f)(4)(A)-(E).

Article 10 section 1004 (b) states "Each such designating ordinance shall include ... a description of the particular features that should be preserved. Any such designation shall be in furtherance of and in conformance with the purposes of this Article 10 and the standards set forth herein." The Landmark Tree Program complies with the requirement to describe the "particular features" that should be preserved.

It is time that this failure to recognize the Landmark Tree Program as an integral part of the city's historical resources must be corrected. This oversight should be mentioned on CLG page 18 along with the actions Planning staff will take to document the program and include landmarked trees in future preservation activities and evaluations.

Thank you for considering a continuance for item 6 to discuss this issue.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel

From: [Simpson, Paul](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kathy Howard](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: SB 902 and the Arrogance of Scott Weiner
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 4:44:45 PM

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

Dear Honorable Supervisors;

I am a San Francisco native who has lived at one time or another in virtually every westside neighborhood of our beautiful city. I currently reside in District 7. I am a registered Democrat, but view myself as non-partisan when it comes San Francisco quality of life issues. I am dismayed, but not surprised, that Senator Wiener continues to demonstrate his disregard for the views of the public who have time and time again made clear that his legislative efforts to destroy the character our unique neighborhoods is not welcome. His arrogance knows no bounds and mirrors that of our current White House occupant.

Wiener's political arrogance aside, San Francisco is about to become flush with empty office space. The COVID 19 crisis has convincingly demonstrated that home offices are the "new office spaces." San Francisco and other California cities will experience office space vacancies the likes of which has never been seen before. This has been the subject of recent editorials in Fortune Magazine, the Wall St. Journal and other publications throughout the country. Landlords will seek property reassessments and the City will find a current healthy source of property revenue plummeting. But there is a solution on the horizon. This already built office space is ready-made for conversion to a mix of high density affordable and market rate residential housing. (e.g. think of the Twitter and Salesforce office spaces being converted in substantial part to residences.) In sum, SB 902 is not only detrimental to maintaining the character of our San Francisco neighborhoods, but its premise that more high density residential is needed has been rendered unnecessary by the COVID-19

crisis.

Hopefully, Mr. Weiner can be persuaded to withdraw his misguided bill. If not, perhaps more enlightened legislators will see the folly of his destructive mission.

Thank you for your support.

Respectfully,

Paul Simpson

San Francisco Westside Resident

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Emergency Ordinance - Restroom and Hand Washing Facilities for Unsheltered People—SUPPORT
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 2:05:00 PM
Attachments: [2020.05.05 - Support Letter - Emergency Ordinance - Restroom and Hand Washing Facilities.pdf](#)

From: Wes Saver <wsaver@glide.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 1:32 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mahogany, Honey (BOS) <honey.mahogany@sfgov.org>
Subject: Emergency Ordinance - Restroom and Hand Washing Facilities for Unsheltered People—SUPPORT

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Distinguished Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please find the attached position letter on behalf of GLIDE in support of Supervisor Matt Haney's emergency ordinance to help limit the spread of COVID-19 by requiring the City to provide, staff, and maintain restrooms equipped with toilets and hand washing facilities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Wesley Saver

--

Wesley Saver

Policy Manager

Center for Social Justice

GLIDE 330 Ellis Street, Room 506, San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICE (415) 674-5536 | **MOBILE** (847) 682-8639

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Glide. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. GLIDE accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.



**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
THE GLIDE FOUNDATION**

Kaye Foster
Chairperson

Mary Glide
Vice Chair

Michael L. Warren
Secretary/Treasurer

Emily H. Cohen

Paula R. Collins

Cheryl L. Flick

Crickette Brown Glad

Dr. Erica Lawson

Shireen McSpadden

Janice Mirikitani

Tara-Nicholle Nelson

Laura Thompson

Ross Weiner

Rev. Cecil Williams

Lin-Hua Wu

Mr. Phillip Zackler

**GLIDE EXECUTIVE
LEADERSHIP**

Karen Hanrahan
President & CEO

May 5, 2020

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

Subject: Emergency Ordinance – Restroom and Hand Washing Facilities for Unsheltered People—SUPPORT (File Number 200373)

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

On behalf of GLIDE, I am writing to urge you to support Supervisor Matt Haney’s emergency ordinance to help limit the spread of COVID-19 by requiring the City to provide, staff, and maintain restrooms equipped with toilets and hand washing facilities, at a ratio of one restroom per 50 unsheltered people. This emergency ordinance is necessary to reduce the spread of COVID-19 by enhancing the ability of people experiencing homelessness to comply with social distancing protocols, particularly the ability to maintain personal hygiene and to frequently and thoroughly wash their hands as recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

GLIDE is a leading social service provider, located in San Francisco’s Tenderloin neighborhood, dedicated to strengthening communities and transforming lives. In this quickly evolving public health emergency, GLIDE is particularly concerned about COVID-19’s disproportionate impact on the most vulnerable residents of our city, including and especially those forced to live unhoused on our streets. GLIDE is committed to maintaining essential services to those in need, while also working with partners across the city to ensure that San Francisco safeguards the health and wellbeing of all San Franciscans.

On February 25, 2020, Mayor London Breed proclaimed a state of emergency in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and on March 3, 2020, the Board of Supervisors concurred. The County Health Officer subsequently issued guidance to San Franciscans, which include that people frequently wash hands with soap and water for at least 20 seconds, or use hand sanitizer that is recognized by the CDC as effective in combatting COVID-19.

Although the order from the County Health Officer requires governmental agencies to “take appropriate steps to help ensure compliance with social distancing requirements, including adequate provision of hand sanitizer,” it does not go so far as to mandate the provision of bathrooms and handwashing stations. Meanwhile, CDC guidance specifically provides that one method of preventing the spread of COVID-19 among those who are unsheltered is to “[e]nsure nearby restroom facilities have functional water taps, are stocked with hand hygiene materials (soap, drying materials) and bath tissue, and remain open to people

experiencing homelessness 24 hours per day. If toilets or handwashing facilities are not available nearby, provide access to portable latrines with handwashing facilities for encampments of more than 10 people.”

Given the spread of COVID-19, individuals without homes should have the opportunity to comply with social distancing requirements, including access to toilets and hand washing, to the greatest extent possible. However, San Francisco’s unsheltered residents experiencing homelessness currently have no realistic way to comply with social distancing and personal hygiene protocols when living in encampments or on the street. The lack of adequate hygiene facilities poses a severe and imminent threat to the health, safety, and well-being of themselves and others. Communicable diseases, such as COVID-19, have the potential to spread quickly through the homeless community. As such, it is especially important that unsheltered individuals have access to free, public restrooms with hand washing facilities.

To meet the needs of San Francisco’s approximately 5,180 unsheltered individuals at a ratio one restroom for 50 unsheltered persons, the City needs approximately 65 additional restrooms. Having a sufficient number of restrooms equipped with hand washing facilities will allow people to maintain proper personal hygiene and to frequently and thoroughly wash their hands, and will help slow community spread of COVID19.

For these reasons and more, please support Supervisor Haney’s ordinance to provide restroom and handwashing facilities for unsheltered people. If you have any questions, you may contact me at wsaver@glide.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wesley Saver', written in a cursive style.

Wesley Saver
Policy Manager, GLIDE

Cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors via angela.calvillo@sfgov.org

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter of support, Intermediate-Length Occupancy legislation at Board of Supervisors 5/5/2020
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:29:00 PM

From: Cynthia Gómez <cgomez@unitehere2.org>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:37 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter of support, Intermediate-Length Occupancy legislation at Board of Supervisors 5/5/2020

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

This letter is in support of the Intermediate Length Occupancy Ordinance (Item #11 on tomorrow's board agenda) to be considered at the Board of Supervisors on May 5, 2020. This legislation will be an important step in protecting affordable housing, which in the weeks and months to come will be sorely needed. As tenants and working people struggle with the financial hit of the Covid-19 crisis, we will need this protection for affordable housing.

Corporate rental companies benefit from renting out housing units as extended-stay hotels in all but name. These units are often marketed to highly professionalized tenants, capable of paying inflated rents for a few months' stay in a furnished apartment. These corporate-managed units further inflate market-rate rents and limit the "tenancy" under a temporary lease. This pushes the housing cost well outside what's affordable to tens of thousands of service sector workers in San Francisco, including our members, many of whom are struggling to reside in the city where they work. This legislation would prohibit corporate rentals in units subject to rent control and would allow the City to exert control over how many units in a building can be turned into an extended-stay hotel, as well as allow a Conditional Use process for future corporate rentals.

Without this ordinance, we risk continuing to lose existing housing units as corporations convert apartments into corporate rentals. And, as we saw recently with the 60-unit building at 2100 Market St, these protections are essential for new development as well. 2100 Market St offered a "boutique living service" instead of apartments. Developers and landlords are capitalizing on this loophole, and they are incentivized to do it: they minimize risk by signing with a company like Sonder as the master tenant, marketer and property manager, who then maximize profits by inflating temporary rents.

And, equally important to housing considerations: are the jobs created – the cleaners, the 24-hour concierges, the repair professionals -- by this type of extended-stay hotel able to sustain a person to be a part of their community? Unfortunately, with these types of jobs, the work is often low paying, temporary, and lacks benefits. Can a person working this type of job be involved in her kid's school, for example, take part in her community, and have to work only one job to pay the bills? Contrast this with the good jobs that are available at city hotels, where our members are paid living wages, receive a pension and healthcare, and have dignity and respect on the job.

This ordinance closes what is in effect a land use loophole that has benefitted wealthy corporations and landlords over long-term residents and workers.

Thank you,

--

Cynthia Gómez
Senior Research Analyst
she/her/hers
UNITE/HERE, Local 2
209 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
cgomez@unitehere2.org
[415.864.8770](tel:415.864.8770), ext. 763

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: 4 letters for File No. 200410
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 1:54:00 PM
Attachments: [RE Stop housing out of town homeless.msg](#)
[RE Testimony re HSA \(separate from testimony on hotels\).msg](#)
[RE Dear Supervisors.msg](#)
[FW For todays committee meeting Hotel placement of homeless and others.msg](#)

Hello,

Attached are 4 letters received for File No. 200410.

File No. 200410 - Hearing to receive an update on the status of hotel contracting, referral, census, staffing, operations, and compliance with the Emergency Ordinance - Limiting COVID-19 Impacts through Safe Shelter Options (File No. 200363); and requesting the Mayor's Office, Department of Emergency Management, Department of Public Health, Department of Human Resources, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, and Human Services Agency to report.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: For today's committee meeting: Hotel placement of homeless and others
Date: Friday, May 1, 2020 5:02:26 PM

This one if for next week c-pages.

JEC

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

From: Carroll, John (BOS)
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 5:02 PM
To: Leigh Escobedo <escobedofam@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: RE: For today's committee meeting: Hotel placement of homeless and others

Thank you for your comments. I am adding your letter to the open file for this hearing.

John Carroll

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

From: Leigh Escobedo <escobedofam@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 12:52 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: For today's committee meeting: Hotel placement of homeless and others

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

I am recently retired from Tom Waddell Clinic and Supportive Housing. I worked at The Empress and at The Plaza. In my 15 years at these homeless venues I never once saw the Mayor or Supervisors visit. When I spoke with them at events I always invited them.

My comments on placing homeless in regular hotels:

#1: Assigning staff without experience with the homeless population is unsafe for the workers.

The level of staffing needed is probably not possible.

#2: Working in supportive housing was difficult and traumatic. Clients are in and out of the hospital, alcohol and drug recovery, unable to care for themselves even with some help in these 'independent living' sites. Having them scattered throughout the city in hotels is, I will just say, ridiculous!

#3: Many clients in supportive housing need 'higher levels of care'. A true assisted living or Laguna Honda. The city can build these on the current Laguna Honda site. My guess is that the money saved on frequent medical would pay for this over the long term. If those clients are moved into the care they need, rooms and apartments would be freed up in supportive housing.

#4: There are brilliant nurses, doctors, other providers, case managers, paramedics, fire people, and clients themselves that could inform the 'powers that be' on what is really needed. Have a round table with the staff that work in supportive housing, SROs, respite and sobering, and with the first responders. These frontline staff can tell you what is working and what is not.

#5: The Mayor and Supervisors should visit every site that houses the homeless. Sit with the staff and clients.

Listen, watch.

Thank you! I have lots of informative experience and am happy to share.

Leigh Escobedo PHN

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Mary Magee](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Dear Supervisors,
Date: Friday, May 1, 2020 5:03:25 PM

Thank you for your comments. I am adding your letter to the open file for this hearing.

John Carroll

From: Mary Magee <mageemc@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 4:14 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Dear Supervisors,

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am a registered nurse who worked for four years at a supportive housing hotel in Tenderloin through the DPH's Direct Access to Housing. After 23 years as a nurse, and 21 years at SFGH, my chosen transition to working in a supportive housing was the biggest professional challenge that I underwent in my career. I was the initially the only nurse in a building of 80 people, then advocated for a half time nurse. During my four years there, there was a room set on fire via a cigarette, a resident jumped out a window (her life saved only by an awning and my holding her body up from below while waiting for 911) , multiple people were found dead (either from disease or OD), one resident hung himself, one person was stabbed, another resident bled to death in her room, and residents were threatened, sexually exploited, and robbed by one another regularly. Falls were frequent and often required 911 assistance. It was also a vibrant community, in which the staff (case managers, property managers and nurse) joined the residents in trying to build some relationships of trust, which took time.

As a nurse, I managed medication for about 30 residents. I could not possibly check in on 80 patients daily . However, I did many room checks and nursing assessments, and called 911 multiple times a week if not per day for medical emergencies that arose regularly. There were a preponderance of folks who could not self manage themselves and would have been endangered if they did not have IHSS workers to assist them with laundry, shopping and keeping room clean enough to avoid eviction.

Unlike what I am hearing about the current deployment of nurses to the newly set up hotels, I was

not responsible for finding linen or assuring that 100 meals were developed. I had an office and was well supplied unlike nurses who report having to stand for 12 hours in a lobby. We would admit no more than 2 people a day while these hotels have admitted one person every 30 minutes. I understand the urgency of getting people off the street, but the hotels need to be well staffed to handle this degree of admissions. I also did not have to deal with a large number of citizens walking in asking for shelter and services that they are hearing about. And I was not asked to distribute cigarettes and alcohol, which then ran out while people still asking for them.

I actively pursued work in the supportive housing setting and this meaningful work changed my life. But in the end, the work was exhausting and the staffing insufficient. If this is true in the long established supportive housing hotels, how much harder is it in these quickly thrown together hotels in the midst of a pandemic.

Please consider the following:

Do deployed workers have a clear chain of command to use as resources and to clarify issues?

How available are the staff supervisors and do they check in at the sites? Do these supervisors have experience working with this population?

Have the deployed nurses had recent experiencing working with with medically complex adults (we have heard that some nurses are being deployed from foster care and maternity).

Are the nurses' duties clearly spelled out? Is it "do the best you can" or are there clear duties spelled out? It is the natural inclination for a nurse to feel responsible for a patient medically, but this is not feasible with the current staffing, so clear duties helpful, albeit with some flexibility in a setting so much less controlled than what they are used to .

Will nurses have responsibility for helping people with medications? Must have access to a computer with EPIC database loaded if nurse is going to be able to check records, contact primary care, etc.

Will the nurses/deployed workers have a designated area that will have chairs, phones workspace, and supplies, available from the beginning of deployment?

Training on Narcan usage or encourage comfort level with calling 911.

Training on full PPE in case it is needed (only inpatient nurses would have recent experience with full PPE).

Coordination with other job classes also working there? Coordination with security?

Feedback loop so issues can be resolved and changes made?

I appreciate your patience with this long testimony and ask that you consider seriously these concerns.

Mary Magee

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Barbara Amato](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Stop housing "out of town " homeless
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:54:33 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comments.

By copy of this message, I'm forwarding your concerns to the Board of Supervisors.

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

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

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

From: Barbara Amato <barb.94110@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 3, 2020 12:23 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Stop housing "out of town " homeless

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

Dear Mr. Carroll,

I am a San Francisco home owner and taxpayer concerned about out of town homeless coming into

the City for free services and hotel rooms. Please convey to Supervisors my concern and request ask them to put the brakes on objective to house the homeless. And to stop blaming and shaming the Mayor. This is a really tough and difficult task and now the word is out for all homeless to come to San Francisco for free services and housing! Wow! We look ridiculous! If you want to help you go out there in the streets and see for yourself instead of complaining from high almighty.

Sincerely,
Barbara Amato
94110

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Mary Magee](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Testimony re: HSA (separate from testimony on hotels)
Date: Friday, May 1, 2020 5:03:56 PM

Thank you for your comments. I am adding your letter to the open file for this hearing.

John Carroll

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

From: Mary Magee <mageemc@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 5:40 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Testimony re: HSA (separate from testimony on hotels)

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

Dear Supervisors,

I have just finished listening to the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting's Hotel Operations Update. I would like to comment on the issue of HSA's deployment of furloughed workers

The following was reported to me by a deployed HSA employee who experienced the following. A few weeks ago HSA was deploying clerks (clerical workers) to work in a motel setting where patients from Laguna Honda were placed. These workers were given less than 24 hours notice and for some, their shifts had been changed significantly. At a training the next day, they were given very general information and training re: their DSW status and a binder. Duties were NOT described in detail. Workers, who had received an email that they were being deployed to a city COVID/quarantine site were not told that the residents in the hotel were not COVID+. They lived in fear, not knowing either way, and understandably assuming the residents were COVID+. No protective supplies such as masks, gloves, or sanitizer were provided on site. The workers brought them from home. It was very worrying for them-their usual positions are clerical. Though they were told that as on site monitors, they would only be doing non medical triage, a medical issue did come up.

This method of deployment leaves a lot to be desired in terms of adequate notice, communications, coordination, training. A binder is not training, and a sense of safety.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues, and for the hearing.

Sincerely, Mary Magee

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: The grandstanding die-in
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:01:00 PM

From: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 10:38 AM
To: anna.bauman@sfchronicle.com
Cc: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: The grandstanding die-in

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

About your piece:

Protesters hold 'die-in' outside Mayor Breed's home

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Protesters-hold-die-in-outside-Mayor-15239121.php?t=996342983d>

These protesters do not speak for most homeless. I have been homeless since 2009 and strongly disagree with all City Hall half-baked plans to provide temporary shelter.

I don't deny some need shelter but if you do not read my 1800 word essay bow, pleas look at this short YouTube video. At the 1:14 mark is a homeless man in a mobility wheelchair at the right side of video. He has no arms and no legs. He should be the easiest to offer housing with assistant. No one from City Hall or these protesters will ask him what he needs. They judge and judge wrong, me included. And I have never been able to walk myself.

https://youtu.be/P_x_3DaGwyg

“**Shut up, sit down and Listen: I am San Francisco’s Homeless Expert**” by Allen Jones

<https://link.medium.com/LNuxy0t3W5>

Allen Jones
(415) 756-7733
jones-allen@att.net

Californiaclemency.org

The Only thing I love more than justice is the freedom to fight for it.
--AllenJones--

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Homelessness
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 5:03:00 PM

From: Andres Lucero <andres.success@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:27 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Homelessness

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

Hello Board ,

I have sent this to the mayor. This is the second time that find a lifeless body when driving into to my garage on Austin and Gough on the side of the church. People pass these lifeless bodies with no compassion I saw several people pass him and not even stop to care. I called 911 and our first responders came. He was not responsive. They took him away his hands were curled and blue. I hope he makes it. I am graduating from SFSU and recently wrote a paper that cited that we had about 7000 homeless when Mayor Agnos was in office. We now have significantly more than that. The issue in 1989 was public housing and dealing with homelessness. 30 YEARS LATER NOTHING HAS CHANGED except the amount of homeless. Immigrants are sleeping on the streets because there is no housing for them during this time what about these churches! People are overdosing on the street. We need to make a real attempt as a leading city. Why can't someone undertake this. We need a task unit this is not something that elected officials seem to have time for. I will send a photo every time I have to call 911 and send letters. This is an inherited problem that we can't keep passing on. Lets help people and keep our first responders safe as well. Today around 7am.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: "Kar Keys" for Post-Coronavirus Homelessness
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 5:05:00 PM

From: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:10 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; metro@sfchronicle.com; newstips <newstips@sfexaminer.com>
Cc: Heather Knight <hknight@sfchronicle.com>; Kevin Fagan <kfagan@sfchronicle.com>; P. Matier <pmatier@sfchronicle.com>; Joshua S <jsabatini@sfexaminer.com>; Heiken, Emma (MYR) <emma.heiken@sfgov.org>
Subject: "Kar Keys" for Post-Coronavirus Homelessness

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

Attention: All Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

After listening to a San Francisco Chronicle podcast hosted by Heather Knight on the topic: "Making Tent Camps Safe" I first shook my head. Then I wrote my plan, which is 1800 words. Though I do to expect my idea will be given any respect, consider the fact, in the 10 years I was homeless it cost The City nothing. And my idea is to expand your idea.

"Kar Keys" for Post-Coronavirus Homelessness

In 2009, I lost my home to foreclosure. The experience, which I learned to love, led to me becoming an expert on being homeless. Therefore, I am confident in saying, if we are more creative, we can get the upper hand on homelessness in post-Coronavirus living San Francisco.

Honestly, time flew by. Mainly because I stayed busy and had a lot of fun with this ten plus year adventure that I determined would last no more than a year. And if it had not been for a bad transmission, I would still be living in my truck and authoring this essay from it.

I proposed we extend on an existing city pilot program but change the name to, "Kar Keys." But the only engines in these cars would be,

homeless San Franciscans, equipped with enough dignity and respect to navigate this part of their life with more hope for the future.

Evidence suggests, San Francisco City Hall does not give a damn about people who really need to be off the streets. They only want to push the homeless out of sight and out of mind. Especially those with severe mental illness. I call it as I see it. Again, City Hall does not care about the homeless.

I defend my statement with the fact, there are too many people in wheelchairs living on the streets of San Francisco. This lack of care is worse than countries that warehouse the disabled in institutions. The easiest homeless to get off the streets should be a person who has no legs or arms and is wheelchair-bound; namely, "Shorty." A wheelchair-bound homeless meth addict.

The latest attempts vomited out of City Hall of suitable shelters for all homeless juxtaposed with the number of wheelchair-bound still living on the streets; equals, they do not care.

Consider this: The San Francisco Board of Supervisors recently passed a law to house 7000 homeless a month temporarily. Then some of these same lawmakers' next piece of proposed legislation called for using vacant parking lots for tent encampments and using city parks to allow tent encampments. To throw anything, at something, to get a problem to go away, is evidence of incompetence or worse: Do not care.

In follow up to March 17, 2020, Department of Public Health Shelter-in-place order announced by Mayor London Breed, she then announced in April 2020 that The City had obtained space at Pier 94 that will accommodate 120 RVs and trailers for the homeless and those who need quarantine due to the Coronavirus. I support this move by the mayor. But it is safe to say not one of these RVs or trailers is wheelchair accessible.

Adding a non-solution, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a law to spend \$58.6 million a month to house 8,250 homeless, first responders, and quarantined in hotels due to COVID-19 temporarily, of which 7000 are for the homeless and 1,250 for first responders and those in need of quarantine. This new law does not place any special emphasis on the many wheelchair-bound homeless on our streets who need preferential or special treatment.

San Francisco is currently spending more than \$340 million a year on homeless services. And the problem is getting worse. This includes in addition to overcrowded shelters, in December of 2019, San Francisco has opened a pilot program at the Balboa Park BART station for 30 slots where RVs and people living in their cars can stay. There are basic amenities like showers, portable toilets, and security. But wait a minute. This program created in response to residents across The City fed up with the disrespect people living in vehicles displayed. In other words, pushing the homeless aside solves nothing.

The mission should be to help the homeless be a part of The City and not tear the city apart.

I fell in love with my alternative living situation in my first winter rainstorm. I looked forward to rainy days because they were so peaceful. But I know that is not the experience of most who experience homelessness.

One man told me how brutal it was for him when it was cold or rained and I felt guilty for loving when it rained. Nevertheless, being homeless does not have to be so cruel if you are creative and respect yourself and others.

What made it so easy for me to live in a vehicle was the fact, I had bought a brand-new Ford pickup the year prior. My 2008 Ford F-150 was so nice, I even loved to stay in it when I had a home. — -Keep that point in mind.

But before I get to the “Key,” let me address the need of using a toilet. My clean appearance and daily routine never denied me the use of businesses or public services when needed. In other words, I hid my being homeless behind being clean, and that allowed me access to at least twenty bathrooms throughout The City to choose from when needed.

The key to enjoying living in a vehicle was the fact that I learned to keep my truck and body clean. In fact, I have nine siblings that have all been in my truck while I lived in it and they all marveled at the fact I kept it and myself so clean. But I did receive occasional reminders that my breath was not as fresh.

I have seen vehicles that appeared to have as much junk in them that would cause home hoarders to seek treatment. I would say, “How you can drive in that thing is amazing.” With that in mind, I sympathize with the NIMBYS who would balk at what I describe as being creative.

Based on my experience, I offer my “Kar Keys” solution to tent encampment living in the era of COVID-19 and for post-COVID-19: City Hall should use decommissioned city fleet vehicles and/or luxury vehicles for sheltering the homeless. These vehicles would be the ultimate “Social distancing” for the homeless during COVID-19. And the homeless need a post-COVID-19 acceptable alternative to tents and tent encampment.

Using refurbished vehicles as a shelter for the homeless could save The City millions of dollars overall and resources if done right.

Removing the engine for added storage space, the best type of vehicle would be a 4-door sedan (police cars) luxury vehicle (Lincoln Town Car or Cadillac) or any number of classy looking cars. Giving the vehicles an appealing high-gloss paint job that even critics would smile at, we could make the interior look equally impressive to the outside.

Then hooking up the “Shelter” with a portable solar power source, this power would be able to run a few necessities safely.

Most importantly these shelter vehicles parked, no more than two per city block preferably near vacant storefronts would cut tent living by 90% as I see it once fully implemented.

With cooperation from property owners, allow the homeless to use their facilities (Install a portable shower if needed) and offer penalty waivers from the vacant storefront law (Prop. D) recently passed by the SF voters. This would not prevent owners of these storefronts who find suitable tenants from renting their storefront. Towing the shelter vehicles to new locations would be to a pre-approved site.

According to the Department of Building Inspection, there are more than 500 vacant building storefronts. But I estimate there should be no less than twelve-hundred vehicles throughout The City for this one program.

There are 5,321 city blocks in San Francisco, and I would not object to having shelter vehicles on both sides of a selected street. But wherever we park these vehicles, they could offer one added feature: Street surveillance cameras placed out of reach of vandals, of course, could aid in the reduction of car break-ins in some high break-in locations. I would also notify with all (including the NIMBYS) who lived or had businesses within three blocks of such vehicles.

If the homeless ignore encouragement to help The City with the upkeep of the vehicles and surrounding area they should be first admonished and then risk losing the use of this new type of “shelter.”

This is better than San Francisco’s “Navigation Center” shelter program in many ways; chiefly privacy. But beyond the added street surveillance feature, keeping better track of our homeless is necessary and with the use of our already “Hot Team” service, we can reduce the ugly tent

encampments to near zero. And for those like myself who now use a mobility scooter, wheelchair, or even those pushing a baby stroller, there is less of a chance that we run into a tent blocking our path.

I call this program “Kar Keys” is opposed to Gov. Gavin Newsom’s “Operation Room Key,” where the California governor has bragged about obtaining more than 15,000 hotel rooms for the homeless as some genuine answer to COVID-19 Shelter-in-place for homeless. The difference? The governor’s program is temporary, my plan is until one gets their act together if so desired.

Of course, there is the concern of people using vehicles for criminal activity. To that I say, I was not born yesterday. And I would not dream of suggesting a project with such an enormous potential for misuse. In other words, you cannot out slick them, but you can outsmart them.

I have seen where The City has embraced “Parklets” and some restaurants and customers swear by them. And I admit, I am not a fan even though some are appealing. But personally, I would rather see a Lincoln Town Car parked on the street than a Parklet.

One restaurant owner said his business increased by 20% after he invested \$20,000.00 for the parklet outside of his business with an annual upkeep of \$500.00. In contrast, Kar Keys could eliminate completely the need for the costly and troubled-plagued city-run shelters once fully functional.

Sure, it would be nice to have a home for anyone who wanted one. But the biggest mistake City Hall and city residents make concerning the homeless is thinking for the homeless or trying to babysit the homeless. In other words, not everyone can handle living in a house or apartment.

Respect the homeless and their desire for privacy and we will cut our homeless problem in half with this one concession called Kar Keys. As San Francisco’s most successful homeless expert, I guarantee it.

I am already laughing at the fact; my Kar Keys plan is sure to receive criticism without mercy before hearing the meat of the details. However, anyone silly enough to think we do not need to plan better for post-Coronavirus homelessness will also be criticizing how many people/families live in their vehicles due to poor or shortsighted planning for post-Coronavirus life. Then what?

Posted on Medium:

<https://medium.com/@calclemency/kar-keys-for-post-coronavirus-homelessness-b622f9e98cd0>

Allen Jones

jones-allen@att.net

(415) 756-7733

californiaclemency.org

The only thing I love more than justice is the freedom to fight for it. -- Allen Jones --

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #11 Planning, Administrative Codes - Residential Occupancy File #191075
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:01:58 PM

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am supporting this legislation which would create intermediate length occupancy units.

Eileen Boken
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods *

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #15 Administrative Code - County Jail #4 Closure File #200372
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:53:47 PM

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am supporting the early closure of County Jail #4 as a means to protect the health and safety of both inmates and staff as well as to avoid the need for emergency repairs for a building which will eventually be demolished.

Eileen Boken
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods *
* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #18 Urging Accreditation Council of Graduate Medical Education to Take Action and Support Resident Physicians During COVID-19 File #200426
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:51:27 PM

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am strongly supporting this legislation to support resident physicians during COVID-19 as they are the next generation of physicians.

Eileen Boken
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods *

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: OPPOSING California Assembly Bill #2261 (Chau) - Facial Recognition Technology (Concurring with Position to Oppose in BOS Agenda Item #19 File #200427)
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:21:34 PM

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am concurring with the legislation's position to oppose State Assembly Bill No. 2261 regarding facial recognition technology.

Besides issues related to the surveillance state, this technology is currently flawed. It has even falsely identified a California State Assemblymember as a criminal.

Eileen Boken
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods *

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Leah Edwards](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff. \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ALLYSON WASHBURN](#)
Subject: Recommendations for government transparency and accountability amid COVID-19 in San Francisco
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 11:34:58 AM
Attachments: [LWVSF-SF4S letter to SF Mayor and BoS 05_04_2020.pdf](#)

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Board of Supervisors,

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco and San Franciscans for Sunshine are advocating for government transparency and accountability amid COVID-19 and future emergency situations that require limitation of in-person contact.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, California and San Francisco have rolled back provisions of state and local law that enable the public to exercise their right to know how the government is conducting work.

We understand this pandemic has stretched San Francisco government resources thin to an extent that requires different priority levels be set. However, we strongly believe that democracy and the public's right to know cannot be sacrificed in any government decisions made.

Attached is a letter with a set of recommendations for ensuring that transparency and accountability are maintained during this crisis.

Thank you for your attention on this matter, hearing our urgent concerns, and the opportunity to provide recommendations to maintain the integrity of our democracy and ensure that San Franciscans are not left in the dark as a result of this current public health crisis. We look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,
Leah Edwards and Allyson Washburn



May 4, 2020

VIA E-MAIL

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

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

RE: Advocates' recommendations for government transparency and accountability amid COVID-19 in San Francisco

Dear Mayor Breed and Board of Supervisors:

Thank you Mayor Breed for taking swift actions in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. The League of Women Voters of San Francisco and San Franciscans for Sunshine commend your efforts in these times of crisis.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, California and San Francisco have rolled back provisions of state and local law that enable the public to exercise their right to know how the government is conducting work. Meetings of various policy bodies and passive meeting bodies (e.g., advisory committees) in San Francisco are

Empowering voters. Defending democracy.

League of Women Voters of San Francisco

582 Market Street, Suite 615, San Francisco, CA 94104 · 415-989-8683 · lwvsf@lwvsf.org · lwvsf.org

being held without the level of transparency that the Brown Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance require.¹

We all acknowledge this pandemic has stretched San Francisco government resources thin to an extent that requires different priority levels be set. However, we strongly believe that democracy and the public's right to know cannot be sacrificed in any government decisions made.

The public's right to know is a hallmark of a democratic government. The League of Women Voters of San Francisco and San Franciscans for Sunshine believe that democratic bodies must protect that right; California Government Code states that access to information is a "fundamental and necessary right of every person in the state"²; and the California Supreme Court has held that "openness in government is essential to the functioning of a democracy."³ Further, San Francisco's own Sunshine Ordinance, passed by the city's voters in November 1999, states in San Francisco Administrative Code, "government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public."⁴

During times of crisis, it is more imperative than ever to protect this right and the policies that enable this right to be exercised. We have drafted a set of recommendations for ensuring that transparency and accountability are maintained during this crisis:

¹Mayoral Declarations impacting government transparency: Section 5 of the [Second Supplemental Declaration](#) from March 13, 2020 suspends "Immediate Disclosure Request" protocols (see page 6); Section 5 of the [Third Supplemental Declaration](#) from March 17, 2020 suspends public meetings (see page 4); Section 6 to 8 of the [Fifth Supplemental Declaration](#) from March 23, 2020 suspends provisions of the [Brown Act](#), the [California Public Records Act](#), and the [Sunshine Ordinance](#) (see pages 7 to 9); Section 1 of the [Eighth Supplemental Declaration](#) from April 1, 2020 extends Section 5 of the Third Supplemental Declaration to May 3, 2020 (see page 3); and Section 3 of the [Twelfth Supplemental Declaration](#) from April 30, 2020 extends Section 5 of the Third Supplemental Declaration to May 31, 2020 (see page 7).

² [CA Govt Code § 6250 \(2016\)](#).

³ *International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 319, 328.

⁴ [Provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance - Section 67.1\(a\)](#)

Recommendations

Access to public meetings, government offices, and policy decisions

Provide easy access from the sfgov.org homepage to the following:

1. A chronological listing of the current week's meetings at a minimum. A link to this information that can be accessed through a top banner notification on all sfgov.org webpages including all executive branch departments and enterprise agencies that have their own branded domain name URL, and will also be posted on the sfbos.org website. Please see sfbos.org as an example.
2. A list of all city policy and advisory bodies⁵ that have received permission from the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to meet.
3. A list of all offices completely closed to operations.
4. A list of all offices open and remotely working, including those making and implementing policy.
5. A list of all policy decisions related to the current crisis and shelter-in-place orders including adjustments to all government operations and public services.

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force must (virtually) resume meetings

The Mayor's Executive Orders directly impact the Sunshine Ordinance and, therefore, impedes the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force from meeting.

The Sunshine Ordinance establishes the public's right to know by holding the government accountable under San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.1(f): "the people of San Francisco enact these amendments to assure that the people of the City remain in control of the government they have created" (see Attachment A), and Administrative Code Section 67.30(c): "The task force shall report to the Board of Supervisors at least once annually on any practical or policy problems encountered in the administration of this chapter." The Sunshine Ordinance Task

⁵ Defined in Section 5 of the [Third Supplemental Declaration](#). Section 5 is in effect through May 31, 2020 from Section 3 of the [Twelfth Supplemental Declaration](#).

Force should provide the continual monitoring of the administration of the Ordinance in this extraordinary time of crisis.

We urge the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to authorize the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to meet by teleconference to review, advise, and make recommendations on the sunshine-related ramifications of the Mayor's Executive Orders.

In summary

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco and San Franciscans for Sunshine believe in a democratic government that requires governmental bodies to protect the public's right to know by giving adequate notice of proposed actions, holding open meetings, and making public records accessible. We call on the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to set protocols for our democracy to function as established. We want to be part of helping create long-term solutions for the government to remain effective in conducting the people's business in full public view, no matter the circumstances.

Thank you for your attention on this matter, hearing our urgent concerns, and the opportunity to provide recommendations to maintain the integrity of our democracy and ensure that San Franciscans are not left in the dark as a result of this current public health crisis.

We look forward to working with you and engaging in a discussion on our recommendations. Please contact Leah Edwards, President of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, at l.edwards@lwvsf.org or 415-989-8683.

Sincerely,

Leah Edwards
President, League of Women Voters of San Francisco
l.edwards@lwvsf.org

Allyson Washburn
Chair of the Steering Committee, San Franciscans for Sunshine



Past President, League of Women Voters of San Francisco
amwashburn@comcast.net

Attachments: 1

CC: The Honorable Norman Yee, President, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Sandra Lee Fewer, Supervisor, District 1
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Supervisor, District 3
The Honorable Gordon Mar, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, District 5
The Honorable Matt Haney, Supervisor, District 6
The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Supervisor, District 10
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Supervisor, District 11
Angela Calvillo, Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Attachment A

From [Provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance - Section 67](#).

Sec. 67.1 Findings and Purpose.

The Board of Supervisors and the People of the City and County of San Francisco find and declare:

(a) Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public.

(b) Elected officials, commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. The people do not cede to these entities the right to decide what the people should know about the operations of local government.

(c) Although California has a long tradition of laws designed to protect the public's access to the workings of government, every generation of governmental leaders includes officials who feel more comfortable conducting public business away from the scrutiny of those who elect and employ them. New approaches to government constantly offer public officials additional ways to hide the making of public policy from the public. As government evolves, so must the laws designed to ensure that the process remains visible.

(d) The right of the people to know what their government and those acting on behalf of their government are doing is fundamental to democracy, and with very few exceptions, that right supersedes any other policy interest government officials may use to prevent public access to information. Only in rare and unusual circumstances does the public benefit from allowing the business of government to be conducted in secret, and those circumstances should be carefully and narrowly defined to prevent public officials from abusing their authority.

(e) Public officials who attempt to conduct the public's business in secret should be held accountable for their actions. Only a strong Open Government and Sunshine Ordinance, enforced by a strong Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, can protect the public's interest in open government.

(f) The people of San Francisco enact these amendments to assure that the people of the City remain in control of the government they have created.

(g) Private entities and individuals and employees and officials of the City and County of San Francisco have rights to privacy that must be respected. However, when a person or entity is before a policy body or passive meeting body, that person, and the public, has the right to an open and public process.

Administrative Code Section 67.30(c), The task force shall propose to the Board of Supervisors amendments to this chapter. The task force shall report to the Board of Supervisors at least once annually on any practical or policy problems encountered in the administration of this chapter.”

From: [Steve Ward](#)
To: outlands.planning@pb04.ascendbywix.com; [Mar_Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Steve Ward](#); [Kathy Howard](#); [Maren Larsen](#); [Buffy Maguire](#); [Great Scot](#); [Stefani_Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Preston_Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar_Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney_Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton_Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin_Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai_Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen_Hillary](#); [Yee_Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer_Sandra \(BOS\)](#); aaron.hyland.hpc; dianematsuda; [Black_Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Foley_Chris \(CPC\)](#); [RSEJohns](#); jonathan.pearlman.hpc; [So_Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin_Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Fung_Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel_Joel \(CPC\)](#); mooreurban@aol.com; [Johnson_Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial_Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond_Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Rachel Grant](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Outlands Planning Council
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 4:11:07 PM

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

The Planning Commission's plan to disregard the character and desires of our local community is pointing toward a Manhattanization of our neighborhood La Playa Park Village in particular and the Sunset in general. **It was hatched under the umbrella of Home San Francisco, a law authored by a supervisor who went to work directly for development and real estate interests after leaving office. The plan is just another baseless assault on quality of life in various communities and on the beauty of San Francisco. While much of the city is contoured as an amphitheater looking onto water the planning department continues to approve the Fontana Building type obstructions while disregarding objections of local community. The effect of this abomination is citywide but a particular target is the Sunset District. This is evidenced by the new buildings at 42nd avenue and Noriega street and the construction on Sloat and 48th avenue. Further objectionable permanent protrusions are in the Outlands Plan for both sides of Judah Street between 45th and 44th avenues. No weight is given to the contrary character of the neighborhood, conformity to the general community outlay, future impact as a precedent, increase in congestion, unplanned for burdens on infrastructure including services and the needs and desires of the people in the immediate surrounding area. These problems are multiplied by the pandemic which will dampen the public's willingness to take public transportation and increase the propensity for contagion. The only winners in this are the development interests and the politicians they support. There are areas that can sensibly accommodate new housing without these destructive results. San Francisco is the densest city west of the Hudson River. Build with discretion let the needs and desires of the people who live near where the development will come to rest be among the highest priority.**

Steve Ward

2nd Gen San Franciscan & Sunset Resident

On Monday, April 6, 2020, 8:13:21 PM PDT, seaward94122@juno.com <seaward94122@juno.com> wrote:

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Outlands Planning Council" <outlands.planning@pb04.ascendbywix.com>

To: "steve ward" <seaward94122@juno.com>

Subject: Outlands Planning Council

Date: Mon, 06 Apr 2020 21:25:52 +0000

<!doctype html>

[Can't See This Message? View in a browser](#)

Outlands Planning Council

April 6, 2020 - Special Public Notice



Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, April 9, 2020 will be via Teleconference.

Currently all items of interest to OPC districts have been postponed to later dates. However, now is a good time to review a significant item of interest that is proposed for presentation on April 30, 2020:

- Final Report of the [Housing Affordability Strategies](#).
This report will inform significant updates to the [San Francisco General Plan, 2022 Housing Element Update](#). Please review the report document for 3 primary proposals to increase housing construction. While initial public forums were held at the end of 2018, it will be increasingly important for the public to express opinions on the information presented in the report. That public feedback will help determine how the strategies are incorporated into the SF [General Plan Housing Element](#).

Public Calendar items and notes will be updated on the OPC [Calendar](#) page.

Get Our Latest Updates

Share Via:



Outlands Planning Council



Created with



Love it? [Discover more](#)

[You've received this email because you are a subscriber of this site](#)
[If you feel you received it by mistake or wish to unsubscribe, click here](#)

From: [SFPaRC](#)
To: [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [mooreurban@aol.com](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [aaron.hyland.hpc](#); [dianematsuda](#); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [RSEJohns](#); [jonathan.pearlman.hpc](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: ["aeboken"](#)
Subject: File 2020-000052PCA, Standard Environmental Requirements (SER), Code Amendments - Request for continuance until at least one month after the end of the stay-at-home order
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 2:34:23 PM
Attachments: [SER Ordinance - SPEAK - 4-30-20.pdf](#)

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

[SPEAK SUNSET PARKSIDE EDUCATION AND ACTION COMMITTEE](#)
[1329 7th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94122-2507 \(415\) 976-4816](#)

April 30, 2020
 San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
 Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: File 2020-000052PCA, Standard Environmental Requirements (SER), Code Amendments - **Request for continuance until at least one month after the end of the stay-at-home order**

Commission President Aaron Jon Hyland,

As a community organization committed to public input and transparency in government, SPEAK is very concerned about the proposed Standard Environmental Requirements (SER) Ordinance and the fact that the Historic Preservation Commission is planning to hear and possibly vote on this ordinance during the shelter-in-place order.

This is not the time to implement such a sweeping change to the CEQA process in San Francisco. Our residents are deeply concerned about the coronavirus and have to deal daily with the impacts on their families. In particular, many frontline responders - including doctors, nurses, emergency room workers as well as food service workers and delivery people - are working long hours to save lives and trying to keep everyone fed and housed. They are not able to participate in this discussion. And yet the proposed change will affect them.

SPEAK urges the Historic Preservation Commission to continue any consideration of and vote on the proposed SER ordinance until at least one month after the shelter-in-place orders for San Francisco have been lifted, so that the public can gather in person, and discuss and weigh in on the proposed SER ordinance in an informed and effective manner.

Sincerely,

Eileen Boken

Eileen Boken, President

cc: Historic Preservation Commissioners
Planning Commissioners
Board of Supervisors

SPEAK SUNSET PARKSIDE EDUCATION AND ACTION COMMITTEE
1329 7th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94122-2507 (415) 976-4816

April 30, 2020

San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: File 2020-000052PCA, Standard Environmental Requirements (SER), Code Amendments - **Request for continuance until at least one month after the end of the stay-at-home order**

Commission President Aaron Jon Hyland,

As a community organization committed to public input and transparency in government, SPEAK is very concerned about the proposed Standard Environmental Requirements (SER) Ordinance and the fact that the Historic Preservation Commission is planning to hear and possibly vote on this ordinance during the shelter-in-place order.

This is not the time to implement such a sweeping change to the CEQA process in San Francisco. Our residents are deeply concerned about the coronavirus and have to deal daily with the impacts on their families. In particular, many frontline responders - including doctors, nurses, emergency room workers as well as food service workers and delivery people - are working long hours to save lives and trying to keep everyone fed and housed. They are not able to participate in this discussion. And yet the proposed change will affect them.

SPEAK urges the Historic Preservation Commission to continue any consideration of and vote on the proposed SER ordinance until at least one month after the shelter-in-place orders for San Francisco have been lifted, so that the public can gather in person, and discuss and weigh in on the proposed SER ordinance in an informed and effective manner.

Sincerely,

Eileen Boken

Eileen Boken, President

cc: Historic Preservation Commissioners
Planning Commissioners
Board of Supervisors

From: [Nancy Wuerfel](#)
To: [aaron.hyland.hpc](#); [dianematsuda](#); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [RSEJohns](#); [jonathan.pearlman.hpc](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [mooreurban@aol.com](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please continue item 7 SER at the May 6 HPC meeting
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 5:13:46 PM

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

Commissioners:

The standard environmental requirements, item 7, must be continued until the coronavirus restrictions are lifted and the public can testify in person to the HPC. As currently written, this proposal is a blank check without any specifics named that are the actual **requirements** to be used to justify a categorical exemption. This important discussion can wait until face to face meetings between commissioners and the public are once again held at city hall. There is no need to rush into this controversial change to our CEQA review.

Thank you for considering a continuance,

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel

From: [Scott Bird](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haneystaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Letter from San Francisco League of Revolutionaries to Governor Gavin Newsom
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 11:20:32 AM

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

April 14, 2020

Open Letter To:

Governor Gavin Newsom
1303 10th Street, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-2841
Fax: (916) 558-3160

We the undersigned urgently demand these basic things of our local and federal government, in this dangerous time of crisis, and beyond:

We demand that our tax dollars be used to take care of people and their needs, all people, and not to bail out the corporations.

We demand that this government, and all governments, concentrate on working together to save humanity.

We demand, in order to stop the virus from spreading, 3 months of a real quarantine, where all workers stay home.

We demand the government guarantee to all people a basic minimum income large enough to fulfill our needs and afford us a decent life.

We demand that all homeless people be given homes, during this crisis and permanently, to end the suffering and moral shame of homelessness in this richest of all nations.

We demand the payment of rent, mortgages, utilities, and all other outstanding debts be waived for the duration of the crisis and as long as is needed thereafter.

We demand that all essential workers must be tested for the virus, so if anyone is sick they can go into quarantine to be taken care of.

We demand that all essential workers who are healthy – from doctors and nurses, to janitors and farmworkers, to retail and grocery workers - be provided with what they need to protect their lives while they take care of us.

We demand an end to wars of aggression against Venezuela, Cuba, Iran, or anywhere on the planet.

We demand that the money from the military budget, \$700 trillion dollars, be used instead to bail out the workers.

We demand that free medical care be available for all.

We demand that the police and national guard, instead of making war and terrorizing our black, brown and poor white communities, serve and protect them by delivering the food and medicine to the people while we are in quarantine.

Corona is the virus. Capitalism is the pandemic.

We understand all of these demands address the inherent flaws of a capitalist society. If we do this, the people of the world will be safe from the coronavirus and the utter ineptitude of capitalism.

Signed:

Sarah Menefee, Chair of the San Francisco Area of the League of Revolutionaries for a New America (LRNA)

Cristina Gutierrez, Mothers on the March
Cesar Pereyra, Black and Brown for Justice Peace and Equality
Lisbit Bailey, Revolutionary Poets Brigade

Cc: Mayor London Breed, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

--

Scott M. Bird

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: 9 letters for a proposed Recreation and Park Department bond
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 4:23:00 PM
Attachments: [2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond.msg](#)
[2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond.msg](#)
[Dedicate funding to Jackson Park in the 2020 Parks Bond.msg](#)
[Support for the 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond.msg](#)
[2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond.msg](#)
[Support for SF Community Gardens.msg](#)
[2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond.msg](#)
[2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond.msg](#)
[2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond.msg](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 9 letters for proposed Recreation and Park Department 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond.

Regards,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Karen Rhodes](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:26:18 AM

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

May 7, 2020

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA

I am writing to express my strong support for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**, being considered for recommendation by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

I am a 30-year resident of the City and am active with a number of civic organizations devoted to parks, open space, and public space. I serve on **PROSAC**, representing District 9, and I volunteer with **the SF Parks Alliance** and one of its park partners, the **Tompkins Stairway Garden**; **WalkSF**; the **Crosstown Trail Coalition**; and the **Bay Area Ridge Trail Council**.

Our City's economic and financial situation has changed due to COVID-19. The **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** will prioritize shovel-ready projects delivering essential government services, support economic recovery through job creation for San Franciscans, provide one-time funding for behavioral health and health access, while prioritizing basic infrastructure investments in our parks and recreation facilities and right-of-way infrastructure so people can get back to work quickly and help San Francisco recover.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents sought solace and refuge in our City Parks for exercise and better mental health, especially in denser neighborhoods and in Equity Zones. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces are essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks are long lasting, and it clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

I am very supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. In particular, the 2020 Bond has identified several park, open space, and recreation facilities and improvement projects that address a

range of benefits for residents and employees to increase quality of life, mental well-being and physical health.

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** by approving the Bond proposal, which will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for their approval and placement on to the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting of our parks and City!

/Karen

Karen Rhodes

59 ½ Manchester Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: [Mary Devereaux](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hui, Mei Ling \(REC\)](#)
Subject: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 5:27:57 PM

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

May 6, 2020

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express support for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** on behalf of the Leadership Team of Craggs Court Community Garden. This 2020 Bond will be considered for recommendation by the Capital Planning Committee and Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents sought solace and refuge in our City Parks and Community Gardens for exercise and better mental health. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces is essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks and community gardens are long lasting, and it is clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

The Craggs Court Community Garden Leadership Team is supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**.

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** by approving the Bond proposal, which will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for their approval and placement on to the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting our parks, our City and our community gardens!

Mary Devereaux
For the Leadership Team of Craggs Court Community Garden

From: [Ed Stuever](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Lyslynn Lacoste](#)
Subject: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 8:41:37 AM
Attachments: [Health and Recovery Bond Letter.pdf](#)

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

May 4, 2020

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA

RE: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my support on behalf of **Friends of Youngblood Coleman Park/ Parks 94124** for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. This 2020 Bond will be considered for recommendation by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

Our City's economic and financial situation has changed due to COVID-19. The **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** will prioritize shovel-ready projects delivering essential government services, support economic recovery through job creation for San Franciscans, provide one-time funding for behavioral health and health access, while prioritizing basic infrastructure investments in our parks and recreation facilities and right-of-way infrastructure so people can get back to work quickly and help San Francisco recover.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents sought solace and refuge in our City Parks for exercise and better mental health, especially in denser neighborhoods and in Equity Zones. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces are essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks are long lasting, and it clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

Both Friends of Youngblood-Coleman park and Parks 94124 are supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City**. In particular, the 2020 Bond has identified several park, open space, and recreation facilities and improvement projects that address a range of benefits for residents and employees to increase quality of life, mental well-being and physical health.

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to

complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City** by approving the Bond proposal for the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting our parks and City!

Sincerely,

Ed Stuever
1406 Hudson Ave.
San Francisco, Ca 94124

May 4, 2020

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA

Via email Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

District 1 Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org

District 2 Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org

District 3 Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org

District 4 Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org

District 5 Dean.Preston@sfgov.org

District 6 Matt.Haney@sfgov.org

District 7 Norman.Yee@sfgov.org

District 8 Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org

District 9 Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org

District 10 Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org

District 11 Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org

RE: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my support on behalf of **Friends of Youngblood Coleman Park/ Parks 94124** for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. This 2020 Bond will be considered for recommendation by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

Our City's economic and financial situation has changed due to COVID-19. The **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** will prioritize shovel-ready projects delivering essential government services, support economic recovery through job creation for San Franciscans, provide one-time funding for behavioral health and health access, while prioritizing basic infrastructure investments in our parks and recreation facilities and right-of-way infrastructure so people can get back to work quickly and help San Francisco recover.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents sought solace and refuge in our City Parks for exercise and better mental health, especially in denser neighborhoods and in Equity Zones. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces are essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks are long lasting, and it clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

Both Friends of Youngblood-Coleman park and Parks 94124 are supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City**. In particular, the 2020 Bond has identified several park, open space, and recreation facilities and improvement projects that address a range of benefits for residents and employees to increase quality of life, mental well-being and physical health.

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City** by approving the Bond proposal for the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting our parks and City!

Sincerely,

Ed Stuever
1406 Hudson Ave.
San Francisco, Ca 94124

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ed Stuever', is located below the typed name and address. The signature is fluid and cursive.

From: [Corona Heights Community Garden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Gardens, Community \(REC\)](#)
Subject: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 5:48:15 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my support on behalf of the **Corona Heights Community Garden** for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. This 2020 Bond will be considered for recommendation by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

Our City's economic and financial situation has changed due to COVID-19. The **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** will prioritize shovel-ready projects delivering essential government services, support economic recovery through job creation for San Franciscans, provide one-time funding for behavioral health and health access, while prioritizing basic infrastructure investments in our parks and recreation facilities and right-of-way infrastructure so people can get back to work quickly and help San Francisco recover.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents are seeking solace and refuge in our City Parks for exercise and better mental health, especially in denser neighborhoods and in Equity Zones. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces are essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks are long lasting, and it clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

The **Corona Heights Community Garden** is supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. In particular, the 2020 Bond has identified several park, open space, and recreation facilities and improvement projects that address a range of benefits for residents and employees to increase quality of life, mental well-being and physical health. **Corona Heights Community Garden** was renovated in 2018 and the improvements have resulted in greater participation by the community garden members, outstanding harvests, and many appreciative comments from park visitors!

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** by approving the Bond proposal for the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting our parks and City!

Sincerely,

Lauren Whittemore
Corona Heights Community Garden Coordinator

From: [Nick Belloni](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:45:06 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my support for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. This 2020 Bond will be considered for recommendation by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

Our City's economic and financial situation has changed due to COVID-19. The **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** will prioritize shovel-ready projects delivering essential government services, support economic recovery through job creation for San Franciscans, provide one-time funding for behavioral health and health access, while prioritizing basic infrastructure investments in our parks and recreation facilities and right-of-way infrastructure so people can get back to work quickly and help San Francisco recover.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents sought solace and refuge in our City Parks for exercise and better mental health, especially in denser neighborhoods and in Equity Zones. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces are essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks are long lasting, and it clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

I am supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City**. In particular, the 2020 Bond has identified several park, open space, and recreation facilities and improvement projects that address a range of benefits for residents and employees to increase quality of life, mental well-being and physical health.

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City** by approving the Bond proposal for the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting of our parks and City!

- Nick Belloni

From: [Coupon Carol](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hui, Mei Ling \(REC\)](#)
Subject: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 1:08:04 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my support on behalf of **Clipper Terrace Community Garden** for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. This 2020 Bond will be considered for recommendation by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

Our City's economic and financial situation has changed due to COVID-19. The **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** will prioritize shovel-ready projects delivering essential government services, support economic recovery through job creation for San Franciscans, provide one-time funding for behavioral health and health access, while prioritizing basic infrastructure investments in our parks and recreation facilities and right-of-way infrastructure so people can get back to work quickly and help San Francisco recover.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents sought solace and refuge in our City Parks for exercise and better mental health, especially in denser neighborhoods and in Equity Zones. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces are essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks are long lasting, and it clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

Clipper Terrace Community Garden, is supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City**. In particular, the 2020 Bond has identified several park, open space, and recreation facilities and improvement projects that address a range of benefits for residents and employees to increase quality of life, mental well-being and physical health.

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City** by

approving the Bond proposal for the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting of our parks and City!

Sincerely,

Carol Chau, CBAP, CSPO

From: [Katherine Doumani](#)
To: [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Capital Planning Program \(ADM\)](#); [Commission, Recpark \(REC\)](#)
Subject: Dedicate funding to Jackson Park in the 2020 Parks Bond
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 6:19:43 PM
Attachments: [Jackson Park Bond \\$ Support Letter.pdf](#)

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

Please see attached letter.

Thank you,
Katherine



KATHERINE DOUMANI President

e. president@dogpatchna.org **w.** www.dogpatchna.org

a. 1459 18th Street #227 | San Francisco CA 94107

p. 415.713.4561 [Join us to Create a Stronger Community](#)



May 6, 2020

Recreation and Park Commission
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Re: Dedicating Funding for Jackson Park & Playground in the Upcoming Parks Bond

Dear Commissioners:

Dogpatch Neighborhood Association requests that you dedicate at least \$10 million in funding of the upcoming parks bond to rehabilitate Jackson Park and Playground.

\$380MM has been spent on SFRPD properties through the bond system in 10 years - \$0 has been spent on Jackson, despite the densification surrounding the park that continues at a crushing pace. There are now hundreds of new housing units within one-half mile of Jackson Park ("Jackson"). Its renovation is a key mitigation to offset the planned density in the effects of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan rezoning.

In comparing SFRPD to SFPL and SFUSD, the latter departments have a methodical approach to renovations, ensuring that every community facility in every neighborhood is upgraded on a rotating basis. Why is Rec Park's process not the same? Why is our community having to literally beg for an update to this park, one that has been a beloved part of Potrero for over a century, yet has never received any bond funding?

If Jackson does not receive the requested funding in this parks cycle, its dismal and unacceptable condition will further deteriorate, leaving thousands of members of our community without adequate open space and Recreation and Parks programming.

Equally as important is that Jackson fulfills the investment criteria identified by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department ("SFRPD"). Specifically:

The Park is centered in an area zoned for high density, mixed-use development by the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan.

Even before the recent building boom, the Park could not adequately satisfy neighborhood demand. On top of this, Jackson serves as the home field for the following: John O'Connell, Mission and International H.S. as well as Everett M. S. and also provides rec softball and baseball for adult leagues from all over the City.

In fact, though it's been requested for years, the Park has never even received a usage survey, but SFRPD Director of Permits and Property Management Dana Ketcham states that the fields are at 95% usage capacity.

Renovation of Jackson Park would address critical safety issues:

Jackson's historic clubhouse facility is in poor condition and suffers from dangerous seismic issues. Its bathrooms are not ADA compliant and are regularly closed for months. Our children (and even adults, frankly) have been terrified of these decrepit bathrooms for more than 15 years, and the kids are often forced to use the bushes of the park instead.

The baseball and softball outfields overlap to produce dangerous conditions whereby players must keep an eye out for balls coming from both directions. In addition, due to the lack of unprogrammed community-serving space, picnickers, children and dogs crowd into the ballfields during games. People have been struck by flying balls on more than several occasions. The backstop fencing is aging and bleachers are beyond their useful life. Drainage is an ongoing problem with runoff that spills directly onto the surrounding sidewalks.

Renovation will expand and enhance Jackson's role as a multi-use community facility.

Jackson's sports fields serve the whole of the City. Its clubhouse provides working-parent critical local afterschool programs and summer camps. The park also serves the independent school across the street. However the park lacks desperately needed non-sports related programming to serve the whole of the community. A renovation would enhance Jackson's strengths while allowing it to better serve its growing neighborhood.

Jackson Park Renovation Planning is shovel-ready.

Friends of Jackson Park ("FoJP") spearheaded the design of a new Park, working in concert with SFRPD to judiciously refine the needs of the neighborhood into an actionable design. FoJP conducted significant public outreach, and the sole hurdle to finalizing the design is having a clear top-line budget number, which the parks bond would establish. *With a dedication of at least \$10 million, the remaining process of public outreach and finalization of designing could be completed before the November election.* Given the significant fundraising completed to date, construction could begin by the time bond funds are available.

Friends of Jackson Park has raised significant outside funding.

FoJP has worked tirelessly and in good faith to raise funds for a Jackson renovation. It has raised just over \$9 million in pledges from local developers and businesses, and successfully lobbied for \$7.6 million from the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee through the Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee. With an additional \$10 million in funding from the bond, FoJP and SFRPD will be able to deliver a new Jackson Park.

In sum, Jackson clearly meets SFRPD's investment priorities.

The Commission must specifically dedicate at least \$10 million to Jackson Playground in the upcoming parks bond. Please take this step to ensure that our growing neighborhood has the facilities it so desperately needs.

Sincerely,

Katherine Doumani

Katherine Doumani

Dogpatch Neighborhood Association President

From: [Gordon Fair](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Gardens, Community \(REC\)](#)
Subject: Support for SF Community Gardens
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 9:55:42 AM
Attachments: [2020 Bond Support Letter - Board of Supervisors.pdf](#)

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

Dear Ahsha Safai and the Board of Supervisors,

Please accept the attached as a letter of support for SF Community Gardens from La Grande Community Garden.

Sincerely,

Gordon Fair
La Grande Community Garden Coordinator

May 6, 2020

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA

Via email Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

District 11 Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org

RE: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond

Dear Board of Supervisors and especially Ahsha Safai as he is our representative,

I am writing to express my support on behalf of **La Grande Community Garden** for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. This 2020 Bond will be considered for recommendation by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

Our City's economic and financial situation has changed due to COVID-19. The **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** will prioritize shovel-ready projects delivering essential government services, support economic recovery through job creation for San Franciscans, provide one-time funding for behavioral health and health access, while prioritizing basic infrastructure investments in our parks and recreation facilities and right-of-way infrastructure so people can get back to work quickly and help San Francisco recover.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents sought solace and refuge in our City Parks for exercise and better mental health, especially in denser neighborhoods and in Equity Zones. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces are essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks are long lasting, and it clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

La Grande Community Garden is supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City**. In particular, the 2020 Bond has identified several park, open space, and recreation facilities and improvement projects that address a range of benefits for residents and employees to increase quality of life, mental well-being and physical health.

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City** by approving the Bond proposal for the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting of our parks and City!

Sincerely,

Gordon Fair

La Grande Community Garden Coordinator

From: [Tod Elkins](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 4:06:29 PM

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

25 Craggs Court
San Francisco, CA 94131-2521
May 6, 2020

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA

re: 2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond

Dear Board of Supervisors, and Supervisor Mandelman -

I am writing to express my support on behalf of the Craggs Court Community Garden for the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond**. This 2020 Bond will be considered for recommendation by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on the November Ballot.

Our City's economic and financial situation has changed due to COVID-19. The **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond** will prioritize shovel-ready projects delivering essential government services, support economic recovery through job creation for San Franciscans, provide one-time funding for behavioral health and health access, while prioritizing basic infrastructure investments in our parks and recreation facilities and right-of-way infrastructure so people can get back to work quickly and help San Francisco recover.

During COVID-19, San Francisco residents sought solace and refuge in our City Parks for exercise and better mental health, especially in denser neighborhoods and in Equity Zones. A recent survey by the National Recreation and Park Association found that 83% of American adults agree that visiting their local parks, trails and open spaces are essential for their mental and physical well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. The benefits of parks are long lasting, and it clear that planning for better days ahead will ensure that our open spaces are resilient.

Craggs Court Community Garden is supportive of the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City**. In particular, the 2020 Bond has identified several park, open space, and recreation facilities and improvement projects that address a range of benefits for residents and employees to increase quality of life, mental well-being and physical health.

The previous 2008 and 2012 bonds allowed San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to complete over 27 large capital projects and over 130 citywide park projects. This level of commitment and dedication immensely improved our parks system, but much more needs to be done. Please support the **2020 San Francisco Health and Recovery Bond City** by approving the Bond proposal for the November 2020 Ballot.

Thank you for supporting of our parks and City!

Sincerely,

Tod Elkins

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: ACLU SUPPORT for Resolution Urging the Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the Nov. Election
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 2:06:00 PM
Attachments: [2020.05.04 -ACLU Support - Yee Resolution.pdf](#)
Importance: High

From: Christina E. Fletes <CFletes@acluca.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 1:10 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: ACLU SUPPORT for Resolution Urging the Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the Nov. Election
Importance: High

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Please see the attached letter in support of the Resolution Urging the Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the November Election.

Please note we submitted this letter yesterday but it has not been included in the Post Packet Correspondence file, possibly due to an error on our part.

Best,



Christina E. Fletes-Romo
Voting Rights Attorney
ACLU of Northern California
(415) 293-6323 | cfletes@aclunc.org
Pronouns: she/her/ella

From: Angela Castellanos <ACastellanos@aclunc.org>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 4:17 PM
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org; Bos-legislative-aides@sfgov.org
Cc: Christina E. Fletes <CFletes@acluca.org>; Brittany Stonesifer <BStonesifer@acluca.org>
Subject: ACLUNC SUPPORT for Resolution Urging the Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the Nov. Election

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Please see the letter attached dated May 4, 2020 submitted on behalf of Christina E. Fletes-Romo and Brittany Stonesifer of the ACLU of Northern California. Should you have any questions, please contact Ms. Fletes-Romo at cfletes@acluca.org and Ms. Stonesifer at bstonesifer@acluca.org.

Kindly,

Angela Castellanos

Litigation Assistant

ACLU of Northern California

39 Drumm St., San Francisco, CA 94111

(415) 293-6388 | acastellanos@aclunc.org

Pronouns: she/her/ella



AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

Northern California

May 4, 2020

Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer
Supervisor Catherine Stefani
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Supervisor Gordon Mar
Supervisor Dean Preston
Supervisor Matt Haney
Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
Supervisor Hillary Ronen
Supervisor Shamann Walton
Supervisor Ahsha Safai
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Bos-legislative-aides@sfgov.org

**RE: Resolution Urging the
Implementation of Statewide Election
Reforms for the November
Presidential Election – SUPPORT**

Via Electronic Mail

Dear Supervisors:

The American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California (ACLU) is pleased to support Supervisor Yee’s Resolution “Urging Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the November Presidential Election” (Resolution), which urges Governor Gavin Newsom and Secretary of State Alex Padilla to require county elections officials to mail a ballot to every registered voter; urges San Francisco Department of Elections Director John Arntz to maintain polling site ratios between the range of 1 site per 1,000 registered voters to 1 per 10,000; opposes recommendations that the State waive or give counties broad discretion regarding in-person voting and drop-off voting requirements; and advocates for mass public education, particularly for infrequent voters. The Resolution also asks that statewide reforms uphold principles such as protecting voter access and the rights of infrequent voters, and center equity in implementation as well as in education and outreach.

The COVID-19 pandemic poses unique challenges to administering the November 2020 election. California must act proactively to ensure the election is safe, secure, and accessible for all voters, and San Francisco can lead the way.

The first and most commonsense step to ensuring this is to send all registered California voters a vote-by-mail (VBM) ballot. A majority of Californians already securely use VBM, and no one

American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR Abdi Soltani • BOARD CHAIR Magan Pritam Ray

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE: 39 Drumm St. San Francisco, CA 94111 • FRESNO OFFICE: PO Box 188 Fresno, CA 93707
TEL (415) 621-2493 • FAX (415) 255-1478 • TTY (415) 863-7832 • WWW.ACLUNC.ORG

should have to choose between their health and their right to vote. However, expanding the availability of VBM will not be enough to protect all voters.

California and San Francisco must also offer as many in-person voting locations as is safely possible. Without in-person voting locations, there is a severe risk that historically underrepresented voters will face significant barriers to voting and be disenfranchised. For example, voters with limited-English proficiency and disabilities rely on services that are provided at in-person voting locations.¹ Voters who are housing insecure or unhoused – as more voters will be this November due to displacement from the economic fallout of COVID-19 – are more likely to not receive a VBM ballot and would therefore need in-person voting options. Further, Black, Latinx, and Native American voters are also historically less likely to use VBM and Asian American voters are more likely to have their VBM ballots rejected.² New voters and voters whose addresses have changed will also need access to same day voter registration.

We are deeply concerned that if California fails to require all counties to provide at least a minimum number of voting locations based on the number of voters in each county, some counties will fail to provide meaningful and safe opportunities to vote in person. This is why we join the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in calling for Governor Newsom, Secretary Padilla, and Director Arntz to ensure there are strong minimum requirements for in-person voting locations.

Finally, voters must have full notice of any changes that will be made to election administration this November. San Francisco officials and elections officials across the state must engage in robust public education efforts to inform all Californians of their voting options and to protect confidence in the election system. This outreach must be in all required languages, available in accessible formats, and delivered through a wide range of platforms and formats.

For these reasons, the ACLU of Northern California supports the Resolution.

Sincerely,



Christina E. Fletes-Romo
Voting Rights Attorney



Brittany Stonesifer
Voting Rights Attorney

¹ See, e.g., Disability Rights California, *Best Processes to Reduce and Eliminate Accessibility Barriers for Voters with Disabilities* (2013), <http://futureofelections.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/FOCE.12-DRC-Barriers-and-Best-Processes-Voters-with-Disabilities.pdf>.

² See, e.g., Asian-Americans Advancing Justice, *Asian Americans Face Higher than Average Vote-by-Mail Rejection Rates in California* (Aug. 2017); Mindy S. Romero, CCEP, *The California Voter Experience: Why African-American Voters Choose to Vote at the Polls or Vote-by-Mail, and How They Perceive Proposed Changes to California's Voting System* (Sept. 2016); Mindy S. Romero, *The California Voter Experience: Vote-by-Mail vs. the Polls* (July 2016); Mindy S. Romero, CCEP, *Disparities in California's Vote-by-Mail Use Changing Demographic Composition: 2002-2012* (Mar. 2014); Native American Rights Fund, *Vote by Mail in Native American Communities*, available at www.narf.org/vote-by-mail.

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: ACLUNC SUPPORT for Resolution Urging the Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the Nov. Election
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:19:00 PM
Attachments: [2020.05.04 -ACLU Support - Yee Resolution.pdf](#)

From: Angela Castellanos <ACastellanos@aclunc.org>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 4:17 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Bos-legislative-aides@sfgov.org
Cc: Christina E. Fletes <CFletes@acluca.org>; Brittany Stonesifer <BStonesifer@acluca.org>
Subject: ACLUNC SUPPORT for Resolution Urging the Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the Nov. Election

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Please see the letter attached dated May 4, 2020 submitted on behalf of Christina E. Fletes-Romo and Brittany Stonesifer of the ACLU of Northern California. Should you have any questions, please contact Ms. Fletes-Romo at cfletes@acluca.org and Ms. Stonesifer at bstonesifer@acluca.org.

Kindly,

Angela Castellanos

Litigation Assistant

ACLU of Northern California

39 Drumm St., San Francisco, CA 94111

(415) 293-6388 | acastellanos@aclunc.org

Pronouns: she/her/ella



AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

Northern California

May 4, 2020

Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer
Supervisor Catherine Stefani
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Supervisor Gordon Mar
Supervisor Dean Preston
Supervisor Matt Haney
Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
Supervisor Hillary Ronen
Supervisor Shamann Walton
Supervisor Ahsha Safai
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Bos-legislative-aides@sfgov.org

**RE: Resolution Urging the
Implementation of Statewide Election
Reforms for the November
Presidential Election – SUPPORT**

Via Electronic Mail

Dear Supervisors:

The American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California (ACLU) is pleased to support Supervisor Yee’s Resolution “Urging Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the November Presidential Election” (Resolution), which urges Governor Gavin Newsom and Secretary of State Alex Padilla to require county elections officials to mail a ballot to every registered voter; urges San Francisco Department of Elections Director John Arntz to maintain polling site ratios between the range of 1 site per 1,000 registered voters to 1 per 10,000; opposes recommendations that the State waive or give counties broad discretion regarding in-person voting and drop-off voting requirements; and advocates for mass public education, particularly for infrequent voters. The Resolution also asks that statewide reforms uphold principles such as protecting voter access and the rights of infrequent voters, and center equity in implementation as well as in education and outreach.

The COVID-19 pandemic poses unique challenges to administering the November 2020 election. California must act proactively to ensure the election is safe, secure, and accessible for all voters, and San Francisco can lead the way.

The first and most commonsense step to ensuring this is to send all registered California voters a vote-by-mail (VBM) ballot. A majority of Californians already securely use VBM, and no one

American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR Abdi Soltani • BOARD CHAIR Magan Pritam Ray

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE: 39 Drumm St. San Francisco, CA 94111 • FRESNO OFFICE: PO Box 188 Fresno, CA 93707
TEL (415) 621-2493 • FAX (415) 255-1478 • TTY (415) 863-7832 • WWW.ACLUNC.ORG

should have to choose between their health and their right to vote. However, expanding the availability of VBM will not be enough to protect all voters.

California and San Francisco must also offer as many in-person voting locations as is safely possible. Without in-person voting locations, there is a severe risk that historically underrepresented voters will face significant barriers to voting and be disenfranchised. For example, voters with limited-English proficiency and disabilities rely on services that are provided at in-person voting locations.¹ Voters who are housing insecure or unhoused – as more voters will be this November due to displacement from the economic fallout of COVID-19 – are more likely to not receive a VBM ballot and would therefore need in-person voting options. Further, Black, Latinx, and Native American voters are also historically less likely to use VBM and Asian American voters are more likely to have their VBM ballots rejected.² New voters and voters whose addresses have changed will also need access to same day voter registration.

We are deeply concerned that if California fails to require all counties to provide at least a minimum number of voting locations based on the number of voters in each county, some counties will fail to provide meaningful and safe opportunities to vote in person. This is why we join the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in calling for Governor Newsom, Secretary Padilla, and Director Arntz to ensure there are strong minimum requirements for in-person voting locations.

Finally, voters must have full notice of any changes that will be made to election administration this November. San Francisco officials and elections officials across the state must engage in robust public education efforts to inform all Californians of their voting options and to protect confidence in the election system. This outreach must be in all required languages, available in accessible formats, and delivered through a wide range of platforms and formats.

For these reasons, the ACLU of Northern California supports the Resolution.

Sincerely,



Christina E. Fletes-Romo
Voting Rights Attorney



Brittany Stonesifer
Voting Rights Attorney

¹ See, e.g., Disability Rights California, *Best Processes to Reduce and Eliminate Accessibility Barriers for Voters with Disabilities* (2013), <http://futureofelections.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/FOCE.12-DRC-Barriers-and-Best-Processes-Voters-with-Disabilities.pdf>.

² See, e.g., Asian-Americans Advancing Justice, *Asian Americans Face Higher than Average Vote-by-Mail Rejection Rates in California* (Aug. 2017); Mindy S. Romero, CCEP, *The California Voter Experience: Why African-American Voters Choose to Vote at the Polls or Vote-by-Mail, and How They Perceive Proposed Changes to California's Voting System* (Sept. 2016); Mindy S. Romero, *The California Voter Experience: Vote-by-Mail vs. the Polls* (July 2016); Mindy S. Romero, CCEP, *Disparities in California's Vote-by-Mail Use Changing Demographic Composition: 2002-2012* (Mar. 2014); Native American Rights Fund, *Vote by Mail in Native American Communities*, available at www.narf.org/vote-by-mail.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Support for Resolution Urging Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 11:45:00 AM
Attachments: [Letter to SF BOS re Nov 2020 Elections Resolution from ALC.pdf](#)

From: Julia Marks <juliam@advancingjustice-alc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 8:04 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support for Resolution Urging Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms

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

Dear Supervisors,

Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus writes to support Supervisor Yee's Resolution "Urging Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the November Presidential Election."
Please find attached our letter of support.

Sincerely,
Julia Marks

--

Julia Marks
Staff Attorney, Voting Rights and Census

Asian Americans Advancing Justice – Asian Law Caucus
415-848-7763
juliam@advancingjustice-alc.org
www.advancingjustice-alc.org



May 4, 2020

Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer
Supervisor Catherine Stefani
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Supervisor Gordon Mar
Supervisor Dean Preston
Supervisor Matt Haney
Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
Supervisor Hillary Ronen
Supervisor Shamann Walton
Supervisor Ahsha Safai
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Bos-legislative-aides@sfgov.org

Via Electronic Mail

Re: Support for Resolution Urging the Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the November Presidential Election

Dear Supervisors:

Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus (Advancing Justice - ALC) is pleased to support Supervisor Yee's Resolution "Urging Implementation of Statewide Election Reforms for the November Presidential Election" (hereinafter "the Resolution"). For the following reasons, we believe that this resolution will serve as an important step toward a more fair and inclusive November 2020 election in San Francisco and the State of California as a whole.

The Resolution promotes effective and equitable elections by pressing for minimum standards and consistency across the State. It urges Governor Newsom and Secretary of State Padilla to require county elections officials to mail a ballot to every registered voter. We strongly support sending all registered voters a vote-by-mail ballot as a first step to providing ballot access and the opportunity for voters to participate in the election safely from home. However, as the Resolution acknowledges, vote-by-mail will not be a solution for all voters.

Voters with disabilities, voters who have limited English proficiency, first-time and infrequent voters, same-day registrants, and voters facing housing instability may need to visit in-person voting locations to vote. The Resolution helps secure ballot access for voters in San Francisco's November 2020 elections by urging the San Francisco Department of Elections Director to maintain polling site ratios between the range of 1 site per 1,000 registered voters to 1 per

10,000. Providing in-person voting opportunities, including accessible locations, is absolutely necessary to avoid disenfranchising voters, especially those who are most often left out of the democratic process. Accordingly, we support the Board in calling for Governor Newsom and Secretary Padilla to require in-person voting opportunities statewide and opposing recommendations that the State waive or give counties broad discretion regarding in-person voting and ballot drop-off requirements.

Finally, we support the statement of values that the Resolution outlines to guide elections reforms. Protecting voting access for people with disabilities and for people who have limited English proficiency is important in all elections and especially important when there are significant changes to elections systems that might further disenfranchise people. Similarly, consideration of equity in placement of voting and drop-box locations and the implementation of robust voter education will be especially important in the November 2020 election.

We support the Board's efforts to ensure a safe, secure, and accessible election for San Francisco voters and voters across the state.

Sincerely,



Julia Marks
Attorney, Voting Rights & Census
Asian Americans Advancing Justice – Asian Law Caucus



Adria Orr
Senior Project Coordinator, Voting Rights & Census
Asian Americans Advancing Justice – Asian Law Caucus

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: 5 letters for File No. 200453
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 4:15:00 PM
Attachments: [Against using GGP for homeless housing .msg](#)
[Against locating unhoused Tent Encampment to Golden Gate Park.msg](#)
[Use of GGP for homeless camp.msg](#)
[No homeless encampments in Golden Gate Park.msg](#)
[OPPOSITION TO KEZAR.msg](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 5 letters for File No. 200453.

File No. 200453 - Emergency ordinance authorizing the use of park property for temporary shelter and other measures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic; directing the Recreation and Park Department to report to the Board of Supervisors with a list of potential locations for such uses; and waiving contrary provisions in Administrative Code, Chapters 79 and 79A, and Charter, Section 4.113, if and to the extent applicable.

Regards,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Martha Ehrenfeld](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Carla McKay](#)
Subject: Against locating unhoused Tent Encampment to Golden Gate Park
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:35:31 AM

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

Dear Supervisors:

Unhoused people is everyone's problem to solve. I do not agree with the plan to move the tents into GGP. GGP is everyone's backyard and the once place people have to gone to seek mental health and exercise. I have heard that the LA parks have become unusable for families. Please don't let that happen here. I urge you to use the old McDonald's site and the Kezar Parking area—even the Kezar Triangle—anything but the park.

Thank you for your time,
Martha Ehrenfeld
1379 6th Ave

We are living in a pandemic crisis and things move quickly, but community outreach is needed for any large scale proposals that impact our neighborhood parks.

- Our city has done a tremendous job in responding to all the issues that have come up during COVID-19. It only makes sense for city leaders to continue to work together collaboratively instead of legislating their way to a solution.
- Homelessness has always been an issue in our city. But without proper long-term solutions this proposal is only a temporary band aid to a much greater issue.
- The cost for this proposal has not been addressed, and with the economic impacts of COVID-19, we are left to wonder if this will further put our city in debt.
- Our park sites are already being used during COVID-19, this proposal will decrease park access even further and limit citizens and residents' access to parks and open space.

Martha Ehrenfeld
It is so old, it is hip!
marmac@aol.com
415-297-2623

From: [Carla McKay](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Against using GGP for homeless housing
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 9:53:19 AM

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am opposed to placing homeless in GGP!

Unhoused people is everyone's problem to solve. I do not agree with the plan to move the tents into GGP. GGP is everyone's backyard and the one place people have gone to seek mental health and exercise.

I urge you to use the old McDonald's site and the Kezar Parking area—even the Kezar Triangle—anything but the park.

Thank you for your time,

Carla McKay
[1379 6th Ave](#)

From: [Morgan Kulla](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [RPDInfo, RPD \(REC\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: No homeless encampments in Golden Gate Park
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 3:16:39 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Fewer and Board of Supervisors and Parks and Rec Commissioners and Mayor Breed,

I live in the outer Richmond. I am writing to tell you that I strongly disagree with Supervisor Fewer's proposal to move homeless into Golden Gate Park

I know there are already homeless living in some areas. But once more are settled, I don't believe it will be possible to move them.

The park is a beautiful yet very fragile environment. It not meant to sustain the homeless lifestyle. It will be severely damaged by the trash, excrement, etc. And the park will be less welcoming to other people who want to walk and jog safely. Homeless people need help and a place to be safe during shelter in place, but GG Park is not the place.

Sincerely,
Morgan Kulla

Morgan Kulla
northbeach3@yahoo.com

From: [Kelly Vinther](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [MARIE HURABIELL](#)
Subject: OPPOSITION TO KEZAR
Date: Saturday, May 2, 2020 5:46:37 PM

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

Kezar stadium is next to the unforced drug mecca, Haight Street.

UCSF workers park at Kezar.

You spent millions to renovate Kezar (taxpayer money).

Children and families exercise at Kezar, along with athletes who train for track and field.

Angel Island is a brilliant solution. Treasure Island is also a brilliant solution. Kezar stadium? Really!? And the parking lot there or McDonalds would not come close to housing enough tents spaced 6 feet apart.

Not a well thought out plan. At all. I vehemently oppose this option.

Kelly Vinther

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

From: alminvielle@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Use of GGP for homeless camp
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 6:58:52 AM

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

Golden Gate Park is a critical quality of life resource for the neighborhoods surrounding it in for the city as a whole. Is a safe place for our Communities to socialize exercise and enjoy natural environments. Is a critical part of the quality of life for all the communities surrounding the park. During these times of restricted movement the park has proven to be critical to our health and well-being. Any action that might compromise safety and the quality of the experience of visiting the park would not be in the public interest. I would vehemently oppose any action involved the movement of groups of homeless to the park. I have suggested at the city consider using the cow palace as a possible emergency shelter and service center for large populations of homeless. It provides large open space toilet facilities containment and it is on the perimeter Of residential neighborhood rather than the heart of multiple communities. Moving the homeless to any neighborhood park Would be a loss to any of its neighboring communities. I urge you not to take any such action.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 6 letters for File No. 200430
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:34:00 PM
Attachments: [Resolution to Honor the 150th Birthday of A.P. Giannini.msg](#)
[Support for resolution honoring AP Giannini.msg](#)
[San Francisco Resolution Honoring 150th Birthday of A.P. Giannini..msg](#)
[Honor A.P. Giannini.msg](#)
[support for resolution honoring 150th Birthday of AP Giannini.msg](#)
[Giannini.msg](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 6 letters for File No. 200430.

File No. 200430 - **Resolution recognizing A. P. Giannini on the occasion of his 150th birthday for his substantial contributions to San Francisco history, Italian American culture, and declaring May 6, 2020, as A. P. Giannini Day in the City and County of San Francisco.**

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: [Nello Prato](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Giannini
Date: Friday, May 1, 2020 4:51:07 PM

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

I support the Giannini memorial. I am 84 years old. I was born in St. Francis Hosital in San Francisco in 1936 and have lived in SF all my life. I remember well the Italian Days and Contributions to SF by Italians. My parents came to SF as Italian immigrants in 1925.

Nello joseph Prato

From: [Paula Pardini](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Honor A.P. Giannini
Date: Sunday, May 3, 2020 11:46:20 AM

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

As an Italian-American raised in San Francisco, I was delighted to hear that Supervisor Stefani introduced the resolution commemorating the 150th birthday of A.P. Giannini.

I trust the Board will approve this resolution, and I look forward to seeing City Hall lit up in the Italian flag colors on May 6th.

Thank you,
Paula Pardini

From: [Toni Sterling](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution to Honor the 150th Birthday of A.P. Giannini
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 11:10:05 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I encourage you to vote yes to support the resolution put forth by Supervisor Catherine Stefani to commemorate the 150th birthday of A.P. Giannini, Founder of Bank of America.

Three generations of my family, like thousands of other Californians worked at the bank since the early days of Banca d'Italia, which then became Bank of America thanks to the ingenuity and foresight of A.P. Giannini.

Due to this brilliant man's vision, Californians have thrived personally and professionally with the bank's support.

Signore Giannini is most deserving of being honored with this resolution to respectfully celebrate his birthday, his life, his achievements and contributions.

Respectfully,

Toni

Toni Galli Sterling
CEO & Sr. Consultant
www.sterling-consulting.net

Cell: (415) 717-6158

Fax: (415) 233-9750

[Project Management & Marketing Professionals.](#)

[Celebrating our 26th year in 2020.](#)

From: [Rita Fuerst Adams](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Resolution Honoring 150th Birthday of A.P. Giannini.
Date: Sunday, May 3, 2020 7:36:35 PM

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

Please support this resolution!

Rita Fuerst Adams
rita@rita1st.com

Sent from my iPad

From: [Marilyn Geary](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: support for resolution honoring 150th Birthday of AP Giannini
Date: Friday, May 1, 2020 4:56:59 PM

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

Please vote for this resolution.
Thank you,
Marilyn L. Geary

From: [Christina Zimbardo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Philip Zimbardo](#)
Subject: Support for resolution honoring AP Giannini
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:01:16 PM

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

To the Board of Supervisors:

My husband, Philip Zimbardo, and I want to strongly endorse the resolution introduced by Supervisor Stefani, to honor A. P. Giannini on the 150th anniversary of his birth, May 6.

Giannini is a giant figure among the business leaders of San Francisco, who did so much to support the recovery of individual citizens and small businesses in the aftermath of the 1906 earthquake, who was the only local banker to step up to fund the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge during the Great Depression, and who bankrolled many key industries in California (including motion pictures, wineries, and technology). His genius and creativity have had a major role in shaping the lives we live today in the San Francisco Bay Area and beyond.

In addition, as descendants of Italian immigrants to the US, both my husband and I want to honor an outstanding example of how such immigration has contributed to the development of our country. My ancestors, the Cuneos and the Garibaldis, came from Liguria to San Francisco, and my husband's ancestors, the Zimbardos and the Bisicchias, came from Sicily to New York -- and they and their descendants have also contributed to many aspects of American society, including education and the arts, as well as business.

We hope that the entire Board will support this resolution, and we thank you in advance for this well-deserved honor for A. P. Giannini.

Sincerely,

Christina and Philip Zimbardo

25 Montclair Terrace, SF 94109

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: . P. Giannini
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 4:07:00 PM

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

From: Vince Fausone <vince@amcdesigns.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 2:14 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: . P. Giannini

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

Dear Supervisors: I wish to make a comment on Mr. Giannini. I believe he was one of the most important men in California in the 20th Century and he was undoubtedly one of the most compassionate generous and honest Bankers in the USA. He dedicated his life to giving to his fellow man. He was smart, tough as nails and he made good things happen. He deserves a special recognition from San Francisco and the Whole nation. Thank you.
Vincent Fausone, Jr.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: my piece on closing sf jails, etc.
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 1:59:00 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the below email from Former Supervisor Mirkarimi.

Thank you,

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

From: ross mirkarimi <rmirk@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 12:54 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: my piece on closing sf jails, etc.

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

Hello,

I hope this note finds you well amid these crazy times. I understand the BoS will consider matters regarding SF jails and inmates soon. The link below is a recent piece on the matter before the Board - if it's applicable to share with them.

Take care!

All the best,
Ross Mirkarimi

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/openforum/article/SF-should-close-a-jail-and-not-send-inmates-to-15239218.php>

[SF should close a jail, and
not send inmates to
Alameda County -
SFChronicle.com](#)

Let's not waste this pandemic. Let's further criminal justice reform by accelerating the closure of County Jail 4 (at the Hall of Justice) and reject any plan to transfer San Francisco inmates ...

www.sfchronicle.com

From: [Chris Taaffe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); gordon.Marr@sfgov.org; [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Not too late! Vote to close 850 Bryant
Date: Thursday, April 30, 2020 2:22:27 PM

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

April 30

Government Audit & Oversight Committee
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Ordinance to Close County Jail #4—SUPPORT (File Number 200372)

Dear Supervisors Mar, Peskin, and Haney:

My name is **Chris Taaffe** and I am a Bay Area resident and a longtime resident of the City.

I am writing to thank you for your courage and doing what is right for all San Franciscans: boldly supporting Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer's ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require the City to close County Jail #4 (CJ4), located on the seventh floor of the Hall of Justice, by November 1, 2020. It is essential to the health and well-being of all of San Francisco for 850 Bryant to close without out-of-county transfers or expansions of jailing through electronic monitoring and jail-bed construction. In addition to yourselves, the legislation is sponsored by a total of eight Supervisors, including Shamann Walton, Hillary Ronen, Dean Preston, and Ahsha Safaí. *We need your continued support now to pass this ordinance with its restrictions on jail expansion as it is currently written.*

As you know, the closure of CJ4 is long overdue; the Hall of Justice is seismically unsafe and has posed a physical threat to people's safety for far too long. Incarcerated people should not be in such a dilapidated facility, nor should deputy sheriffs, jail health employees, or any other personnel be working there.

Furthermore, the spread of COVID-19 has made the need for the closure of CJ4 all the more urgent. The current crisis has shed even more light on how imprisonment and jailing jeopardize public health, and that even earthquake-safe jails are unsafe and dangerous. Allowing an institution like CJ4 to remain open during the time of COVID-19, or expanding San Francisco's capacity to incarcerate with more cells or jail beds, places everyone inside at risk of contracting the virus, and worsens the probability of a spike in contraction across all of the Bay Area's communities—this includes jail staff, who return home to their families.

Closing CJ4, stopping out-of-country transfers to Santa Rita Jail, and ending any and all expansions of jailing through electronic monitoring or jail-bed construction are essential steps in caring for and protecting all San Francisco residents, especially the poor, people experiencing homelessness, the LGBTQI community, immigrants, and people of color. The closure of CJ4 will save San Francisco an estimated \$25 million per year, which is money better spent on community resources, including: housing, healthcare, meaningful employment, access to healthy food, and mental health and substance use treatment. The City, too, is already below the maximum allowable 1,044 incarcerated people required by this legislation to close CJ4. For these reasons and more, **please continue your support of Supervisor Fewer's ordinance to close CJ4, and refer this item to the full Board for consideration.**

Thank you for the principled leadership our city needs now more than ever.

From: [Meredith Serra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject: Please let our elected Sheriff do his job
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:16:58 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

I am writing by suggestion of the group Stop Crime SF. Please oppose the recently introduced legislation regarding County Jail No. 4 or amend it to allow the sheriff to add beds in the remaining jails when needed.

I agree with Sheriff Miyamoto that County Jail No. 4 is dilapidated and must close. But before that happens, the sheriff must have the ability to add beds or renovate remaining jails if unforeseen events warrant it.

The risk of coronavirus in jail is real and raises important questions the sheriff and health officials must answer: How many prisoners should we release and where do they go? We must let the sheriff and health officials do their jobs to keep inmates, deputies and the general public safe.

Meredith Serra

Westwood Highlands

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Big victory for Hunters Point activists / As PG&E closes its old, smoky power plant, the neighborhood breathes a sigh of relief
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 4:51:00 PM

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

From: Ahimsa Porter Sumchai MD <asumchai@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 7:41 AM
To: Wagner Elizabeth <Elizabeth.Wagner@nbcuni.com>; dalila@greenaction.org; Janice <janice@greenaction.org>; Jterijohnson@aol.com; crwbot@gmail.com; Charles Bonner <cbonner799@aol.com>; Charlesworth, Annemarie (UCSF) <Annemarie.Charlesworth@ucsf.edu>; DPH, Health Commission (DPH) <HealthCommission.DPH@sfdph.org>; DanielHirsch <Dhirsch1@cruzio.com>; Brown Elaine <sistaelaine@gmail.com>; SL Harrison <sistahs4hh@gmail.com>; Anthony Khalil <anthony.khalil@lejyouth.org>; Wagner Liz <e.wagner@hotmail.com>; editor@sfbayview.com; Lonnie Mason <superior1mobile@gmail.com>; Pierce Michelle <jmichellepierce@gmail.com>; Muhammad Minister Christopher <m26sf@aol.com>; Shirley Moore <sammy988@aol.com>; Linda Parker Pennington <llparker1@gmail.com>; Pierce, Karen (DPH) <karen.pierce@sfdph.org>; Tompkins Raymond <rtomp@sbcglobal.net>; Woodruff, Tracey (UCSF) <Tracey.Woodruff@ucsf.edu>; Bradley Angel <bradley@greenaction.org>; Danielle Barnett- Carpenter <Dnc_carpenter@yahoo.com>; supervisors Board Of <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Aragon, Tomas (DPH) <tomas.aragon@sfdph.org>; Kelly Tony <Tonykelly@astound.net>; LaConstance Shahid <writ3r86@gmail.com>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; CAROL TATUM <cetatum@aol.com>; Ellington Theo <ellingtontheo@gmail.com>; Dr. Rupa Marya <radiorupa@gmail.com>; David@CDPH Chang <David.Chang@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: Big victory for Hunters Point activists / As PG&E closes its old, smoky power plant, the neighborhood breathes a sigh of relief

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

<https://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Big-victory-for-Hunters-Point-activists-As-PG-E-2534998.php>

Ahimsa Porter Sumchai MD
 Golden State MD Health & Wellness
 Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee 2019 Annual Report
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 5:01:00 PM
Attachments: [BRCAC_Final Annual Report 2019.pdf](#)

Hello,

Pursuant to Ordinance 45-15, attached is the 2019 Annual Report from the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee.

Thank you,

Jackie Hickey
 Board of Supervisors
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
 San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
 Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Lutenski, Leigh (ECN) <leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 6:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peacock, Rebecca (MYR) <rebecca.peacock@sfgov.org>; Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hong, Seung Yen (CPC) <seungyen.hong@sfgov.org>; Exline, Susan (CPC) <susan.exline@sfgov.org>
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee 2019 Annual Report

Hello Mayor Breed and Supervisors,

Attached for your records is the 2019 Annual Report from the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee. The Committee was formed in 2015 by Supervisor Yee and has been the key forum for the community planning process. The CAC has been meeting regularly since 2015 to discuss parameters and details related to the proposed Balboa Reservoir housing project. The CAC's webpage has records of all the past meetings and discussions and can be found here: <https://sfplanning.org/project/balboa-reservoir-and-community-advisory-committee-cac>.

Please reach out to me, Sue Exline, or Seung-Yen Hong (copied here) with any questions or comments.

Thank you, Leigh

Leigh Lutenski
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
(415) 554-6679
leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org

REPORT OF BALBOA RESERVOIR COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To: Mayor London Breed
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Date: December 2019

1. Background

Ordinance No. 4515, as amended March 19, 2015, formed the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (“BRCAC”). The BRCAC was formed to function as a clearinghouse for community input as the City considers possible development on 17 acres owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) known as the Balboa Reservoir, located adjacent to the City College of San Francisco (“CCSF”). The Ordinance provided “The general purpose of the Advisory Committee shall be to provide a regular venue for interested community stakeholders and the general public to discuss any proposed development on the Site, and to ask questions of and give input to City officers and staff and to developers, once selected.” The Ordinance concludes by requiring the BRCAC to provide annual reports to the Board of Supervisors.

The BRCAC is comprised of nine seats, each filled by representatives of the Balboa Reservoir’s constituencies in the adjacent areas and at large. The first meeting of the BRCAC took place in August, 2015, and this report is the first Annual Report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors of the BRCAC.

Discussion on the Draft Environmental Impact Report is not included in this report.

2. Discussion of the Development Principles and Parameters

During its first year the BRCAC met 18 times and developed a set of guidelines called The Proposed Development Principles and Parameters for the Balboa Reservoir to guide the selection of a developer team. Those Principles and Parameters were adopted in September 2016 after the BRCAC heard from many stakeholders including

residents in adjacent neighborhoods, representatives of City College, representatives of the Ocean Avenue businesses, and other interested members of the public. Supervisor Norman Yee has attended many of these meetings.

The resulting seven Principles and Parameters concerned housing, transportation and Parking, the project's relationship with City College, the public realm, urban design and neighborhood character, sustainability, and additional public benefits.

Additionally, a letter dated September 9, 2016, was sent by the BRCAC to the developers interested in submitting a proposal. That letter stressed that the BRCAC looked forward to the Principles and Parameters guiding the project. The letter also stated that to be successful, no project would garner community support if it would worsen traffic congestion or adversely impact the availability of street parking in the local community. The letter also stressed that since the project displaces parking for CCSF "it will be critical for the Balboa Reservoir developer to work with City College to address parking needs by identifying alternative parking and transportation solutions that do not compromise student's ability to access their education."

A developer team was selected in August 2017 composed of AvalonBay Communities who propose to build the market-rate housing along with Bridge Housing, Mission Housing, and Habitat for Humanity who propose to develop the affordable homes, and Pacific Union Development Company who specializes in parking solutions.

Since then the BRCAC and the public have met quarterly to discuss and comment on the project as it took shape. Hundreds of public comments were recorded in the meeting minutes over this time. They covered a wide gamut of opinion for and against the project, its relationship with City College, its effect on transportation and neighborhood character, as well and its role in the City's ongoing housing crisis.

During the development review process, in addition to regular meetings the Committee and the Developer Team hosted ongoing community engagement with events such as a park day, tours, and workshops.

3. Comments on Proposals

In the following three sections of this Report, The BRCAC will comment on the proposal's level of compliance with the Principles and Parameters developed by the BRCAC.

4. Comment on the Developer Team's Proposal

HOUSING

The Developer Team's Proposal includes 1100 units of housing of all types. As per the CAC Principles and Parameters, 50% percent of the housing will be affordable to low and moderate-income households (18% for households with an income under 55% of AMI). By cross-subsidizing the affordable housing with the market-rate housing the project will need a minimum of public funding. The Developer Team proposal is in compliance with the housing parameters.

TRANSPORTATION

The Developer Team's proposal is in keeping with the principle that parking should be unbundled and that the ratio should be 0.5:1 overall. At this time the call for a transportation demand management plan is undetermined and there has been no input from the SFMTA.

Plans to incentivize the use of transportation choices other than driving are still unclear. Despite the publication of a Transportation Demand Management Plan in October 2016 performance targets are largely undetermined.

The BRCAC also has yet to hear how SFMTA plans to proactively accommodate the influx of new residents and actively promote transit use. Similarly, SFMTA has not yet proposed changes to the surrounding streets, especially along the pedestrian and bike route to the Balboa Park BART Station that would enhance pedestrian safety and comfort. Also unclear is how the SFMTA will respond to congestion impacts, especially at the two vehicular entrances to the site on Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way.

The pedestrian and bicycle circulation plans within the confines of the site are largely in keeping with the BRCAC's Principles and Parameters.

PROJECT'S RELATIONSHIP WITH CITY COLLEGE

It is imperative that the Balboa Reservoir project not adversely impact CCSF's mission to provide a quality education at an affordable price for a large number of the city's residents. CCSF has produced a transportation demand management plan (March, 2019) that, if implemented, intends to reduce the need for a large portion of its staff and student body to drive, producing a smaller shortfall in parking needs than the one thousand parking spots that will be replaced by housing. The developer team plans to

accommodate the shortfall with public parking in the Reservoir. The amount of this public parking is undetermined at this time as CCSF finalizes decisions on their Facilities Master Plan and which version of their TDM they will settle on. The developers have promised that provided public parking will be scaled according to the need once these variables are resolved. As of this date, both CCSF and the City have informed the BRCAC that the problem caused by loss of appropriate parking on the reservoir has not been resolved yet. The BRCAC intends to closely monitor any purported resolution of this matter.

There has been a discussion that student or faculty housing be built by the Developer Team on CCSF property.

There is a danger that the CCSF Facilities Master Plan and the Reservoir project will evolve separately. There is a need for ongoing monitoring to ensure that discussions are taking place. The BRCAC will be a forum for updating progress or issues as they come up.

PUBLIC REALM

The Developer Team's Proposal has been very thoughtful in regards to creating walking routes, open space, and amenities such as childcare for residents and students. At the urging of BRCAC meeting participants, the proposed orientation of the park has been changed to shelter public space from the ocean wind.

The landscape architects have also formulated innovative ways of activating the PUC easement along the southern edge of the Reservoir with exercise areas, farmers markets, and children's play areas near the proposed childcare center.

URBAN DESIGN AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

For the most part, there has been considerable input and good continuing fine-tuning revisions. The Developer Team's Proposal strives to fit into the existing neighborhood design by scaling from twenty foot heights near the western side of the site to taller buildings on the eastern side. Public comment has been mixed. Some neighbors are wary of higher density in the neighborhood while others constituencies feel the urgent need for housing necessitates it. The project has deviated from the sixty-five foot height limit proscribed in the Principles and Parameters with a proposal that some buildings on the east side of the site reach a maximum height of seventy-seven feet, i.e. twelve feet taller.

SUSTAINABILITY

The project is compliant with the Principles and Parameters which follow City standards.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC BENEFITS

The BRCAC will need ongoing updates on progress in this area.

5. Other Items

The Balboa Park Station Area CAC was disbanded at the end of 2018 leaving many unresolved issues regarding transit, safety, and general livability in the area.

6. BRCAC Activities Moving Forward

- The Committee will continue to serve as a forum for community feedback.
- The committee will continue to monitor the discussions between CCSF and the Developer relating to their collaboration, especially the requirement in the Parameters that CCSF and the Developer “address parking needs by identifying appropriate parking and transportation solutions that do not compromise student’s ability to access their education.” [Parameters letter of September 9, 2016].
- The BRCAC may submit a further report or reports in advance of consideration of these matters by the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the SFPUC, and possibly other City Agencies.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Comments made to newspaper
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 5:10:00 PM

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

From: Kim Wynn <kimrwynn@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:09 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comments made to newspaper

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

I find the comment made by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors concerning the "Mason - Dixon Line" highly disrespectful, demeaning and discriminatory.

Does this "supervisor" speak for the entire Board? Do they have a phobia concerning Southern People for the way they talk, for what they believe?

This "supervisor" must not have a good working relationship with the police force. The type/ style of their masks does not violate most police force's rule against unapproved adornment/decoration of uniforms since a face mask is not a normal piece of the uniform.

Sincerely,
Kim R. Wynn

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: SF Chronicle Story about Stolen Bikes - Many tips from SF residents about where stolen bike operations operate - Why does SFPD ignore stolen bike gangs?
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 5:13:00 PM

From: Michael Papesh <michaelpapesh@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:39 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Chronicle Story about Stolen Bikes - Many tips from SF residents about where stolen bike operations operate - Why does SFPD ignore stolen bike gangs?

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

<https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/articleComments/UCSF-nurse-bike-stolen-locals-help-15240477.php>

I would swing by 15th and Julian, where a long running theft and chop shop ring is currently headquartered. You can't miss them - huge piles of stoked bikes covered in tarps, blocking the sidewalk. Neighbors have been calling the SFPD about them for years. The only time anything was done was during the all too brief interim mayoralty of Mark Ferrell. They confiscated the tents leaving the criminal crew standing awkwardly around their exposed piles of hundreds of stolen bikes.

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#)
Subject: FW: Twelfth Supplement to Emergency Declaration
Date: Friday, May 1, 2020 2:09:00 PM
Attachments: [Twelfth Supplement 043020.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the attached Twelfth Supplement to the Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency dated April 30, 2020.

Thank you,

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

From: Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2020 2:07 PM
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>](mailto:mchugh@sfgov.org); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)
Cc: [BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>](mailto:bos-operations@sfgov.org)
Subject: FW: Twelfth Supplement to Emergency Declaration

Please see attached the Twelfth Supplement to the Mayor's Emergency Proclamation.

Thanks,
Sophia

Sophia Kittler
Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
(415) 554 6153 | Sophia.kittler@sfgov.org



**TWELFTH SUPPLEMENT TO MAYORAL PROCLAMATION DECLARING
THE EXISTENCE OF A LOCAL EMERGENCY DATED FEBRUARY 25, 2020**

WHEREAS, California Government Code Sections 8550 et seq., San Francisco Charter Section 3.100(14) and Chapter 7 of the San Francisco Administrative Code empower the Mayor to proclaim the existence of a local emergency, subject to concurrence by the Board of Supervisors as provided in the Charter, in the case of an emergency threatening the lives, property or welfare of the City and County or its citizens; and

WHEREAS, On February 25, 2020, the Mayor issued a Proclamation (the “Proclamation”) declaring a local emergency to exist in connection with the imminent spread within the City of a novel (new) coronavirus (“COVID-19”); and

WHEREAS, On March 3, 2020, the Board of Supervisors concurred in the Proclamation and in the actions taken by the Mayor to meet the emergency; and

WHEREAS, On March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom proclaimed a state of emergency to exist within the State due to the threat posed by COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, On March 6, 2020, the Local Health Officer declared a local health emergency under Section 101080 of the California Health and Safety Code, and the Board of Supervisors concurred in that declaration on March 10, 2020; and

WHEREAS, On March 6, 2020, the City issued public health guidance to encourage social distancing to disrupt the spread of COVID-19 and protect community health; and

WHEREAS, On March 16, 2020, the City’s Health Officer issued a stay safe at home order, Health Officer Order No. C19-07 (the “Stay Safe At Home Order”), requiring most people to remain in their homes subject to certain exceptions including obtaining essential goods such as food and necessary supplies, and requiring the closure of non-essential businesses; the Health Officer has extended the Stay Safe At Home Order through May 31, 2020; and

WHEREAS, There are currently 1,499 confirmed cases of COVID-19 within the City, and there have been at least 25 COVID-19-related deaths in the City; and there are more than 50,000 confirmed cases in California, and there have been more than 2,000 COVID-19-related deaths in California; and



WHEREAS, This order and the previous orders issued during this emergency have all been issued because of the propensity of the virus to spread person to person and also because the virus physically is causing property loss or damage due to its proclivity to attach to surfaces for prolonged periods of time; and

WHEREAS, On March 16, 2020, the Governor issued Executive Order N-28-20, finding that it is necessary to promote stability among residential and commercial tenancies to further public health and to mitigate the economic pressures of the emergency, and waiving certain provisions of state law so that local jurisdictions may achieve these purposes; and

WHEREAS, On March 18, 2020, the San Francisco Superior Court stayed all actions of unlawful detainer cases for 90 days, except those resulting from violence, threats of violence, or health and safety issues, and ordered that the period from March 18, 2020, through April 15, 2020 is deemed a holiday for purposes of computing time under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1167, with the exception of unlawful detainer cases resulting from violence, threats of violence, or health and safety issues; and

WHEREAS, On April 6, 2020, the California Judicial Council adopted temporary emergency rules modifying the procedures for unlawful detainer actions, including prohibiting courts from issuing summons on complaints, prohibiting entry of default, and extending the time for trial in cases already filed, subject to limited exceptions; the Judicial Council's temporary rule remains in effect until 90 day after the Governor lifts the state of emergency related to COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, The Mayor has issued several orders concerning residential evictions: on March 13, 2020, the Mayor issued the Second Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation, imposing a temporary moratorium on residential evictions to prevent mass displacement of City residents due to the financial impacts of the COVID-19 emergency and to prevent the public health impacts that would result from such displacement; on March 23, 2020, in the Fifth Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation, the Mayor clarified and expanded the scope of the temporary eviction moratorium; the Mayor extended the temporary residential eviction moratorium by an additional 30 days on April 22, 2020; and



WHEREAS, In light of the continuing emergency and its severe impact on renters in the City, it is necessary to amend the temporary residential eviction moratorium to clarify its intended scope, and to provide greater certainty to landlords and tenants regarding the rules that shall apply; and

WHEREAS, In the Third Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation dated March 17, 2020, recognizing that many City employees affected by the Stay Safe At Home Order cannot perform their duties remotely and must stay home and that it is in the public interest to support such employees with paid leave, the Mayor authorized a paid leave program through April 17, 2020, to mitigate financial impacts of the emergency on City employees; the Mayor extended the program to May 1, 2020 through a further order in the Seventh Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation; due to the extension of the Stay Safe At Home Order through May 31, 2020, it is in the public interest to further extend this paid leave program; and

WHEREAS, In the Third Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation dated March 17, 2020, the Mayor prohibited meetings of City boards, commissions, and advisory bodies, other than the Board of Supervisors, through April 7, 2020, unless authorized by the Mayor or the Board of Supervisors; the Mayor extended this order on May 3, 2020, in the Eighth Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation; given the extension of the Stay Safe At Home Order through May 31, 2020, it is necessary to continue the restrictions on meetings of these bodies through May 31, 2020; and

NOW, THEREFORE,

I, London N. Breed, Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco, proclaim that there continues to exist an emergency within the City and County threatening the lives, property or welfare of the City and County and its citizens;

In addition to the measures outlined in the Proclamation and in the Supplements to the Proclamation dated March 11, March 13, March 17, March 18, March 23, March 27, March 31, April 1, April 10, April 14, and April 23, 2020, it is further ordered as follows:



(1) Sections 1 and 2 of the Fifth Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation, dated March 23, 2020 and extended by the Mayor on April 22, 2020, are revised and replaced as follows:

(a) Notwithstanding Sections 37.9(a)(1) or 37.9(b) of the Administrative Code, no owner shall evict a residential tenant due to a missed rent payment that was due between March 13, 2020 and the date this Order expires or is terminated, if the tenant was unable to pay due to financial impacts of COVID-19, until six months after the date this Order expires or is terminated. The tenant shall have at least until the six-month mark to pay any past due rent, and may use the protections of this subsection (1)(a) as an affirmative defense to any action to evict due to the non-payment.

(i) The protections of this subsection (1)(a) shall apply to the following types of units:

(A) all rental units covered by the Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code (including without limitation single-family homes, new construction, and owner/master tenant-occupied units);

(B) all residential units in residential hotels regardless of how long the unit has been occupied; and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD") may adopt regulations to toll the 32-day period for establishing permanent residency in such units in cases where the landlord was prohibited from evicting due to this Order; and

(C) all units where the rent is controlled or regulated by the City, including without limitation privately-operated units regulated by MOHCD or the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

(ii) This subsection (1)(a) shall also apply to evictions based on nonpayment of late fees and interest due to missed rent payments, nonpayment of monies due under existing stipulations or payment plans, or failure to replenish or increase security deposits.

(iii) Tenants shall notify their landlords if they are unable to pay due to financial impacts of COVID-19 and shall provide supporting documentation. However, failure to provide notice and/or documentation to the landlord shall not affect a tenant's



ability to claim the protections of this subsection (1)(a) as an affirmative defense in the event the landlord files an action to evict for non-payment. Supporting documentation shall be required in court, though a court may in its discretion waive this requirement in circumstances such as where the documentation is unavailable.

(iv) For purposes of this Order, “financial impacts” means a substantial loss of household income due to business closure, loss of compensable hours of work or wages, layoffs, or extraordinary out-of-pocket expenses. A financial impact is “related to COVID-19” if it was caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Mayor’s Proclamation, the Local Health Officer’s Declaration of Local Health Emergency, or orders or recommended guidance related to COVID-19 from local, state, or federal authorities.

(v) Landlords and tenants are strongly encouraged to discuss payments plans for the tenant to repay all or a portion of the back rent. A payment plan may not shorten the six-month period or otherwise require a tenant to waive any of the protections of this subsection (1)(a). A landlord may accept partial rent payments or temporarily discount the rent, without affecting the maximum allowable base rent. Tenants who are unable to pay rent due to financial impacts of COVID-19 shall also be eligible to participate in the Good Samaritan program set forth in Section 37.2(a)(1)(D) of the Administrative Code.

(vi) Nothing in this subsection (1)(a) relieves a tenant of the obligation to pay rent, nor restricts any remedy of the landlord other than to evict for non-payment.

(b) No owner may impose late fees or interest on rent not paid under subsection (1)(a). In addition, no owner of a unit identified in subsection (1)(a)(i)(C) may impose a rent increase, either under an existing lease (including a lease modification) or through the renewal of an expired lease, until one month after the date this Order expires or is terminated.

(c) No owner shall recover possession of a residential dwelling unit, including but not limited to any unit specified in subsection (1)(a)(i), if the effective date of the notice of termination would fall within two months after the date this Order expires, unless the owner can show it is necessary to recover possession due to violence, threats of violence, or health and safety issues. This subsection (1)(c) shall apply to evictions under Section 37.9(a)(13) only if and when the Governor or State Legislature authorize such limitations on Ellis Act evictions during this state of emergency.



(d) The Director of MOHCD or the Director's designee, in consultation with the Executive Director of the Rent Board as appropriate, shall have the authority to adopt regulations and publish guidelines with respect to the types of documentation that may show financial impacts related to COVID-19, notices that landlords must use to inform tenants of the protections of this Order, and such other matters as MOHCD may deem appropriate in order to effectuate the purposes of this Order.

(e) This Order shall last for a period of two months, until the Proclamation of Local Emergency is terminated, or upon further Order from the Mayor, whichever occurs sooner. The Mayor may extend this Order by an additional period of one month if conditions at that time warrant extension. The Mayor shall provide notice of the extension through an Executive Order posted on the Mayor's website and delivered to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

(2) The Human Resources Director is authorized, with the concurrence of the Controller, to extend the existing paid leave program for City employees, first authorized on March 17, 2020 in the Third Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation, through May 31, 2020, to mitigate the financial impacts of the emergency on these City employees. The Director of Transportation is authorized, with the concurrence of the Controller, to extend the existing paid leave program for service critical employees of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency first authorized on March 17, 2020 by the Third Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation, through May 31, 2020. This paid leave program is for employees who are available to work, but not working, including working from home, due to the Stay Safe At Home Order.

///

///

///

///

///



(3) Section 1 of the Eighth Supplement to the Emergency Proclamation dated April 1, 2020, is revised and replaced as follows: From March 18, 2020 through May 31, 2020, City policy and advisory bodies shall not hold public meetings, unless the Board of Supervisors, acting by written motion, or the Mayor or the Mayor's designee directs otherwise, based on a determination that a policy body has an urgent need to take action to ensure public health, safety, or essential government operations. This order applies to all City commissions, boards, and advisory bodies other than the Board of Supervisors and its committees.

DATED: April 30, 2020

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "London Breed".

London N. Breed
Mayor of San Francisco