

FILE NO. 220968

Petitions and Communications received from September 8, 2022, through September 15, 2022, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on September 20, 2022.

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

From the Office of the Mayor, making the following reappointments to the following bodies. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

Reappointments pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18):

- Human Rights Commission
 - Karen Clopton - term ending August 31, 2026
 - Michael Sweet - term ending August 31, 2026
- Fire Commission
 - Paula Collins - term ending January 15, 2026

From the Police Commission, regarding a proposed Ordinance approving a Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras. File No. 220606. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From various Departments, submitting Chapter, Section 12B, Waiver Request Forms, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1. 7 Contracts. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, regarding a Resolution initiating a landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code for Lincoln Park, formerly known as City Cemetery, and an Ordinance amending the Planning Code to designate City Cemetery as a Landmark consistent with Article 10 of the Planning Code. File Nos. 220654 and 210426. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From Matthew Binzek, regarding a crime on Clay Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From concerned citizens, regarding a Hearing to consider the renewal of the Tourism Improvement District, and a Resolution to establish, renew and expand the Tourism Improvement District. 8 Letters. File Nos. 220783 and 220784. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From concerned citizens, regarding a Hearing on Laguna Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan. File No. 220619. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From concerned citizens, regarding a Resolution urging the Recreation and Park Department to develop and install appropriate interpretive signage onsite at Sharp Park, acknowledging the site's dark chapter in San Francisco history as a concentration camp, in consultation with the Japanese American Community. File No. 220958. 7 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From Jay Chatfield, regarding Cruise Autonomous Vehicles and taxi medallions. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From Mariclare Ballard, regarding parklets. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Joshua Sclar, regarding public approval of the Board of Supervisors. (11)

From concerned citizens, regarding a Hearing on the Civil Grand Jury report, entitled "Buried Problems and a Buried Process - The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change," (The Report), and a Resolution responding to The Report. File Nos. 220720 and 220721. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From concerned citizens, regarding Slow Streets and Lake Street. 8 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From concerned citizens, regarding algal blooms in the San Francisco Bay. 70 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From concerned citizens, regarding an Ordinance amending the Park Code to adopt the Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program. File No. 220261. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Allen Jones, regarding electric wheelchair charging stations. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From David Sundy, regarding quality-of-life issues. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Robert Rutkowski, regarding the San Francisco Police Department. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Wynship Hillier, regarding the Behavioral Health Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#); [Fennell, Tyra \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Reappointment - HRC
Date: Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:08:00 PM
Attachments: [Clerk's Memo 9.14.22.pdf](#)
[Reappointment-Karen Clopton 2022.pdf](#)
[Karen Clopton bio.pdf](#)
[Clopton_Karen_Form 700.pdf](#)
[Michael Sweet Form 700.pdf](#)
[Reappointment-Michael Sweet 2022.pdf](#)
[Sweet_Michael_A_-_Bio.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached complete reappointment packages. Please see the memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instructions.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | 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, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 14, 2022
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *ACC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: *ACC* Mayoral Reappointments - Human Rights Commission

The Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete reappointment packages:

Reappointments to the Human Rights Commission:

- Karen Clopton - term ending August 1, 2026
- Michael Sweet - term ending August 31, 2026

Pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18), appointments in this category are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (October 14, 2022).

Board Rule 2.18.3, states that a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral appointment by timely notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within 30 days of the transmittal letter as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you wish to hold a hearing on either reappointment, please let me know in writing by Wednesday, September 21, 2022.

c: Aaron Peskin, Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy
Victor Young, Rules Clerk
Anne Pearson, Deputy City Attorney
Tom Paulino, Mayor's Legislative Liaison
Tyra Fennell, Director of Commission Affairs

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Reappointment

September 12, 2022

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to **Charter Section 3.100 (18)**, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following appointment:

Karen Clopton, to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission for a four year term ending August 1, 2026.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Commission Affairs, Tyra Fennell, at 415-554-6696

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "London Breed".

London N. Breed
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

Karen Valentia Clopton
2509 Lake Street
San Francisco, CA 94121
(415) 308-6285



Karen V. Clopton is the Chief Administrative Law Judge for the California Public Utilities Commission and manages a staff of 100 including over 40 judges who draft proposed decisions for discussion and adoption by the Commission. She has over 25 years experience in the practice of administrative law in a wide variety of forums. She is the 2010 winner of the American Bar Association's Mary C. Lawton Award for Outstanding Government Service from the Section on Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice. Appointed in 2007 by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger as the General Counsel for the California Department of Corporations, she oversaw all

litigation counsel, both in house and outside; and served as liaison with the Governor's legal staff and other governmental agencies. Recruited in 2002 to be the first Chief of Operations and Corporate Counsel for the San Francisco State University Foundation, Inc., she successfully chaired the University's 42-member Task Force on Intergroup Relations with its initial focus on the relationship of the Palestinian and Jewish communities to universal plaudits.

Judge Clopton was appointed by Mayor Frank Jordan to the San Francisco Civil Service Commission in 1993 and was re-appointed by Mayor Willie L. Brown in 1999. During her tenure she streamlined the classification system and personal services contracting process. She was serving an unprecedented fourth term as President of the Commission when the Port Commission recruited her in 2000 to become the Port's first Chief of Operations, overseeing Human Resources, Information Systems, Communications, Legislative Affairs, Business Services, Contract Compliance, and Environmental Health and Safety.

Judge Clopton also served on the San Francisco Mayor's Advisory Employee Relations Panel from 1992-94 chaired by the Honorable Joseph Grodin under Mayor Jordan. She was awarded the prestigious Jack Berman Individual Award of Achievement for Distinguished Service to the Profession and the Public by the State Bar of California's Young Lawyers Association in 1994, which is awarded to one of the state's 40,000 young lawyers each year. In 1998, the San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women honored Judge Clopton with the Women Who Make a Difference Award for making a positive difference in women's lives in the areas of employment and economic development.

Judge Clopton is an accomplished author and lecturer on professional responsibility and corporate governance, regulatory practices and procedures, workplace diversity and discrimination issues, sexual harassment prevention and investigation policies, and alcohol and substance abuse policies. She is the Immediate Past President of the San Francisco League of Women Voters. She is a graduate of Vassar College **cum laude** and Antioch University School of Law and was awarded the highly competitive Maguire Fellowship by Vassar College for post-graduate study in international and comparative labor-management relations in London, England. She earned a certificate in administrative law and fair hearings from the National Judicial College. Judge Clopton serves on the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners' Administrative Law Judge Subcommittee. Judge Clopton received the 2011 Trailblazer Award from the National Coalition of 100 Black Women, San Francisco Chapter and was recognized for this honor by the Congress, the California State Senate, San Francisco's Mayor and Board of Supervisors. She also received the 2011 History Maker Award for the March into National

Karen Valentia Clopton, Chief ALJ, California Public Utilities Commission, kvc@cpuc.ca.gov, 415 703-2008
Please note that all opinions expressed and materials presented by Judge Clopton are her own and do not represent the opinions of the Commission or California state government.

Karen Valentia Clopton

Women's History Month, "Celebrating the Contributions of Powerful Women of the Bay." In 2012, Judge Clopton was awarded the California Association of Black Lawyers' Judicial Award of Excellence in recognition of her exemplary and dedicated service.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS AND APPOINTMENTS

- **State Bar of California, Council on Access and Fairness, 2010-2014**
- **State Bar of California, Labor & Employment Law Section, Executive Committee**
2000-2010: Served as Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Treasurer; appointed by the Board of Governors of the State Bar of California in 2000 to serve on 15 member Executive Committee that represents the over 5,000 Labor and Employment Law Section members on statewide issues that impact the practice of labor and employment law; Chair, Education Subcommittee that presents continuing legal education programs for the State Bar.
- **Chair, President's Task Force on Inter-Group Relations, 2002**
Appointed by San Francisco State University President Robert A. Corrigan to Chair the President's 42-member Task Force on Inter-Group Relations: Initial Focus on the Effect of Middle East Issues on Campus Life; developed methodology, presided over meetings, and successfully produced the Preliminary Report as charged by August 1, 2002. This tenure began on June 3 and successfully completed December 15, 2002 with a comprehensive final report that was well received by all of the diverse communities involved, including the Jewish and Palestinian communities. www.sfsu.edu/~ohr/noindex/finalreport.html
- **Judge, Ecclesiastical Court, Episcopal Diocese of California** 1996-2006
Elected Presiding Judge 1998; seven member court adjudicates clergy misconduct cases for the Episcopal Diocese of California; drafted court protocol based upon federal rules of civil procedure and evidence; create and submit annual budget; presided over hearings and meetings of the court.
- **Commissioner, Civil Service Commission, City & County of San Francisco** 1993-2000
The Commission oversees the personnel merit system that governs over 26,000 municipal employees, reviews all personal service contracts with the City & County; and has appellate authority over certain personnel decisions made by the Human Resources Department. Elected President four terms and Vice President two terms. Presided over biweekly public hearings. Oversaw City's Equal Employment Opportunity and diversity program implementation and compliance efforts; directed the Executive Officer and annual budget.
- **State Bar of California, Board of Legal Specialization** 1991-1994
Appointed by the Board of Governors, oversaw California State Bar's Legal Specialization Program and Advisory Commissions, annual budget, examination process, education programs; served as editor of quarterly Legal Specialization Digest and chair of Public Awareness Committee.
- **Employee Relations Advisory Panel, City & County of San Francisco** 1992-1994

Karen Valentia Clopton

Appointed by Mayor Frank Jordan, Member of Panel mandated by 1991 Proposition B chaired by Hon. Joseph Grodin to draft and implement municipal ordinance for collective bargaining and labor relations for San Francisco municipal employees.

- **Lawyers Club of San Francisco, Board of Governors** 1996-2000
PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

Faculty Member

Hastings College of Law, Legal Research and Writing Program, Fall 2005

State Bar of California Section Education Institute, 2000-2010

Stanford Law School, Stanford Advocacy Skills Workshop, 1999-2000

San Francisco State University, Paralegal Education Program, 1994-1997

Developed, researched and taught course in labor law and individual employment rights.

Council on Education in Management, 1999

“Effectively Managing ADA, Workers’ Compensation and FMLA Issues”

California Bankers School, Bankers Executive Council 1997-1999

Moderator

League of Women Voters of San Francisco Election Debates, City Watch, Cable Television Channel, 1998-2003

State Bar of California Labor and Employment Law Section, Education Chair, 2000-2009

The Labor and Employment Law Section of the Bar Association of San Francisco, Fall 1996.

Bias in Alternative Dispute Resolution, Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco, Summer 1994

Publications, television, media, and articles by and about Karen Clopton

[Beyond the Headlines: African American Roundtable | abc7news.com](http://abc7news.com/abclocal.go.com/kgo/story?section=resources/lifestyle...id...)

abclocal.go.com/kgo/story?section=resources/lifestyle...id...

[African American Salutes 2012: Judge Karen Clopton, Chief ...](http://abclocal.go.com/kgo/story?section=resources/lifestyle...id...)

abclocal.go.com/kgo/story?section=resources/lifestyle...id...

Credo, San Francisco Sunday Examiner, March 26, 2011

<http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/credo/2011/03/league-women-voters-sf-president-celebrates-important-anniversary>

“The Challenges and Rewards of an Administrative Law Judge” Nina Schuyler, San Francisco Attorney, Bar Association of San Francisco, Spring 2010

www.sfbar.org/forms/sfam/q12010/administrative-law-judges.pdf

Editorial Board, California Labor & Employment Law Review, 2000-Present

“Eliminating Bias in the Legal Workplace and Beyond,” [California Labor & Employment Law Review](http://www.ccwomenofcolor.org/eliminating-bias-workplace.html), Volume 23, No.5, September 2009

“The Evolution of Sexual Harassment Law in California: What Business Lawyers Should Know,” [California Business Law Practitioner](http://www.ccwomenofcolor.org/eliminating-bias-workplace.html), Volume 24/Number 1, Winter 2009.

“Diversity, Affirmative Action and the Supreme Court,” [California Labor and Employment Law Review](http://www.ccwomenofcolor.org/eliminating-bias-workplace.html), Volume 17, No.5, September 2003

“The Good Mother and the Workplace,” [California Bar Journal](http://www.ccwomenofcolor.org/eliminating-bias-workplace.html), September 2002

“Avoiding the Pitfalls of Serving as In-House Counsel,” [California Labor & Employment Law Quarterly](http://www.ccwomenofcolor.org/eliminating-bias-workplace.html), Volume 16, No.4, May 2002

“Alcohol and the Workplace,” [California Bar Journal](http://www.ccwomenofcolor.org/eliminating-bias-workplace.html), July 2001

San Francisco Bay Crossings October 2001 Working Waterfront in Their Own Words

www.baycrossings.com/archives/.../working_waterfront.htm -

Karen Valentia Clopton

Editor, Legal Specialization Digest, Quarterly Publication of the Board of Legal Specialization,
1991-94

“Making a Good Impression: How Lawyers Can Make a Difference,” The San Francisco
Attorney Magazine, September 1994

Karen Valentia Clopton

NON-PROFIT CORPORATE BOARD MEMBERSHIP

- **League of Women Voters of San Francisco, President** 2007-2011

A non-partisan political organization encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy; Board member since 2006; as President, served as spokesperson for the organization; active League member since 1990.

- **Jack and Jill of America, San Francisco Chapter, President** 2001-Present

- **KQED Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Chair** 2006-2012

CAP members advise the Board of Directors of KQED/Northern California Public Broadcasting effectiveness in meeting the specialized educational and diverse cultural needs of the communities it serves. CAP members also participate in outreach and community relations activities, such as forums, speaker bureaus, committee assignments, and other activities that promote awareness of the Bay Area's public television and radio station's programming, services, and mission.

- **Zeum Board of Directors** 2003-2008

Children's museum for arts, technology and media in Yerba Buena Gardens; oversaw K-12 curriculum, exhibits, special programs and projects; provided fundraising and educational guidance as well as finance and budget oversight; Chair of Audit committee.

- **Junior Statesmen Foundation Board of Trustees, Trustee** 1991-Present

Responsible for oversight management of 75 year old national Junior Statesmen program for high school students interested in government, politics and debate; Board provides fundraising and educational guidance as well as finance and budget oversight.

- **Bayview-Hunter's Point Foundation, President Board of Directors** 1992-1996

Provided management, strategic planning, and oversight analysis of \$10,000,000 budget for community-based non-profit organization.

- **Youth Leadership Institute, Board of Directors** 1992-1997

Oversaw personnel management, strategic planning, budget and program implementation for leading statewide center and national model for youth leadership development, tobacco-free and drug-free youth advocacy, education, and philanthropy; drafted new bylaws and personnel policies.

- **Sister to Sister Mentor Program, Founder** 1991-1995

Developed, administered and recruited volunteers for mentoring program for pre-adolescent African American girls in the San Francisco Unified School District's Middle Schools to develop self-esteem and positive future goals; spearheaded fundraising and development; coordinated pilot program at Visitation Valley Middle School.

Karen Valentia Clopton

Chronological Resume

2012 **Judicial Award of Excellence**, California Association of Black Lawyers

2011 **History Makers Award**, National Women's History Month, Celebrating the Contributions of Powerful Women of the Bay

2011 **Trailblazer Award**, National Coalition of 100 Black Women, San Francisco Chapter

2010 **Mary C. Lawton Award for Outstanding Government Service**, American Bar Association, Section on Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice

2009-present: **Chief Administrative Law Judge**, California Public Utilities Commission, manage Division staff of 100 employees, including over 40 judges who draft proposed decisions for discussion and adoption by the Commission in adjudicatory, quasi-legislative and rate-setting proceedings. Develop Commission meeting agendas; implement statutory deadlines and mandates; serves as member of National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners' Administrative Law Judge staff subcommittee. National Judicial College Certificate.

2007-2008: **General Counsel**, California Department of Corporations (DOC). Appointed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, managed all litigation counsel, both in- house and outside; reviewed all Office of Administrative Hearings decisions; reviewed and implemented all DOC employment policies and procedures; and served as liaison with the Governor's legal staff and other governmental agencies.

2007-2011: **President, League of Women Voters of San Francisco**

2006: **Chief Executive Officer and General Counsel**, Workplace Consulting Consortium, a human resource firm that provided corporate coaching, discrimination investigations, protocols, and performance evaluation tools to business.

2002-2005: **Chief of Operations and Corporate Counsel**, San Francisco State University Foundation, Inc., recruited and managed staff and outside counsel; successfully recruited executive staff, including information technology director and chief accountant/controller; oversaw human resources, including diversity outreach program, staff development, and management training; grant and contract administration; and real estate and portfolio management; successfully increased business revenues and maximized development funds.

2000-2002: **Chief of Operations**, Port of San Francisco, managed daily administration of human resources, including recruitment, staffing, diversity outreach program implementation, examination process, performance appraisal development and implementation, and personnel policies.

1993-2000: **Commissioner**, San Francisco Civil Service Commission, served unprecedented four terms as President, two terms as Vice President, streamlined personal service contract process and radically reduced and reformed classification system. During seven year tenure, oversaw the diversity, equal employment opportunity, and affirmative action programs for the 26,000 San Francisco City and County employees.

Karen Valentia Clopton

2000-present: **Editorial Board, California Labor and Employment Law Review**

2000-2010: **Executive Committee, State Bar of California's Labor and Employment Law Section**, Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer; Education Committee Chair.

1998 **Women Who Make a Difference Award**, San Francisco Commission on Status of Women

1994 **Individual Award of Achievement for Distinguished Service to the Profession and the Public**, Jack Berman Award, California Young Lawyers Association

1990-2000: Human Resource Management/Labor and Employment Law Practice

1997-2000: **Special Labor and Employment Law Counsel**, Director of Diversity and Marketing, Leland, Parachini, Steinberg, Matzger & Melnick: supervised associates, paralegals, and support staff; conducted diversity training and continuing legal education on the elimination of bias; participated in the California Minority Counsel Program.

1995-1997: **Labor and Employment Law Partner**, Cooper, White and Cooper

1995: **Labor and Employment Law Partner**, Landels, Ripley & Diamond (defunct)

Founded MALARD, Minority Attorneys of Landels, Ripley & Diamond to support firm diversity initiatives and mentor associates.

1992-1995: **Partner**, Berman, Berkeley & Lasky (BB&L), (defunct) Labor and employment law practice, and served as **Executive Director**, Internal Dispute Resolution, Inc., (IDR) founded by BB&L. Recruited staff, developed marketing strategies and branding, implemented diversity program for law firm and IDR.

1990-1991: **Associate**, Jackson, Lewis, San Francisco office, national labor and employment law firm on behalf of management.

1987-1990: **Trial Attorney, National Labor Relations Board**, Regions 20 and 32, also served as Federal Women's Program Manager; Attorney Steward; EEO Officer.

1986-1987: **Labor Relations Representative**, CSEA, SEIU Local 1000.

1985-1986: **Assistant Regional Counsel**, Health and Human Services, San Francisco

1984-1985: **Maguire Fellow**, competitive post-graduate fellowship awarded by Vassar College to study international and comparative labor management relations and employment rights in London, England and Geneva, Switzerland

1983-1984: **Staff Attorney**, National Labor Relations Board, Division of Advice, D.C.

1983: **Juris Doctor**, Antioch University School of Law, Washington, D.C.

1980: **AB cum laude, Vassar College**, Poughkeepsie, New York

Double major: Political Science and Hispanic Studies

Columnist, Miscellany News

Student Representative, Trustee Investor Responsibility Committee

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS
COVER PAGE
A Public Document

 Date Initial Filing Received
 Filing Official Use Only

 E-Filed
 03/31/2022
 16:51:59

 Filing ID:
 203290935

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER	(LAST)	(FIRST)	(MIDDLE)
Clopton, Karen			

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

City and County of San Francisco

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Human Rights Commission

Your Position

Commissioner

▶ If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)

Agency: _____

Position: _____

2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box) State Multi-County _____ City of _____ Judge, Retired Judge, Pro Tem Judge, or Court Commissioner
(Statewide Jurisdiction) County of San Francisco Other _____**3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)** **Annual:** The period covered is January 1, 2021 through
December 31, 2021.

-or-

The period covered is ____/____/____, through
December 31, 2021. **Assuming Office:** Date assumed ____/____/____ **Candidate:** Date of Election _____ and office sought, if different than Part 1: _____ **Leaving Office:** Date Left ____/____/____
(Check one circle) The period covered is January 1, 2021 through the date of
leaving office. The period covered is ____/____/____, through the date
of leaving office.**4. Schedule Summary (must complete) ▶ Total number of pages including this cover page: 1****Schedules attached** **Schedule A-1 - Investments** – schedule attached **Schedule A-2 - Investments** – schedule attached **Schedule B - Real Property** – schedule attached **Schedule C - Income, Loans, & Business Positions** – schedule attached **Schedule D - Income – Gifts** – schedule attached **Schedule E - Income – Gifts – Travel Payments** – schedule attached

-or-

 None - No reportable interests on any schedule**5. Verification**

MAILING ADDRESS	STREET	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)				
		San Francisco	CA	94121

DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
()	

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete. I acknowledge this is a public document.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date Signed 03/31/2022
(month, day, year)Signature Karen Clopton
(File the originally signed paper statement with your filing official.)

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Reappointment

September 12, 2022

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to **Charter Section 3.100 (18)**, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following reappointment:

Michael Sweet, to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission for a four year term ending August 31, 2026.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Commission Affairs, Tyra Fennell, at 415-554-6696

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "London N. Breed".

London N. Breed
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



Fox Rothschild LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Michael A. Sweet

Partner

San Francisco, CA | Los Angeles, CA – Century City Office

p 415.364.5548

f 415.391.4436

msweet@foxrothschild.com



Michael is an experienced litigator who helps clients navigate through financial restructurings and bankruptcy as well as complex litigation matters and election law issues in federal and state court. He has brought multiple jury and bench trials to verdict.

Bankruptcy and Financial Restructuring

Michael represents debtors, creditors and creditors' committees and trustees in bankruptcy cases throughout the state of California. He has extensive experience litigating preferences, fraudulent conveyances, claims objections and plan confirmation, and he frequently advises clients in financial distress on bankruptcy avoidance. He also handles municipal bankruptcies and restructurings, advising local governments on issues related to potential Chapter 9 filings.

Representative Matters:

- Served as lead bankruptcy counsel to the Official Committee of Equity Investors in California Mortgage and Realty (CMR) cases in the Northern District of California, which involved more than 1,200 equity investors with claims based on more than \$200 million in investments.
- Responsible for major claims and preference litigation on behalf of the Chapter 11 bankruptcy estates of Metricom, Inc. and Washington Group, International. Successfully reduced claims against the estates by tens of millions of dollars.
- Assisted the city of Richmond, CA, in restructuring its finances to avoid filing for bankruptcy.
- Obtained significant concessions from creditors and facilitated financing backed by a new parcel tax in order to help a health care district avoid bankruptcy.

Practice Areas

Financial Restructuring and Bankruptcy
Municipal Insolvency
Litigation
Government Relations

Education

J.D., University of California at Los Angeles School of Law, 1996
B.A., *cum laude*, Brandeis University, 1991

Bar Admissions

California

Memberships

Bar Association of San Francisco
Bay Area Bankruptcy Forum
California Bankruptcy Forum
California Political Attorneys' Association
California State Democratic Central Committee

Board of Directors

Chair, San Francisco Human Rights Commission
Chair, California Jewish Public Affairs Committee
Vice President, San Francisco Metropolitan Jewish Community Relations Council
Past-president, Raoul Wallenberg Jewish Democratic Club of San Francisco



Litigation

Michael is an accomplished litigator who represents both plaintiffs and defendants in state and federal courts in commercial and employment disputes, creditors' rights issues and class actions, including those under California's Unfair Competition Law. His clients include technology companies, green-tech businesses, financial institutions, hospitality companies and a gourmet food producer.

Representative Matters:

- Represented the Larry L. Hillblom Foundation in complex probate litigation in Saipan.
- Successfully represented a major diversified financial institution in a complex fraudulent transfer case brought against eight individuals and 43 related companies.

Election Law

Michael represents candidates, campaign committees and officeholders involved in recall campaigns and finance-related law enforcement matters.

Professional Accomplishments

Michael's published decisions include:

- *Roberts v. North American Van Lines*, U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7787 (N.D. Cal., 2004). Michael helped defend the moving company against a class action suit filed by former customers relating to allegedly deceptive business practices. After the defendants defeated the motion for class certification, the plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed the case.
- *Bunker v. County of Orange*, 103 Cal.App. 4th 542 (2002). Michael successfully argued to uphold taxpayers' rights to bring a class action lawsuit over the county's handling of the real property assessment appeals process.
- *Bramberg v. Jones*, 20 Cal. 4th 1045 (1999). Michael successfully pursued litigation before the California Supreme Court on behalf of U.S. House of Representatives Speaker Nancy Pelosi and former California Senate President Pro Tem John Burton. The case invalidated a statewide ballot initiative on constitutional grounds.

Before Fox Rothschild

Michael has practiced at various bankruptcy and litigation firms throughout California. Prior to his arrival at Fox, he served as chair of the municipal debt restructuring and bankruptcy practice group at a California law firm.

He is a former judicial extern for The Hon. Lisa Hill Fenning of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California.



Beyond Fox Rothschild

Michael has spoken and written extensively on bankruptcy topics, particularly in the arena of government issues related to potential Chapter 9 bankruptcy filings.

In the News

- Featured, "Another City May Declare Bankruptcy," *The Daily Journal* (October 5, 2012)
- Featured, "The Basics of Restructuring: Alternative Paths to Reform - Prospects for Deficit Reduction and Pension Reform in the Golden State," *University of California Television* (October 1, 2012)
- Featured, "Restructuring in California: Rare Defaults; Growing Pension Burdens - Conference Coverage," *Debtwire* (September 24, 2012)
- Featured, "SEC Lawyer Keeps Eye On Stockton," *The Stockton Record* (September 11, 2012)
- Featured, "Mammoth Lakes Hopes To Ink Settlement This Month, But Chapter 9 Case Isn't Over Just Yet," *Debtwire* (September 6, 2012)
- Featured, "Mammoth Lakes Settlement May Inspire More Ch. 9 Mediation," *Law 360* (August 27, 2012)
- Featured, "Judge Lends Bankruptcy Experience to Stockton," *The Stockton Record* (August 24, 2012)
- Featured, "CalPERS Will Get its Due From Bankrupt Cities," *Pensions & Investments* (July 23, 2012)
- Featured, "Rolling the Dice," *The Stockton Record* (July 17, 2012)
- Featured, "Movers," *The National Law Journal* (July 16, 2012)
- Featured, "San Bernardino Vote To Pursue Bankruptcy Surprises Some," *San Francisco Daily Journal* (July 12, 2012)
- Featured, "City's Woes May Impede Bid to Seize Mortgages," *American Banker* (July 12, 2012)
- Featured, "Lang & O'Leary Exchange," *CBC News* (July 11, 2012)
- Featured, "Another California City Opts for Bankruptcy," *The Associated Press* (July 11, 2012)
- Featured, "Rising Costs Could Push More Calif. Cities Underwater," *Law360* (July 11, 2012)
- Featured, "San Bernardino, California, Weighs Chapter 9 Bankruptcy," *Bloomberg* (July 11, 2012)
- Featured, "Bankrupt California City Provides Cautionary Tale," *Agence France-Presse* (July 7, 2012)
- Featured, "Fox Rothschild Builds Up Muni Debt Practice," *Law360* (June 29, 2012)
- Featured, "Michael A. Sweet Joins Fox Rothschild, Bolstering Firm's Municipal Bankruptcy and Restructuring Capabilities," (June 28, 2012)
- Featured, "Stockton Bankruptcy To Hit City Retirees Hard," *The Associated Press* (June 27, 2012)
- Featured, "Public Sector Restructuring to Grow With Declining Government Revenue," *The Distressed Debt Report*, 2011
- Featured, "When Municipalities Are Living Beyond Their Means," *The Sacramento Bee*, 2010



Articles/Publications

- Author, "Talking Chapter 9," *Journal of the National Association of Bankruptcy Trustees* (Fall 2012)
- Author, "Mammoth Lakes' Possible Filing Tests AB 506," *San Francisco Daily Journal*, 2012
- Co-Author, "Local Governments Need Bankruptcy Option," *San Diego Union Tribune*, 2011
- Author, "Will California's Crisis Lead to a Bankruptcy Wave?," *The Bond Buyer*, 2009
- Guest Columnist, "More Cities Facing Bankruptcy?: While Often Avoidable, Sometimes Going to Court is the Best Option," *The Orange County Register*, 2009
- Author, "Cities Generally Have Alternatives to Bankruptcy," Viewpoints, *The Sacramento Bee*, 2009

Speaking Engagements/Events

- Speaker, "Nightmare to Hollywood Ending: Special Districts Getting Out of the Red," CSDA Annual Conference, (September 27, 2012)
- Speaker, "California's Fiscal Crisis: Prospects for Deficit Reduction and Pension Reform in the Golden State," Berkeley, CA (September 21, 2012)
- Speaker, "Gamechanger: AB 506's Impact on Reducing Budget Obligations," Meyers Nave Webinar, 2012
- Speaker, "Financing Economic Development Today," Meyers Nave Webinar, 2012
- Speaker, "Squeezing Blood From Turnips and Other (Un)proven Strategies For Surviving the Next Budget Cycle," Contra Costa County City Attorneys Association, 2011
- Speaker, "Subdivision Improvement Security: A Potentially Untapped Source of Revenue for Local Government," Meyers Nave Webinar, 2011
- Panel Speaker, "How California Cities Are Coping with Budgetary Issues," California Society of Municipal Analysts Conference, 2011
- Speaker, "Overview of Bankruptcy for Redevelopment Agencies" and "Deals Gone Bad," California Redevelopment Association Presentation, 2010
- Speaker, "Strategies for Growing Your Practice," Bar Association of San Francisco, 2010
- Speaker, "City Survival in the Post-Stimulus World: The Bankruptcy Option," League of California Cities City Managers Department Meeting, 2010
- Speaker, "Municipal Bankruptcy: Strategies, Options and Realities," Municipal Attorneys Group, 2009
- Speaker, "Protecting Your Business from Accessibility Lawsuits," Golden Gate Restaurant Association, 2007
- Co-Speaker, "How to Stop Your Competitors from Stealing Your Trade Secrets and Employees; Also, What You May Lawfully Poach in California" (with Hon. James Kleinberg and John Fox), the Labor and Employment Law Section of the Santa Clara County Bar Association, 2006
- Co-Speaker, "UCL Remedies, The Scope of Restitution and Injunctive Relief" (with Kim Kralowec), Bridgeport Continuing Education 2006 UCL and Class Action Litigation Conference, 2006
- Co-Speaker, "Be Careful What You Wish For: The UCL After Prop. 64" (with Hon. James Kleinberg and Kim Kralowec), Santa Clara County Bar Association MCLE program, 2005



Fox Rothschild LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

- Speaker, “Is There Any Bite Left in B & P Section 17200? Unfair Competition Lawsuits After Proposition 64,” the Barristers Litigation Section meeting of The Bar Association of San Francisco, 2005
- Co-Speaker, “Same Horse, New Rider, Better Ammo: Unfair Competition and Consumer Protection Lawsuits After Proposition 64” (with Mark Olson), Winston & Strawn’s Technology Law Seminar, 2005

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS
COVER PAGE
A Public Document

 Date Initial Filing Received
 Filing Official Use Only

 E-Filed
 03/07/2022
 14:42:50

 Filing ID:
 202566317

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER	(LAST)	(FIRST)	(MIDDLE)
Sweet, Michael			

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

City and County of San Francisco

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Human Rights Commission

Your Position

Commissioner

▶ If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)

Agency: _____ Position: _____

2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box) State Multi-County San Francisco Bay Area City of _____ Judge, Retired Judge, Pro Tem Judge, or Court Commissioner
(Statewide Jurisdiction) County of San Francisco Other _____**3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)** **Annual:** The period covered is January 1, 2021 through
December 31, 2021.

-or-

The period covered is ____/____/____, through
December 31, 2021. **Assuming Office:** Date assumed ____/____/____ **Candidate:** Date of Election _____ and office sought, if different than Part 1: _____ **Leaving Office:** Date Left ____/____/____
(Check one circle) The period covered is January 1, 2021 through the date of
leaving office. The period covered is ____/____/____, through the date
of leaving office.**4. Schedule Summary (must complete) ▶ Total number of pages including this cover page: 4****Schedules attached** **Schedule A-1 - Investments** – schedule attached **Schedule A-2 - Investments** – schedule attached **Schedule B - Real Property** – schedule attached **Schedule C - Income, Loans, & Business Positions** – schedule attached **Schedule D - Income – Gifts** – schedule attached **Schedule E - Income – Gifts – Travel Payments** – schedule attached

-or-

 None - No reportable interests on any schedule**5. Verification**

MAILING ADDRESS	STREET	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
<i>(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)</i>				
		San Francisco	CA	94102

DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
()	

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete. I acknowledge this is a public document.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date Signed 03/07/2022
(month, day, year)Signature Michael Sweet
(File the originally signed paper statement with your filing official.)

SCHEDULE A-1

Investments

Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests

(Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

Investments must be itemized.

Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM **700**

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Sweet, Michael

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Citrix Systems

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Computer software/services

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____
(Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Fox Rothschild, LLP

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Law Firm

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____
(Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____
(Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____
(Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____
(Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____
(Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

Comments: _____

SCHEDULE A-2

Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts

(Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name
Sweet, Michael

▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Debra Sweet Attorney at Law
Name
San Francisco, CA 94127
Address (Business Address Acceptable)
Check one
 Trust, go to 2 Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Legal services

FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 \$0 - \$1,999 21 21
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 ACQUIRED DISPOSED
 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000
 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Partnership Sole Proprietorship Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION Wife is sole proprietor

▶ 2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)

\$0 - \$499 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$500 - \$1,000 OVER \$100,000
 \$1,001 - \$10,000

▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

None or Names listed below

▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
 INVESTMENT REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 21 21
 \$10,001 - \$100,000 ACQUIRED DISPOSED
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000
 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INTEREST
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust Stock Partnership
 Leasehold _____ Other _____
Yrs. remaining

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Name

Address (Business Address Acceptable)
Check one
 Trust, go to 2 Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 \$0 - \$1,999 21 21
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 ACQUIRED DISPOSED
 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000
 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Partnership Sole Proprietorship Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION _____

▶ 2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)

\$0 - \$499 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$500 - \$1,000 OVER \$100,000
 \$1,001 - \$10,000

▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

None or Names listed below

▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
 INVESTMENT REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 21 21
 \$10,001 - \$100,000 ACQUIRED DISPOSED
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000
 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INTEREST
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust Stock Partnership
 Leasehold _____ Other _____
Yrs. remaining

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

Comments: _____

SCHEDULE C

Income, Loans, & Business Positions

(Other than Gifts and Travel Payments)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Sweet, Michael

▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED	▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED
<p>NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME</p> <p>Citrix Systems, Inc.</p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p>Santa Clara, CA 95054</p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p>Software</p> <p>YOUR BUSINESS POSITION</p> <p>Counsel</p> <p>GROSS INCOME RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> No Income - Business Position Only</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000</p> <p>CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Salary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income (For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sale of _____ (Real property, car, boat, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Loan repayment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Commission or <input type="checkbox"/> Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more</p> <p>_____ (Describe)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ (Describe)</p>	<p>NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME</p> <p>Fox Rothschild, LLP</p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p>San Francisco, CA 94104</p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p>Law Firm</p> <p>YOUR BUSINESS POSITION</p> <p>Partner</p> <p>GROSS INCOME RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> No Income - Business Position Only</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000</p> <p>CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Salary <input type="checkbox"/> Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income (For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sale of _____ (Real property, car, boat, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Loan repayment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Commission or <input type="checkbox"/> Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more</p> <p>_____ (Describe)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ (Describe)</p>

▶ 2. LOANS RECEIVED OR OUTSTANDING DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

* You are not required to report loans from a commercial lending institution, or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or credit card transaction, made in the lender's regular course of business on terms available to members of the public without regard to your official status. Personal loans and loans received not in a lender's regular course of business must be disclosed as follows:

<p>NAME OF LENDER*</p> <p>_____</p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER</p> <p>_____</p> <p>HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000</p>	<p>INTEREST RATE</p> <p>_____ % <input type="checkbox"/> None</p> <p>TERM (Months/Years)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>SECURITY FOR LOAN</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Personal residence</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Real Property _____ Street address</p> <p>_____ City</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Guarantor _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ (Describe)</p>
--	---

Comments: _____

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 15, 2022
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *AC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: *AC* Mayoral Appointment - Fire Commission

The Office of the Mayor submitted the following appointment package:

Appointment to the Fire Commission:

- Paula Collins - term ending January 15, 2026

Pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18), appointments in this category are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (October 16, 2022).

Board Rule 2.18.3, states that a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral appointment by timely notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within 30 days of the transmittal letter as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you wish to hold a hearing on this appointment, please let me know in writing by Wednesday, September 21, 2022.

c: Aaron Peskin, Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy
Victor Young, Rules Clerk
Anne Pearson, Deputy City Attorney
Tom Paulino, Mayor's Legislative Liaison
Tyra Fennell, Director of Commission Affairs

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

September 14, 2022

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Section 3.100 (18) of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby make the following appointment of Paula Collins to the Fire Commission for a term ending January 15, 2026.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Commission Affairs, Tyra Fennell, at 415-554-6696

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "London Breed".

London N. Breed
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

**Paula Robinson Collins
24 Sixth Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118
(415) 720-5632**

Paula Robinson Collins, a San Francisco real estate developer, was appointed to the board of the Presidio Trust by President Barack Obama in June 2012 and re-appointed in June 2015, at which point she took over as the board's chair. She attended Mount Holyoke College, earning a B.A. in urban studies in 1971 and then a master's in city planning from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1975. Her thesis examined the effect of federal revenue sharing on underserved communities.

In 1987, Collins and her husband, Chuck, founded WDG Ventures, a real estate development company in San Francisco. They helped develop the Moscone Convention Center and the company has worked on large hotels, medical centers and other projects. Collins is the chief executive officer of WDG. In 1987 she became a director of Tahoe Savings and Loan. In 1993, she joined the board of directors of Bay View Capital Corporation, leaving in 2002. She began a three-year term on the board of the California State Automobile Association and Inter-Insurance Bureau in 1997. She was also a member of the Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. In 2004, she formed Portfolio Real Estate Consulting, which provides development management services.

The Collins have two adult daughters, Julia Collins, co-founder and CEO of Zume Pizza, and Sara Dereath Collins, a cardiologist in Washington DC.

2020-2021 Statement of Economic Interests



Form 700

A Public Document

Table of Contents

Quick Start Guide	p.2
Who? Where? How? When?	p.3
Types of Statements.....	p.4
Cover Page and Schedules	
Cover Page	p.5
Schedule A-1 (<i>Investments</i>).....	p.7
Schedule A-2 (<i>Business Entities/Trusts</i>)	p.9
Schedule B (<i>Real Property</i>)	p.11
Schedule C (<i>Income</i>)	p.13
Schedule D (<i>Gifts</i>).....	p.15
Schedule E (<i>Travel Payments</i>).....	p.17
Restrictions and Prohibitions.....	p.19
Q & A.....	p.20

Helpful Resources

- Video Tutorials
- Reference Pamphlet
- Excel Version
- FAQs
- Gift and Travel Fact Sheet for State and Local Officials

California Fair Political Practices Commission

1102 Q Street, Suite 3000 • Sacramento, CA 95811

Email Advice: advice@fppc.ca.gov

Toll-free advice line: 1 (866) ASK-FPPC • 1 (866) 275-3772

Telephone: (916) 322-5660 • Website: www.fppc.ca.gov

December 2020

Quick Start Guide

Detailed instructions begin on page 3.

WHEN IS THE ANNUAL STATEMENT DUE?

- March 1 – Elected State Officers, Judges and Court Commissioners, State Board and Commission members listed in Government Code Section 87200
- April 1 – Most other filers

WHERE DO I FILE?

Most people file the Form 700 with their agency. If you're not sure where to file your Form 700, contact your filing officer or the person who asked you to complete it.

ITEMS TO NOTE!

- The Form 700 is a public document.
- Only filers serving in active military duty may receive an extension on the filing deadline.
- You must also report interests held by your spouse or registered domestic partner.
- Your agency's conflict of interest code will help you to complete the Form 700. You are encouraged to get your conflict of interest code from the person who asked you to complete the Form 700.

NOTHING TO REPORT?

Mark the "No reportable interests" box on Part 4 of the Cover Page, and submit only the signed Cover Page. Please review each schedule carefully!

Schedule	Common Reportable Interests	Common Non-Reportable Interests
A-1: Investments	Stocks, including those held in an IRA or 401K. Each stock must be listed.	Insurance policies, government bonds, diversified mutual funds, funds similar to diversified mutual funds.
A-2: Business Entities/Trusts	Business entities, sole proprietorships, partnerships, LLCs, corporations and trusts. (e.g., Form 1099 filers).	Savings and checking accounts, and annuities.
B: Real Property	Rental property in filer's jurisdiction, or within two miles of the boundaries of the jurisdiction.	A residence used exclusively as a personal residence (such as a home or vacation property).
C: Income	Non-governmental salaries. Note that filers are required to report only half of their spouse's or partner's salary.	Governmental salary (from school district, for example).
D: Gifts	Gifts from businesses, vendors, or other contractors (meals, tickets, etc.).	Gifts from family members.
E: Travel Payments	Travel payments from third parties (not your employer).	Travel paid by your government agency.

Note: Like reportable interests, non-reportable interests may also create conflicts of interest and could be grounds for disqualification from certain decisions.

QUESTIONS?

- advice@fppc.ca.gov
- (866) 275-3772 Mon-Thurs, 9-11:30 a.m.

E-FILING ISSUES?

- If using your agency's system, please contact technical support at your agency.
- If using FPPC's e-filing system, write to form700@fppc.ca.gov.

What's New

Gift Limit Increase

The gift limit increased to **\$520** for calendar years **2021** and **2022**. The gift limit in 2020 was **\$500**.

Who must file:

- Elected and appointed officials and candidates listed in Government Code Section 87200
- Employees, appointed officials, and consultants filing pursuant to a conflict of interest code (“code filers”).
Obtain your disclosure categories, which describe the interests you must report, from your agency; they are not part of the Form 700
- Candidates running for local elective offices that are designated in a conflict of interest code (e.g., county sheriffs, city clerks, school board trustees, and water board members)

Exception:

- Candidates for a county central committee are not required to file the Form 700.
- Members of newly created boards and commissions not yet covered under a conflict of interest code
- Employees in newly created positions of existing agencies

For more information, see Reference Pamphlet, page 3, at www.fppc.ca.gov.

Where to file:

87200 Filers

State offices	⇒	Your agency
Judicial offices	⇒	The clerk of your court
Retired Judges	⇒	Directly with FPPC
County offices	⇒	Your county filing official
City offices	⇒	Your city clerk
Multi-County offices	⇒	Your agency

Code Filers — State and Local Officials, Employees, and Consultants Designated in a Conflict of Interest

Code: File with your agency, board, or commission unless otherwise specified in your agency’s code (e.g., Legislative staff files directly with FPPC). In most cases, the agency, board, or commission will retain the statements.

Members of Boards and Commissions of Newly Created Agencies:

File with your newly created agency or with your agency’s code reviewing body.

Employees in Newly Created Positions of Existing Agencies:

File with your agency or with your agency’s code reviewing body. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 3.)

Candidates: File with your local elections office.

How to file:

The Form 700 is available at www.fppc.ca.gov. Form 700 schedules are also available in Excel format. All

statements must have an original “wet” signature or be duly authorized by your filing officer to file electronically under Government Code Section 87500.2.

When to file:

Annual Statements

⇒ March 1, 2021

- Elected State Officers
- Judges and Court Commissioners
- State Board and State Commission Members listed in Government Code Section 87200

⇒ April 1, 2021

- Most other filers

Individuals filing under conflict of interest codes in city and county jurisdictions should verify the annual filing date with their local filing officers.

Statements postmarked by the filing deadline are considered filed on time.

Statements of 30 pages or less may be emailed or faxed by the deadline as long as the originally signed paper version is sent by first class mail to the filing official within 24 hours.

Assuming Office and Leaving Office Statements

Most filers file within 30 days of assuming or leaving office or within 30 days of the effective date of a newly adopted or amended conflict of interest code.

Exception:

If you assumed office between October 1, 2020, and December 31, 2020, and filed an assuming office statement, you are not required to file an annual statement until March 1, 2022, or April 1, 2022, whichever is applicable. The annual statement will cover the day after you assumed office through December 31, 2021. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 6, for additional exceptions.)

Candidate Statements

File no later than the final filing date for the declaration of candidacy or nomination documents. A candidate statement is not required if you filed an assuming office or annual statement for the same jurisdiction within 60 days before filing a declaration of candidacy or other nomination documents.

Late Statements

There is no provision for filing deadline extensions unless the filer is serving in active military duty. (See page 19 for information on penalties and fines.)

Amendments

Statements may be amended at any time. You are only required to amend the schedule that needs to be revised. It is not necessary to amend the entire filed form. Obtain amendment schedules at www.fppc.ca.gov.

Types of Statements

Assuming Office Statement:

If you are a newly appointed official or are newly employed in a position designated, or that will be designated, in a state or local agency's conflict of interest code, your assuming office date is the date you were sworn in or otherwise authorized to serve in the position. If you are a newly elected official, your assuming office date is the date you were sworn in.

- Report: Investments, interests in real property, and business positions held on the date you assumed the office or position must be reported. In addition, income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to the date you assumed the office or position.

For positions subject to confirmation by the State Senate or the Commission on Judicial Appointments, your assuming office date is the date you were appointed or nominated to the position.

- Example: Maria Lopez was nominated by the Governor to serve on a state agency board that is subject to state Senate confirmation. The assuming office date is the date Maria's nomination is submitted to the Senate. Maria must report investments, interests in real property, and business positions she holds on that date, and income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to that date.

If your office or position has been added to a newly adopted or newly amended conflict of interest code, use the effective date of the code or amendment, whichever is applicable.

- Report: Investments, interests in real property, and business positions held on the effective date of the code or amendment must be reported. In addition, income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to the effective date of the code or amendment.

Annual Statement:

Generally, the period covered is January 1, 2020, through December 31, 2020. If the period covered by the statement is different than January 1, 2020, through December 31, 2020, (for example, you assumed office between October 1, 2019, and December 31, 2019 or you are combining statements), you must specify the period covered.

- Investments, interests in real property, business positions held, and income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the period covered by the statement must be reported. Do not change the preprinted dates on Schedules A-1, A-2, and B unless you are required to report the acquisition or disposition of an interest that did not occur in 2020.

- If your disclosure category changes during a reporting period, disclose under the old category until the effective date of the conflict of interest code amendment and disclose under the new disclosure category through the end of the reporting period.

Leaving Office Statement:

Generally, the period covered is January 1, 2020, through the date you stopped performing the duties of your position. If the period covered differs from January 1, 2020, through the date you stopped performing the duties of your position (for example, you assumed office between October 1, 2019, and December 31, 2019, or you are combining statements), the period covered must be specified. The reporting period can cover parts of two calendar years.

- Report: Investments, interests in real property, business positions held, and income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the period covered by the statement. Do not change the preprinted dates on Schedules A-1, A-2, and B unless you are required to report the acquisition or disposition of an interest that did not occur in 2020.

Candidate Statement:

If you are filing a statement in connection with your candidacy for state or local office, investments, interests in real property, and business positions held on the date of filing your declaration of candidacy must be reported. In addition, income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to the date of filing your declaration of candidacy is reportable. Do not change the preprinted dates on Schedules A-1, A-2, and B.

Candidates running for local elective offices (e.g., county sheriffs, city clerks, school board trustees, or water district board members) must file candidate statements, as required by the conflict of interest code for the elected position. The code may be obtained from the agency of the elected position.

Amendments:

If you discover errors or omissions on any statement, file an amendment as soon as possible. You are only required to amend the schedule that needs to be revised; it is not necessary to refile the entire form. Obtain amendment schedules from the FPPC website at www.fppc.ca.gov.

Note: Once you file your statement, you may not withdraw it. All changes must be noted on amendment schedules.

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS
COVER PAGE
A PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER (LAST) (FIRST) (MIDDLE)
Collins Paula Robinson

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)
City and County of San Francisco Commissioner

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable Your Position

► If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)

Agency: _____ Position: _____

2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box)

- State Judge, Retired Judge, Pro Tem Judge, or Court Commissioner (Statewide Jurisdiction)
- Multi-County _____ County of _____
- City of _____ Other _____

3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)

- Annual: The period covered is January 1, 2020, through December 31, 2020. Leaving Office: Date Left ____/____/_____
-or- The period covered is ____/____/_____, through (Check one circle.)
 Assuming Office: Date assumed ____/____/_____. The period covered is January 1, 2020, through the date of leaving office.
- Candidate: Date of Election _____ and office sought, if different than Part 1: _____ -or- The period covered is ____/____/_____, through the date of leaving office.

4. Schedule Summary (must complete) ► Total number of pages including this cover page: _____

Schedules attached

<input type="checkbox"/> Schedule A-1 - Investments - schedule attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Schedule C - Income, Loans, & Business Positions - schedule attached
<input type="checkbox"/> Schedule A-2 - Investments - schedule attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Schedule D - Income - Gifts - schedule attached
<input type="checkbox"/> Schedule B - Real Property - schedule attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Schedule E - Income - Gifts - Travel Payments - schedule attached

-or- None - No reportable interests on any schedule

5. Verification

MAILING ADDRESS STREET CITY STATE ZIP CODE
(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)

DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER EMAIL ADDRESS
pcollins@wdgventures.com

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete. I acknowledge this is a public document.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date Signed September 5, 2022
(month, day, year)

Signature
(File the originally signed paper statement with your filing official.)

Instructions Cover Page

Enter your name, mailing address, and daytime telephone number in the spaces provided. **Because the Form 700 is a public document, you may list your business/office address instead of your home address.**

Part 1. Office, Agency, or Court

- Enter the name of the office sought or held, or the agency or court. Consultants must enter the public agency name rather than their private firm's name. (Examples: State Assembly; Board of Supervisors; Office of the Mayor; Department of Finance; Hope County Superior Court)
- Indicate the name of your division, board, or district, if applicable. (Examples: Division of Waste Management; Board of Accountancy; District 45). **Do not use acronyms.**
- Enter your position title. (Examples: Director; Chief Counsel; City Council Member; Staff Services Analyst)
- If you hold multiple positions (i.e., a city council member who also is a member of a county board or commission), you may be required to file statements with each agency. To simplify your filing obligations, you may complete an expanded statement.
 - To do this, enter the name of the other agency(ies) with which you are required to file and your position title(s) in the space provided. **Do not use acronyms.** Attach an additional sheet if necessary. Complete one statement covering the disclosure requirements for all positions. Each copy must contain an original signature. Therefore, before signing the statement, make a copy for each agency. Sign each copy with an original signature and file with each agency.

If you assume or leave a position after a filing deadline, you must complete a separate statement. For example, a city council member who assumes a position with a county special district after the April annual filing deadline must file a separate assuming office statement. In subsequent years, the city council member may expand his or her annual filing to include both positions.

Example:

Brian Bourne is a city council member for the City of Lincoln and a board member for the Camp Far West Irrigation District – a multi-county agency that covers Placer and Yuba counties. Brian will complete one Form 700 using full disclosure (as required for the city position) and covering interests in both Placer and Yuba counties (as required for the multi-county position) and list both positions on the Cover Page. Before signing the statement, Brian will make a copy and sign both statements. One statement will be filed with City of Lincoln and the other will be filed with Camp Far West Irrigation District. Both will contain an original signature.

Part 2. Jurisdiction of Office

- Check the box indicating the jurisdiction of your agency and, if applicable, identify the jurisdiction. Judges, judicial candidates, and court commissioners have statewide jurisdiction. All other filers should review the Reference Pamphlet, page 13, to determine their jurisdiction.

- If your agency is a multi-county office, list each county in which your agency has jurisdiction.
- If your agency is not a state office, court, county office, city office, or multi-county office (e.g., school districts, special districts and JPAs), check the “other” box and enter the county or city in which the agency has jurisdiction.

Example:

This filer is a member of a water district board with jurisdiction in portions of Yuba and Sutter Counties.

1. Office, Agency, or Court	
Agency Name (Do not use acronyms) Feather River Irrigation District	
Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable N/A	Your Position Board Member
▶ If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)	
Agency: N/A	Position:
2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box)	
<input type="checkbox"/> State	<input type="checkbox"/> Judge or Court Commissioner (Statewide Jurisdiction)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multi-County Yuba & Sutter Counties	<input type="checkbox"/> County of _____
<input type="checkbox"/> City of _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

Part 3. Type of Statement

Check at least one box. The period covered by a statement is determined by the type of statement you are filing. If you are completing a 2020 annual statement, **do not** change the pre-printed dates to reflect 2021. Your annual statement is used for reporting the **previous year's** economic interests. Economic interests for your annual filing covering January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2021, will be disclosed on your statement filed in 2022. See Reference Pamphlet, page 4.

Combining Statements: Certain types of statements may be combined. For example, if you leave office after January 1, but before the deadline for filing your annual statement, you may combine your annual and leaving office statements. File by the earliest deadline. Consult your filing officer or the FPPC.

Part 4. Schedule Summary

- Complete the Schedule Summary after you have reviewed each schedule to determine if you have reportable interests.
- Enter the total number of completed pages including the cover page and either check the box for each schedule you use to disclose interests; **or** if you have nothing to disclose on any schedule, check the “No reportable interests” box. Please **do not** attach any blank schedules.

Part 5. Verification

Complete the verification by signing the statement and entering the date signed. All statements must have an original “wet” signature or be duly authorized by your filing officer to file electronically under Government Code Section 87500.2.

When you sign your statement, you are stating, under penalty of perjury, that it is true and correct. Only the filer has authority to sign the statement. An unsigned statement is not considered filed and you may be subject to late filing penalties.

SCHEDULE A-1

Investments

Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests

(Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

Investments must be itemized.

Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

Name
Paula R Collins

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Zume Pizza

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Pizza Delivery

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____ (Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/20 _____/_____/20
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Heritage Bank of Commerce

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____ (Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/20 _____/_____/20
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____ (Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/20 _____/_____/20
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____ (Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/20 _____/_____/20
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____ (Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/20 _____/_____/20
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
 \$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Stock Other _____ (Describe)
 Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 _____/_____/20 _____/_____/20
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

Comments: _____

Print

Clear

Instructions – Schedules A-1 and A-2 Investments

“Investment” means a financial interest in any business entity (including a consulting business or other independent contracting business) that is located in, doing business in, planning to do business in, or that has done business during the previous two years in your agency’s jurisdiction in which you, your spouse or registered domestic partner, or your dependent children had a direct, indirect, or beneficial interest totaling \$2,000 or more at any time during the reporting period. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 13.)

Reportable investments include:

- Stocks, bonds, warrants, and options, including those held in margin or brokerage accounts and managed investment funds (See Reference Pamphlet, page 13.)
- Sole proprietorships
- Your own business or your spouse’s or registered domestic partner’s business (See Reference Pamphlet, page 8, for the definition of “business entity.”)
- Your spouse’s or registered domestic partner’s investments even if they are legally separate property
- Partnerships (e.g., a law firm or family farm)
- Investments in reportable business entities held in a retirement account (See Reference Pamphlet, page 15.)
- If you, your spouse or registered domestic partner, and dependent children together had a 10% or greater ownership interest in a business entity or trust (including a living trust), you must disclose investments held by the business entity or trust. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 16, for more information on disclosing trusts.)
- Business trusts

You are not required to disclose:

- Government bonds, diversified mutual funds, certain funds similar to diversified mutual funds (such as exchange traded funds) and investments held in certain retirement accounts. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 13.) (Regulation 18237)
- Bank accounts, savings accounts, money market accounts and certificates of deposits
- Insurance policies
- Annuities
- Commodities
- Shares in a credit union
- Government bonds (including municipal bonds)
- Retirement accounts invested in non-reportable interests (e.g., insurance policies, mutual funds, or government bonds) (See Reference Pamphlet, page 15.)

- Government defined-benefit pension plans (such as CalPERS and CalSTRS plans)
- Certain interests held in a blind trust (See Reference Pamphlet, page 16.)

Use Schedule A-1 to report ownership of less than 10% (e.g., stock). Schedule C (Income) may also be required if the investment is not a stock or corporate bond. (See second example below.)

Use Schedule A-2 to report ownership of 10% or greater (e.g., a sole proprietorship).

To Complete Schedule A-1:

Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

- Disclose the name of the business entity.
- Provide a general description of the business activity of the entity (e.g., pharmaceuticals, computers, automobile manufacturing, or communications).
- Check the box indicating the highest fair market value of your investment during the reporting period. If you are filing a candidate or an assuming office statement, indicate the fair market value on the filing date or the date you took office, respectively. (See page 20 for more information.)
- Identify the nature of your investment (e.g., stocks, warrants, options, or bonds).
- An acquired or disposed of date is only required if you initially acquired or entirely disposed of the investment interest during the reporting period. The date of a stock dividend reinvestment or partial disposal is not required. Generally, these dates will not apply if you are filing a candidate or an assuming office statement.

Examples:

Frank Byrd holds a state agency position. His conflict of interest code requires full disclosure of investments. Frank must disclose his stock holdings of \$2,000 or more in any company that is located in or does business in California, as well as those stocks held by his spouse or registered domestic partner and dependent children.

Alice Lance is a city council member. She has a 4% interest, worth \$5,000, in a limited partnership located in the city. Alice must disclose the partnership on Schedule A-1 and income of \$500 or more received from the partnership on Schedule C.

Reminders

- Do you know your agency’s jurisdiction?
- Did you hold investments at any time during the period covered by this statement?
- Code filers – your disclosure categories may only require disclosure of specific investments.

SCHEDULE A-2

Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts

(Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name
Paula R Collins

▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Paula R Collins

Name _____

24 Sixth Avenue

Address (Business Address Acceptable) _____

Check one
 Trust, go to 2 Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Executive Coaching

<p>FAIR MARKET VALUE</p> <input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$1,999 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000	<p>IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">____/____/20 ____/____/20 ACQUIRED DISPOSED</p>
---	---

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Partnership Sole Proprietorship _____ Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION Executive Coach

▶ 2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$499	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000	<input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000	

▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

None or Names listed below

▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
 INVESTMENT REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property _____

Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property _____

<p>FAIR MARKET VALUE</p> <input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000	<p>IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">____/____/20 ____/____/20 ACQUIRED DISPOSED</p>
--	---

NATURE OF INTEREST
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust Stock Partnership

Leasehold _____ Yrs. remaining Other _____

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Name _____

Address (Business Address Acceptable) _____

Check one
 Trust, go to 2 Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

<p>FAIR MARKET VALUE</p> <input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$1,999 <input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000	<p>IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">____/____/20 ____/____/20 ACQUIRED DISPOSED</p>
--	---

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
 Partnership Sole Proprietorship _____ Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION _____

▶ 2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$499	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000	<input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000	

▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

None or Names listed below

▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
 INVESTMENT REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property _____

Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property _____

<p>FAIR MARKET VALUE</p> <input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000	<p>IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">____/____/20 ____/____/20 ACQUIRED DISPOSED</p>
--	---

NATURE OF INTEREST
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust Stock Partnership

Leasehold _____ Yrs. remaining Other _____

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

Comments: _____

Instructions – Schedule A-2

Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts

Use Schedule A-2 to report investments in a business entity (including a consulting business or other independent contracting business) or trust (including a living trust) in which you, your spouse or registered domestic partner, and your dependent children, together or separately, had a 10% or greater interest, totaling \$2,000 or more, during the reporting period and which is located in, doing business in, planning to do business in, or which has done business during the previous two years in your agency's jurisdiction. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 13.) A trust located outside your agency's jurisdiction is reportable if it holds assets that are located in or doing business in the jurisdiction. Do not report a trust that contains non-reportable interests. For example, a trust containing only your personal residence not used in whole or in part as a business, your savings account, and some municipal bonds, is not reportable.

Also report on Schedule A-2 investments and real property held by that entity or trust if your pro rata share of the investment or real property interest was \$2,000 or more during the reporting period.

To Complete Schedule A-2:

Part 1. Disclose the name and address of the business entity or trust. If you are reporting an interest in a business entity, check "Business Entity" and complete the box as follows:

- Provide a general description of the business activity of the entity.
- Check the box indicating the highest fair market value of your investment during the reporting period.
- If you initially acquired or entirely disposed of this interest during the reporting period, enter the date acquired or disposed.
- Identify the nature of your investment.
- Disclose the job title or business position you held with the entity, if any (i.e., if you were a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or held any position of management). A business position held by your spouse is not reportable.

Part 2. Check the box indicating **your pro rata** share of the **gross** income received **by** the business entity or trust. This amount includes your pro rata share of the **gross** income **from** the business entity or trust, as well as your community property interest in your spouse's or registered domestic partner's share. Gross income is the total amount of income before deducting expenses, losses, or taxes.

Part 3. Disclose the name of each source of income that is located in, doing business in, planning to do business in, or that has done business during the previous two years in your agency's jurisdiction, as follows:

- Disclose each source of income and outstanding loan **to the business entity or trust** identified in Part 1 if your pro rata share of the **gross** income (including your community property interest in your spouse's or registered domestic partner's share) to the business entity or trust from that source was \$10,000 or more during the reporting

period. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 11, for examples.) Income from governmental sources may be reportable if not considered salary. See Regulation 18232. Loans from commercial lending institutions made in the lender's regular course of business on terms available to members of the public without regard to your official status are not reportable.

- Disclose each individual or entity that was a source of commission income of \$10,000 or more during the reporting period through the business entity identified in Part 1. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 8.)

You may be required to disclose sources of income located outside your jurisdiction. For example, you may have a client who resides outside your jurisdiction who does business on a regular basis with you. Such a client, if a reportable source of \$10,000 or more, must be disclosed.

Mark "None" if you do not have any reportable \$10,000 sources of income to disclose. Phrases such as "various clients" or "not disclosing sources pursuant to attorney-client privilege" are not adequate disclosure. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 14, for information on procedures to request an exemption from disclosing privileged information.)

Part 4. Report any investments or interests in real property held or leased **by the entity or trust** identified in Part 1 if your pro rata share of the interest held was \$2,000 or more during the reporting period. Attach additional schedules or use FPPC's Form 700 Excel spreadsheet if needed.

- Check the applicable box identifying the interest held as real property or an investment.
- If investment, provide the name and description of the business entity.
- If real property, report the precise location (e.g., an assessor's parcel number or address).
- Check the box indicating the highest fair market value of your interest in the real property or investment during the reporting period. (Report the fair market value of the portion of your residence claimed as a tax deduction if you are utilizing your residence for business purposes.)
- Identify the nature of your interest.
- Enter the date acquired or disposed only if you initially acquired or entirely disposed of your interest in the property or investment during the reporting period.

Instructions – Schedule B Interests in Real Property

Report interests in real property located in your agency's jurisdiction in which you, your spouse or registered domestic partner, or your dependent children had a direct, indirect, or beneficial interest totaling \$2,000 or more any time during the reporting period. Real property is also considered to be "within the jurisdiction" of a local government agency if the property or any part of it is located within two miles outside the boundaries of the jurisdiction or within two miles of any land owned or used by the local government agency. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 13.)

Interests in real property include:

- An ownership interest (including a beneficial ownership interest)
- A deed of trust, easement, or option to acquire property
- A leasehold interest (See Reference Pamphlet, page 14.)
- A mining lease
- An interest in real property held in a retirement account (See Reference Pamphlet, page 15.)
- An interest in real property held by a business entity or trust in which you, your spouse or registered domestic partner, and your dependent children together had a 10% or greater ownership interest (Report on Schedule A-2.)
- Your spouse's or registered domestic partner's interests in real property that are legally held separately by him or her

You are **not** required to report:

- A residence, such as a home or vacation cabin, used exclusively as a personal residence (However, a residence in which you rent out a room or for which you claim a business deduction may be reportable. If reportable, report the fair market value of the portion claimed as a tax deduction.)
- Some interests in real property held through a blind trust (See Reference Pamphlet, page 16.)
 - **Please note:** A non-reportable property can still be grounds for a conflict of interest and may be disqualifying.

To Complete Schedule B:

- Report the precise location (e.g., an assessor's parcel number or address) of the real property.
- Check the box indicating the fair market value of your interest in the property (regardless of what you owe on the property).
- Enter the date acquired or disposed only if you initially acquired or entirely disposed of your interest in the property during the reporting period.
- Identify the nature of your interest. If it is a leasehold,

disclose the number of years remaining on the lease.

- If you received rental income, check the box indicating the gross amount you received.
- If you had a 10% or greater interest in real property and received rental income, list the name of the source(s) if your pro rata share of the gross income from any single tenant was \$10,000 or more during the reporting period. If you received a total of \$10,000 or more from two or more tenants acting in concert (in most cases, this will apply to married couples), disclose the name of each tenant. Otherwise, mark "None."
- Loans from a private lender that total \$500 or more and are secured by real property may be reportable. **Loans from commercial lending institutions made in the lender's regular course of business on terms available to members of the public without regard to your official status are not reportable.**

When reporting a loan:

- Provide the name and address of the lender.
- Describe the lender's business activity.
- Disclose the interest rate and term of the loan. For variable interest rate loans, disclose the conditions of the loan (e.g., Prime + 2) or the average interest rate paid during the reporting period. The term of a loan is the total number of months or years given for repayment of the loan at the time the loan was established.
- Check the box indicating the highest balance of the loan during the reporting period.
- Identify a guarantor, if applicable.

If you have more than one reportable loan on a single piece of real property, report the additional loan(s) on Schedule C.

Example:

Allison Gande is a city planning commissioner. During the reporting period, she received rental income of \$12,000, from a single tenant who rented property she owned in the city's jurisdiction. If Allison received \$6,000 each from two tenants, the tenants' names would not be required because no single tenant paid her \$10,000 or more. A married couple is considered a single tenant.

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER OR STREET ADDRESS 4600 24th Street	
CITY Sacramento	
FAIR MARKET VALUE <input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000	IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: ____/____/19 XX ____/____/19 XX ACQUIRED DISPOSED
NATURE OF INTEREST <input type="checkbox"/> Ownership/Deed of Trust <input type="checkbox"/> Easement <input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold Yrs. remaining: _____ Other: _____	
IF RENTAL PROPERTY, GROSS INCOME RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$499 <input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000	
SOURCES OF RENTAL INCOME: If you own a 10% or greater interest, list the name of each tenant that is a single source of income of \$10,000 or more. <input type="checkbox"/> None Henry Wells	
NAME OF LENDER* Sophia Petroillo	
ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable) 2121 Blue Sky Parkway, Sacramento	
BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER Restaurant Owner	
INTEREST RATE 8 % <input type="checkbox"/> None	TERM (Months/Years) 15 Years
HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000	
<input type="checkbox"/> Guarantor, if applicable	
Comments: _____	

Reminders

- Income and loans already reported on Schedule B are not also required to be reported on Schedule C.
- Real property already reported on Schedule A-2, Part 4 is not also required to be reported on Schedule B.
- Code filers – do your disclosure categories require disclosure of real property?

SCHEDULE C

Income, Loans, & Business Positions

(Other than Gifts and Travel Payments)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Paula R Collins

▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED	▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED
<p>NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME <u>American Automobile Ass'n and Affiliates</u></p> <p>ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i> <u>1255 Treat Blvd. Ste170, Walnut Creek, CA 94597</u></p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE <u>Insurance and Automobile Member Services</u></p> <p>YOUR BUSINESS POSITION <u>Corporate Director</u></p> <p>GROSS INCOME RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> No Income - Business Position Only</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000</p> <p>CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Salary <input type="checkbox"/> Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income <i>(For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sale of _____ <i>(Real property, car, boat, etc.)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Loan repayment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Commission or <input type="checkbox"/> Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more</p> <p>_____ <i>(Describe)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other <u>Director Fees</u> <i>(Describe)</i></p>	<p>NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME <u>YMCA of San Francisco</u></p> <p>ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i> <u>50 California St, Ste 50, SF.CA. 94111</u></p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p>YOUR BUSINESS POSITION</p> <p>GROSS INCOME RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> No Income - Business Position Only</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000</p> <p>CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Salary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income <i>(For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sale of _____ <i>(Real property, car, boat, etc.)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Loan repayment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Commission or <input type="checkbox"/> Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more</p> <p>_____ <i>(Describe)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <i>(Describe)</i></p>

▶ 2. LOANS RECEIVED OR OUTSTANDING DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

* You are not required to report loans from a commercial lending institution, or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or credit card transaction, made in the lender's regular course of business on terms available to members of the public without regard to your official status. Personal loans and loans received not in a lender's regular course of business must be disclosed as follows:

<p>NAME OF LENDER* _____</p> <p>ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i> _____</p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER _____</p> <p>HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000</p>	<p>INTEREST RATE TERM (Months/Years)</p> <p>_____ % <input type="checkbox"/> None _____</p> <p>SECURITY FOR LOAN</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Personal residence</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Real Property _____ <i>Street address</i></p> <p>_____ <i>City</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Guarantor _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <i>(Describe)</i></p>
--	---

Comments: _____

Instructions – Schedule C

Income, Loans, & Business Positions

(Income Other Than Gifts and Travel Payments)

Reporting Income:

Report the source and amount of gross income of \$500 or more you received during the reporting period. Gross income is the total amount of income before deducting expenses, losses, or taxes and includes loans other than loans from a commercial lending institution. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 11.) You must also report the source of income to your spouse or registered domestic partner if your community property share was \$500 or more during the reporting period.

The source and income must be reported only if the source is located in, doing business in, planning to do business in, or has done business during the previous two years in your agency's jurisdiction. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 13.) Reportable sources of income may be further limited by your disclosure category located in your agency's conflict of interest code.

Reporting Business Positions:

You must report your job title with each reportable business entity even if you received no income during the reporting period. Use the comments section to indicate that no income was received.

Commonly reportable income and loans include:

- Salary/wages, per diem, and reimbursement for expenses including travel payments provided by your employer
- Community property interest (50%) in your spouse's or registered domestic partner's income - **report the employer's name and all other required information**
- Income from investment interests, such as partnerships, reported on Schedule A-1
- Commission income not required to be reported on Schedule A-2 (See Reference Pamphlet, page 8.)
- Gross income from any sale, including the sale of a house or car (Report your pro rata share of the total sale price.)
- Rental income not required to be reported on Schedule B
- Prizes or awards not disclosed as gifts
- Payments received on loans you made to others
- An honorarium received prior to becoming a public official (See Reference Pamphlet, page 10.)
- Incentive compensation (See Reference Pamphlet, page 12.)

Reminders

- Code filers – your disclosure categories may not require disclosure of all sources of income.
- If you or your spouse or registered domestic partner are self-employed, report the business entity on Schedule A-2.
- Do not disclose on Schedule C income, loans, or business positions already reported on Schedules A-2 or B.

You are not required to report:

- Salary, reimbursement for expenses or per diem, or social security, disability, or other similar benefit payments received by you or your spouse or registered domestic partner from a federal, state, or local government agency.
- Stock dividends and income from the sale of stock unless the source can be identified.
- Income from a PERS retirement account.

(See Reference Pamphlet, page 12.)

To Complete Schedule C:

Part 1. Income Received/Business Position Disclosure

- Disclose the name and address of each source of income or each business entity with which you held a business position.
- Provide a general description of the business activity if the source is a business entity.
- Check the box indicating the amount of gross income received.
- Identify the consideration for which the income was received.
- For income from commission sales, check the box indicating the gross income received and list the name of each source of commission income of \$10,000 or more. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 8.) **Note: If you receive commission income on a regular basis or have an ownership interest of 10% or more, you must disclose the business entity and the income on Schedule A-2.**
- Disclose the job title or business position, if any, that you held with the business entity, even if you did not receive income during the reporting period.

Part 2. Loans Received or Outstanding During the Reporting Period

- Provide the name and address of the lender.
- Provide a general description of the business activity if the lender is a business entity.
- Check the box indicating the highest balance of the loan during the reporting period.
- Disclose the interest rate and the term of the loan.
 - For variable interest rate loans, disclose the conditions of the loan (e.g., Prime + 2) or the average interest rate paid during the reporting period.
 - The term of the loan is the total number of months or years given for repayment of the loan at the time the loan was entered into.
- Identify the security, if any, for the loan.

SCHEDULE D Income – Gifts

Name
 Paula R Collins

<p>▶ NAME OF SOURCE <i>(Not an Acronym)</i></p> <p>_____ ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i></p> <p>_____ BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th>DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	<p>▶ NAME OF SOURCE <i>(Not an Acronym)</i></p> <p>_____ ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i></p> <p>_____ BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th>DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
<p>▶ NAME OF SOURCE <i>(Not an Acronym)</i></p> <p>_____ ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i></p> <p>_____ BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th>DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	<p>▶ NAME OF SOURCE <i>(Not an Acronym)</i></p> <p>_____ ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i></p> <p>_____ BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th>DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
<p>▶ NAME OF SOURCE <i>(Not an Acronym)</i></p> <p>_____ ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i></p> <p>_____ BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th>DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	<p>▶ NAME OF SOURCE <i>(Not an Acronym)</i></p> <p>_____ ADDRESS <i>(Business Address Acceptable)</i></p> <p>_____ BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th>DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___/___/___</td> <td>\$ _____</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____	___/___/___	\$ _____	_____
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							
___/___/___	\$ _____	_____																							

Comments: _____

Instructions – Schedule D Income – Gifts

A gift is anything of value for which you have not provided equal or greater consideration to the donor. A gift is reportable if its fair market value is \$50 or more. In addition, multiple gifts totaling \$50 or more received during the reporting period from a single source must be reported.

It is the acceptance of a gift, not the ultimate use to which it is put, that imposes your reporting obligation. Except as noted below, you must report a gift even if you never used it or if you gave it away to another person.

If the exact amount of a gift is unknown, you must make a good faith estimate of the item's fair market value. Listing the value of a gift as "over \$50" or "value unknown" is not adequate disclosure. In addition, if you received a gift through an intermediary, you must disclose the name, address, and business activity of both the donor and the intermediary. You may indicate an intermediary either in the "source" field after the name or in the "comments" section at the bottom of Schedule D.

Commonly reportable gifts include:

- Tickets/passes to sporting or entertainment events
- Tickets/passes to amusement parks
- Parking passes not used for official agency business
- Food, beverages, and accommodations, including those provided in direct connection with your attendance at a convention, conference, meeting, social event, meal, or like gathering
- Rebates/discounts not made in the regular course of business to members of the public without regard to official status
- Wedding gifts (See Reference Pamphlet, page 16)
- An honorarium received prior to assuming office (You may report an honorarium as income on Schedule C, rather than as a gift on Schedule D, if you provided services of equal or greater value than the payment received. See Reference Pamphlet, page 10.)
- Transportation and lodging (See Schedule E.)
- Forgiveness of a loan received by you

Reminders

- Gifts from a single source are subject to a **\$500** limit in **2020**. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 10.)
- Code filers – you only need to report gifts from reportable sources.

Gift Tracking Mobile Application

- FPPC has created a gift tracking app for mobile devices that helps filers track gifts and provides a quick and easy way to upload the information to the Form 700. Visit FPPC's website to download the app.

You are not required to disclose:

- Gifts that were not used and that, within 30 days after receipt, were returned to the donor or delivered to a charitable organization or government agency without being claimed by you as a charitable contribution for tax purposes
- Gifts from your spouse or registered domestic partner, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother, sister, and certain other family members (See Regulation 18942 for a complete list.). The exception does not apply if the donor was acting as an agent or intermediary for a reportable source who was the true donor.
- Gifts of similar value exchanged between you and an individual, other than a lobbyist registered to lobby your state agency, on holidays, birthdays, or similar occasions
- Gifts of informational material provided to assist you in the performance of your official duties (e.g., books, pamphlets, reports, calendars, periodicals, or educational seminars)
- A monetary bequest or inheritance (However, inherited investments or real property may be reportable on other schedules.)
- Personalized plaques or trophies with an individual value of less than \$250
- Campaign contributions
- Up to two tickets, for your own use, to attend a fundraiser for a campaign committee or candidate, or to a fundraiser for an organization exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The ticket must be received from the organization or committee holding the fundraiser.
- Gifts given to members of your immediate family if the source has an established relationship with the family member and there is no evidence to suggest the donor had a purpose to influence you. (See Regulation 18943.)
- Free admission, food, and nominal items (such as a pen, pencil, mouse pad, note pad or similar item) available to all attendees, at the event at which the official makes a speech (as defined in Regulation 18950(b)(2)), so long as the admission is provided by the person who organizes the event.
- Any other payment not identified above, that would otherwise meet the definition of gift, where the payment is made by an individual who is not a lobbyist registered to lobby the official's state agency, where it is clear that the gift was made because of an existing personal or business relationship unrelated to the official's position and there is no evidence whatsoever at the time the gift is made to suggest the donor had a purpose to influence you.

To Complete Schedule D:

- Disclose the full name (not an acronym), address, and, if a business entity, the business activity of the source.
- Provide the date (month, day, and year) of receipt, and disclose the fair market value and description of the gift.

Name _____

**SCHEDULE E
Income – Gifts
Travel Payments, Advances,
and Reimbursements**

- Mark either the gift or income box.
- Mark the “501(c)(3)” box for a travel payment received from a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization or the “Speech” box if you made a speech or participated in a panel. Per Government Code Section 89506, these payments may not be subject to the gift limit. However, they may result in a disqualifying conflict of interest.
- For gifts of travel, provide the travel destination.

▶ NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)* _____

ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)* _____

CITY AND STATE _____

501 (c)(3) or DESCRIBE BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE _____

DATE(S): ___/___/___ - ___/___/___ AMT: \$ _____
(If gift)

▶ MUST CHECK ONE: Gift **-or-** Income

Made a Speech/Participated in a Panel

Other - Provide Description _____

▶ If Gift, Provide Travel Destination _____

▶ NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)* _____

ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)* _____

CITY AND STATE _____

501 (c)(3) or DESCRIBE BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE _____

DATE(S): ___/___/___ - ___/___/___ AMT: \$ _____
(If gift)

▶ MUST CHECK ONE: Gift **-or-** Income

Made a Speech/Participated in a Panel

Other - Provide Description _____

▶ If Gift, Provide Travel Destination _____

▶ NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)* _____

ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)* _____

CITY AND STATE _____

501 (c)(3) or DESCRIBE BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE _____

DATE(S): ___/___/___ - ___/___/___ AMT: \$ _____
(If gift)

▶ MUST CHECK ONE: Gift **-or-** Income

Made a Speech/Participated in a Panel

Other - Provide Description _____

▶ If Gift, Provide Travel Destination _____

▶ NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)* _____

ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)* _____

CITY AND STATE _____

501 (c)(3) or DESCRIBE BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE _____

DATE(S): ___/___/___ - ___/___/___ AMT: \$ _____
(If gift)

▶ MUST CHECK ONE: Gift **-or-** Income

Made a Speech/Participated in a Panel

Other - Provide Description _____

▶ If Gift, Provide Travel Destination _____

Comments: _____

Print

Clear

Instructions – Schedule E Travel Payments, Advances, and Reimbursements

Travel payments reportable on Schedule E include advances and reimbursements for travel and related expenses, including lodging and meals.

Gifts of travel may be subject to the gift limit. In addition, certain travel payments are reportable gifts, but are not subject to the gift limit. To avoid possible misinterpretation or the perception that you have received a gift in excess of the gift limit, you may wish to provide a specific description of the purpose of your travel. (See the FPPC fact sheet entitled “Limitations and Restrictions on Gifts, Honoraria, Travel, and Loans” to read about travel payments under section 89506(a).)

You are not required to disclose:

- Travel payments received from any state, local, or federal government agency for which you provided services equal or greater in value than the payments received, such as reimbursement for travel on agency business from your government agency employer.
- A payment for travel from another local, state, or federal government agency and related per diem expenses when the travel is for education, training or other inter-agency programs or purposes.
- Travel payments received from your employer in the normal course of your employment that are included in the income reported on Schedule C.
- A travel payment that was received from a nonprofit entity exempt from taxation under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) for which you provided equal or greater consideration, such as reimbursement for travel on business for a 501(c)(3) organization for which you are a board member.

Note: Certain travel payments may not be reportable if reported via email on Form 801 by your agency.

To Complete Schedule E:

- Disclose the full name (not an acronym) and address of the source of the travel payment.
- Identify the business activity if the source is a business entity.
- Check the box to identify the payment as a gift or income, report the amount, and disclose the date(s).
 - **Travel payments are gifts** if you did not provide services that were equal to or greater in value than the payments received. You must disclose gifts totaling \$500 or more from a single source during the period covered by the statement.

When reporting travel payments that are gifts, you must provide a description of the gift, the **date(s)** received, and the **travel destination**.

- **Travel payments are income** if you provided services that were equal to or greater in value than the

payments received. You must disclose income totaling \$500 or more from a single source during the period covered by the statement. You have the burden of proving the payments are income rather than gifts. When reporting travel payments as income, you must describe the services you provided in exchange for the payment. You are not required to disclose the date(s) for travel payments that are income.

Example:

City council member MaryClaire Chandler is the chair of a 501(c)(6) trade association, and the association pays for her travel to attend its meetings. Because MaryClaire is deemed to be providing equal or greater consideration for the travel payment by virtue of serving on the board, this payment may be reported as income. Payments for MaryClaire to attend other events for which she is not providing services are likely considered gifts. Note that the same payment from a 501(c)(3) would NOT be reportable.

<small>▶ NAME OF SOURCE (Not an Acronym)</small>	
Health Services Trade Association	
<small>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</small>	
1230 K Street, Suite 610	
<small>CITY AND STATE</small>	
Sacramento, CA	
<input type="checkbox"/> 501 (c)(3) or DESCRIBE BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE	
Association of Healthcare Workers	
<small>DATE(S):</small> ___/___/___ <small>(if gift)</small> <small>AMT: \$</small> 550.00	
<small>▶ MUST CHECK ONE:</small> <input type="checkbox"/> Gift <small>-or-</small> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Income	
<input type="radio"/> Made a Speech/Participated in a Panel	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Other - Provide Description <u>Travel reimbursement for board meeting.</u>	
<small>▶ If Gift, Provide Travel Destination</small> _____	

Example:

Mayor Kim travels to China on a trip organized by China Silicon Valley Business Development, a California nonprofit, 501(c)(6) organization. The Chengdu Municipal People’s Government pays for Mayor Kim’s airfare and travel costs, as well as his meals and lodging during the trip. The trip’s agenda shows that the trip’s purpose is to promote job creation and economic activity in China and in Silicon Valley, so the trip is reasonably related to a governmental purpose. Thus, Mayor Kim must report the gift of travel,

<small>▶ NAME OF SOURCE (Not an Acronym)</small>	
Chengdu Municipal People’s Government	
<small>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</small>	
2 Caoshi St. CaoShiJie, Qingyang Qu, Chengdu Shi,	
<small>CITY AND STATE</small>	
Sichuan Sheng, China, 610000	
<input type="checkbox"/> 501 (c)(3) or DESCRIBE BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE	
<small>DATE(S):</small> <u>09</u> / <u>04</u> / <u>XX</u> <small>(if gift)</small> <small>AMT: \$</small> 3,874.38	
<small>▶ MUST CHECK ONE:</small> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gift <small>-or-</small> <input type="checkbox"/> Income	
<input type="radio"/> Made a Speech/Participated in a Panel	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Other - Provide Description <u>Travel reimbursement for trip to China.</u>	
<small>▶ If Gift, Provide Travel Destination</small> <u>Sichuan Sheng, China</u>	

but the gift is exempt from the gift limit. In this case, the travel payments are not subject to the gift limit because the source is a foreign government and because the travel is reasonably related to a governmental purpose. (Section 89506(a)(2).) Note that Mayor Kim could be disqualified from participating in or making decisions about The Chengdu Municipal People’s Government for 12 months. Also note that if China Silicon Valley Business Development (a 501(c)(6) organization) paid for the travel costs rather than the governmental organization, the payments would be subject to the gift limits. (See the FPPC fact sheet, Limitations and Restrictions on Gifts, Honoraria, Travel and Loans, at www.fppc.ca.gov.)

Restrictions and Prohibitions

The Political Reform Act (Gov. Code Sections 81000-91014) requires most state and local government officials and employees to publicly disclose their personal assets and income. They also must disqualify themselves from participating in decisions that may affect their personal economic interests. The Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) is the state agency responsible for issuing the attached Statement of Economic Interests, Form 700, and for interpreting the law's provisions.

Gift Prohibition

Gifts received by most state and local officials, employees, and candidates are subject to a limit. In 2021-2022, the gift limit increased to \$520 from a single source during a calendar year. In 2019 and 2020, the gift limit was \$500 from a single source during a calendar year.

Additionally, state officials, state candidates, and certain state employees are subject to a \$10 limit per calendar month on gifts from lobbyists and lobbying firms registered with the Secretary of State. See Reference Pamphlet, page 10.

State and local officials and employees should check with their agency to determine if other restrictions apply.

Disqualification

Public officials are, under certain circumstances, required to disqualify themselves from making, participating in, or attempting to influence governmental decisions that will affect their economic interests. This may include interests they are not required to disclose. For example, a personal residence is often not reportable, but may be grounds for disqualification. Specific disqualification requirements apply to 87200 filers (e.g., city councilmembers, members of boards of supervisors, planning commissioners, etc.). These officials must publicly identify the economic interest that creates a conflict of interest and leave the room before a discussion or vote takes place at a public meeting. For more information, consult Government Code Section 87105, Regulation 18707, and the Guide to Recognizing Conflicts of Interest page at www.fppc.ca.gov.

Honorarium Ban

Most state and local officials, employees, and candidates are prohibited from accepting an honorarium for any speech given, article published, or attendance at a conference, convention, meeting, or like gathering. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 10.)

Loan Restrictions

Certain state and local officials are subject to restrictions

on loans. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 14.)

Post-Governmental Employment

There are restrictions on representing clients or employers before former agencies. The provisions apply to elected state officials, most state employees, local elected officials, county chief administrative officers, city managers, including the chief administrator of a city, and general managers or chief administrators of local special districts and JPAs. The FPPC website has fact sheets explaining the provisions.

Late Filing

The filing officer who retains originally-signed or electronically filed statements of economic interests may impose on an individual a fine for any statement that is filed late. The fine is \$10 per day up to a maximum of \$100. Late filing penalties may be reduced or waived under certain circumstances.

Persons who fail to timely file their Form 700 may be referred to the FPPC's Enforcement Division (and, in some cases, to the Attorney General or district attorney) for investigation and possible prosecution. In addition to the late filing penalties, a fine of up to \$5,000 per violation may be imposed.

For assistance concerning reporting, prohibitions, and restrictions under the Act:

- Email questions to advice@fppc.ca.gov.
- Call the FPPC toll-free at (866) 275-3772.

Form 700 is a Public Document Public Access Must Be Provided

Statements of Economic Interests are public documents. The filing officer must permit any member of the public to inspect and receive a copy of any statement.

- Statements must be available as soon as possible during the agency's regular business hours, but in any event not later than the second business day after the statement is received. Access to the Form 700 is not subject to the Public Records Act procedures.
- No conditions may be placed on persons seeking access to the forms.
- No information or identification may be required from persons seeking access.
- Reproduction fees of no more than 10 cents per page may be charged.

Questions and Answers

General

- Q. What is the reporting period for disclosing interests on an assuming office statement or a candidate statement?
- A. On an assuming office statement, disclose all reportable investments, interests in real property, and business positions held on the date you assumed office. In addition, you must disclose income (including loans, gifts and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to the date you assumed office.
- On a candidate statement, disclose all reportable investments, interests in real property, and business positions held on the date you file your declaration of candidacy. You must also disclose income (including loans, gifts and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to the date you file your declaration of candidacy.
- Q. I hold two other board positions in addition to my position with the county. Must I file three statements of economic interests?
- A. Yes, three are required. However, you may complete one statement listing the county and the two boards on the Cover Page or an attachment as the agencies for which you will be filing. Report your economic interests using the largest jurisdiction and highest disclosure requirements assigned to you by the three agencies. Make two copies of the entire statement before signing it, sign each copy with an original signature, and distribute one original to the county and to each of the two boards. Remember to complete separate statements for positions that you leave or assume during the year.
- Q. I am a department head who recently began acting as city manager. Should I file as the city manager?
- A. Yes. File an assuming office statement as city manager. Persons serving as “acting,” “interim,” or “alternate” must file as if they hold the position because they are or may be performing the duties of the position.
- Q. My spouse and I are currently separated and in the process of obtaining a divorce. Must I still report my spouse’s income, investments, and interests in real property?
- A. Yes. A public official must continue to report a spouse’s economic interests until such time as dissolution of marriage proceedings is final. However, if a separate property agreement has been reached prior to that time, your estranged spouse’s income may not have to be reported. Contact the FPPC for more information.

- Q. As a designated employee, I left one state agency to work for another state agency. Must I file a leaving office statement?
- A. Yes. You may also need to file an assuming office statement for the new agency.

Investment Disclosure

- Q. I have an investment interest in shares of stock in a company that does not have an office in my jurisdiction. Must I still disclose my investment interest in this company?
- A. Probably. The definition of “doing business in the jurisdiction” is not limited to whether the business has an office or physical location in your jurisdiction. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 13.)
- Q. My spouse and I have a living trust. The trust holds rental property in my jurisdiction, our primary residence, and investments in diversified mutual funds. I have full disclosure. How is this trust disclosed?
- A. Disclose the name of the trust, the rental property and its income on Schedule A-2. Your primary residence and investments in diversified mutual funds registered with the SEC are not reportable.
- Q. I am required to report all investments. I have an IRA that contains stocks through an account managed by a brokerage firm. Must I disclose these stocks even though they are held in an IRA and I did not decide which stocks to purchase?
- A. Yes. Disclose on Schedule A-1 or A-2 any stock worth \$2,000 or more in a business entity located in or doing business in your jurisdiction.
- Q. The value of my stock changed during the reporting period. How do I report the value of the stock?
- A. You are required to report the highest value that the stock reached during the reporting period. You may use your monthly statements to determine the highest value. You may also use the entity’s website to determine the highest value. You are encouraged to keep a record of where you found the reported value. Note that for an assuming office statement, you must report the value of the stock on the date you assumed office.

Questions and Answers Continued

Q. I am the sole owner of my business, an S-Corporation. I believe that the nature of the business is such that it cannot be said to have any "fair market value" because it has no assets. I operate the corporation under an agreement with a large insurance company. My contract does not have resale value because of its nature as a personal services contract. Must I report the fair market value for my business on Schedule A-2 of the Form 700?

A. Yes. Even if there are no *tangible* assets, intangible assets, such as relationships with companies and clients are commonly sold to qualified professionals. The "fair market value" is often quantified for other purposes, such as marital dissolutions or estate planning. In addition, the IRS presumes that "personal services corporations" have a fair market value. A professional "book of business" and the associated goodwill that generates income are not without a determinable value. The Form 700 does not require a precise fair market value; it is only necessary to check a box indicating the broad range within which the value falls.

Q. I own stock in IBM and must report this investment on Schedule A-1. I initially purchased this stock in the early 1990s; however, I am constantly buying and selling shares. Must I note these dates in the "Acquired" and "Disposed" fields?

A. No. You must only report dates in the "Acquired" or "Disposed" fields when, during the reporting period, you initially purchase a reportable investment worth \$2,000 or more or when you dispose of the entire investment. You are not required to track the partial trading of an investment.

Q. On last year's filing I reported stock in Encoe valued at \$2,000 - \$10,000. Late last year the value of this stock fell below and remains at less than \$2,000. How should this be reported on this year's statement?

A. You are not required to report an investment if the value was less than \$2,000 during the **entire** reporting period. However, because a disposed date is not required for stocks that fall below \$2,000, you may want to report the stock and note in the "comments" section that the value fell below \$2,000. This would be for informational purposes only; it is not a requirement.

Q. We have a Section 529 account set up to save money for our son's college education. Is this reportable?

A. If the Section 529 account contains reportable interests (e.g., common stock valued at \$2,000 or more), those interests are reportable (not the actual Section 529 account). If the account contains solely mutual funds, then nothing is reported.

Income Disclosure

Q. I reported a business entity on Schedule A-2. Clients of my business are located in several states. Must I report all clients from whom my pro rata share of income is \$10,000 or more on Schedule A-2, Part 3?

A. No, only the clients located in or doing business on a regular basis in your jurisdiction must be disclosed.

Q. I believe I am not required to disclose the names of clients from whom my pro rata share of income is \$10,000 or more on Schedule A-2 because of their right to privacy. Is there an exception for reporting clients' names?

A. Regulation 18740 provides a procedure for requesting an exemption to allow a client's name not to be disclosed if disclosure of the name would violate a legally recognized privilege under California or Federal law. This regulation may be obtained from our website at www.fppc.ca.gov. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 14.)

Q. I am sole owner of a private law practice that is not reportable based on my limited disclosure category. However, some of the sources of income to my law practice are from reportable sources. Do I have to disclose this income?

A. Yes, even though the law practice is not reportable, reportable sources of income to the law practice of \$10,000 or more must be disclosed. This information would be disclosed on Schedule C with a note in the "comments" section indicating that the business entity is not a reportable investment. The note would be for informational purposes only; it is not a requirement.

Questions and Answers Continued

Q. I am the sole owner of my business. Where do I disclose my income - on Schedule A-2 or Schedule C?

A. Sources of income to a business in which you have an ownership interest of 10% or greater are disclosed on Schedule A-2. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 8.)

Q. My husband is a partner in a four-person firm where all of his business is based on his own billings and collections from various clients. How do I report my community property interest in this business and the income generated in this manner?

A. If your husband's investment in the firm is 10% or greater, disclose 100% of his share of the business on Schedule A-2, Part 1 and 50% of his income on Schedule A-2, Parts 2 and 3. For example, a client of your husband's must be a source of at least \$20,000 during the reporting period before the client's name is reported.

Q. How do I disclose my spouse's or registered domestic partner's salary?

A. Report the name of the employer as a source of income on Schedule C.

Q. I am a doctor. For purposes of reporting \$10,000 sources of income on Schedule A-2, Part 3, are the patients or their insurance carriers considered sources of income?

A. If your patients exercise sufficient control by selecting you instead of other doctors, then your patients, rather than their insurance carriers, are sources of income to you. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 14.)

Q. I received a loan from my grandfather to purchase my home. Is this loan reportable?

A. No. Loans received from family members are not reportable.

Q. Many years ago, I loaned my parents several thousand dollars, which they paid back this year. Do I need to report this loan repayment on my Form 700?

A. No. Payments received on a loan made to a family member are not reportable.

Real Property Disclosure

Q. During this reporting period we switched our principal place of residence into a rental. I have full disclosure and the property is located in my agency's jurisdiction, so it is now reportable. Because I have not reported this property before, do I need to show an "acquired" date?

A. No, you are not required to show an "acquired" date because you previously owned the property. However, you may want to note in the "comments" section that the property was not previously reported because it was used exclusively as your residence. This would be for informational purposes only; it is not a requirement.

Q. I am a city manager, and I own a rental property located in an adjacent city, but one mile from the city limit. Do I need to report this property interest?

A. Yes. You are required to report this property because it is located within 2 miles of the boundaries of the city you manage.

Q. Must I report a home that I own as a personal residence for my daughter?

A. You are not required to disclose a home used as a personal residence for a family member unless you receive income from it, such as rental income.

Q. I am a co-signer on a loan for a rental property owned by a friend. Since I am listed on the deed of trust, do I need to report my friend's property as an interest in real property on my Form 700?

A. No. Simply being a co-signer on a loan for property does not create a reportable interest in real property for you.

Gift Disclosure

Q. If I received a reportable gift of two tickets to a concert valued at \$100 each, but gave the tickets to a friend because I could not attend the concert, do I have any reporting obligations?

A. Yes. Since you accepted the gift and exercised discretion and control of the use of the tickets, you must disclose the gift on Schedule D.

Questions and Answers Continued

- Q. Julia and Jared Benson, a married couple, want to give a piece of artwork to a county supervisor. Is each spouse considered a separate source for purposes of the gift limit and disclosure?
- A. Yes, each spouse may make a gift valued at the gift limit during a calendar year. For example, during 2020 the gift limit was \$500, so the Bensons may have given the supervisor artwork valued at no more than **\$1,000**. The supervisor must identify Jared and Julia Benson as the sources of the gift.
- Q. I received free admission to an educational conference related to my official duties. Part of the conference fees included a round of golf. Is the value of the golf considered informational material?
- A. No. The value of personal benefits, such as golf, attendance at a concert, or sporting event, are gifts subject to reporting and limits.
- Q. I am a Form 700 filer with full disclosure. Our agency holds a holiday raffle to raise funds for a local charity. I bought \$10 worth of raffle tickets and won a gift basket valued at \$120. The gift basket was donated by Doug Brewer, a citizen in our city. At the same event, I bought raffle tickets for, and won a quilt valued at \$70. The quilt was donated by a coworker. Are these reportable gifts?
- A. Because the gift basket was donated by an outside source (not an agency employee), you have received a reportable gift valued at \$110 (the value of the basket less the consideration paid). The source of the gift is Doug Brewer and the agency is disclosed as the intermediary. Because the quilt was donated by an employee of your agency, it is not a reportable gift.
- Q. My agency is responsible for disbursing grants. An applicant (501(c)(3) organization) met with agency employees to present its application. At this meeting, the applicant provided food and beverages. Would the food and beverages be considered gifts to the employees? These employees are designated in our agency's conflict of interest code and the applicant is a reportable source of income under the code.
- A. Yes. If the value of the food and beverages consumed by any one filer, plus any other gifts received from the same source during the reporting period total \$50 or more, the food and beverages would be reported using the fair market value and would be subject to the gift limit.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Concerns Regarding the Scope and Impact of Proposed Surveillance Technology Policy for the San Francisco Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras
Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 10:03:00 AM
Attachments: [Letter to BOS re Surveillance Proposal.pdf](#)

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

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

From: Elias, Cindy (POL) <cindy.elias@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 6:36 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Benedicto, Kevin (POL) <kevin.benedicto@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <paul.henderson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Concerns Regarding the Scope and Impact of Proposed Surveillance Technology Policy for the San Francisco Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras

Please see the attached letter.

Thank you.
-Cindy Elias



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CINDY ELIAS
Vice President

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

September 8, 2022

VIA EMAIL: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Concerns Regarding the Scope and Impact of Proposed Surveillance Technology Policy for the San Francisco Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

We write as Board-appointed members of the San Francisco Police Commission to express significant concerns about the Proposed revisions to Administrative Code 19B, regarding “Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras,” (the “Proposed Policy”). The matter, which was first presented before the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee on July 11, 2022, and continued several times since then, remains under consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

The Proposed Policy will have massive ramifications for the San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD” or “Department”), and even larger ramifications and impacts on the San Francisco community we serve, as it touches on issues of civil liberties, constitutional rights, and privacy. Recent events have reminded us of how fragile these rights can be and how we must, as public servants, ensure they are protected.

Given these concerns, we, the signatories of this letter in our individual capacity as Commissioners, ask the Board to ***refrain from final passage*** of the Proposed Policy until we can comprehensively and carefully analyze its impact on SFPD’s policies, procedures, and the community at large, while ensuring this policy aligns with police reform efforts.

We believe that the Proposed Policy will have a significant impact on the following areas currently being worked on by SFPD and the Police Commission:

1. **SFPD General Order on Search Warrants:** The Police Commission is currently in the process of revising Department General Order (“DGO”) 5.16, which governs SFPD’s procedures on obtaining and executing search warrants. This process has included multiple meetings with stakeholders and



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CINDY ELIAS
Vice President

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

subject matter experts, including SFPD command staff and the District Attorney's office. This process is ongoing, and the Proposed Policy would have significant impacts on this DGO and related SFPD policies and procedures. If provided with the additional above-requested time, we would work closely to ensure that both SFPD and the Commission fully understand the impact the Proposed Policy will have on DGO 5.16.

- SFPD General Order on First Amendment Activities:** The Police Commission and SFPD are also currently in the process of updating DGO 8.10, which governs SFPD's policies and procedures relating to First Amendment Activities, such as protests and demonstrations. This is a critically important DGO that has not been updated in more than a decade. Concurrently, the Department of Police Accountability ("DPA") is in the fieldwork phase of an audit of SFPD's compliance with this DGO, with results of the audit expected before the end of 2022. Once again, the Proposed Policy will have significant ramifications on how the Department handles protected First Amendment activity. We believe that more time is needed to assess the Proposed Policy's impact on this DGO, and to incorporate the results of the forthcoming audit on SFPD's compliance with the order.
- Addressing Racial Disparities in Policing:** It has been well-documented, including as recently as the Police Commission meeting on September 7, 2022, that SFPD continues to confront unacceptable levels of racial disparity in its stops, searches, and arrests.¹ Despite years of positive progress in other areas of reform, these racial disparities persist, and in Q1 2022, the last quarter for which SFPD has data, the data shows that Black San Franciscans are still five times more likely to be stopped, and eight times more likely to be searched than White San Franciscans. The Commission and SFPD are hard at work on multiple fronts, including SFPD's Race and Reconciliation series and the Commission's ongoing work to revise SFPD's policy regarding traffic stops in DGO 9.01. Multiple experts, including Professor Andrew Guthrie Ferguson in his book, *The Rise of Big Data Policing: Surveillance, Race, and the Future of Law Enforcement*, have highlighted the fact that new surveillance technologies like the ones in the Proposed Policy are not silver bullets, and require careful study so that existing problems and disparities are not exacerbated. We believe that more time is needed to assess the Proposed Policy's impacts on the Department's ongoing efforts to reduce its racial disparities in stops, searches arrests, and uses of force.
- Other General Orders and Policies:** In addition to the examples provided above, the Proposed Policy may require both updates and revisions to any number of additional DGOs, and changes to SFPD policies and procedures that will require Commission review and action. We believe that a thorough review of the impact of the Proposed Policy is required before its passage.²

¹ September 7, 2022 Meeting of San Francisco Police Commission, <https://sf.gov/meeting/september-7-2022/september-7-2022-police-commission-meeting>

² The Commission is in the process of hiring a Policy Analyst, which we believe will significantly assist in a review and analysis of the Proposed Policy.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CINDY ELIAS
Vice President

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

The Proposed Policy represents a significant shift in the SFPD's access to and use of surveillance technology and carries major ramifications for the Department and for the people of San Francisco. We were not provided a draft of the Proposed Policy before it was introduced to the Board and learned about this matter just as members of the public did, from news reports and the presentation to the Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors. Given that the Proposed Policy will have major impacts and ramifications on the Department's policy, the Commission – as the policy and oversight body of the Department – should have been consulted.

We respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors continue this matter to allow us more time to conduct a thorough review of the policy and provide the Board a better view of its impacts on SFPD's policies and reform efforts.

Respectfully,

Cindy Elias, Vice-President
San Francisco Police Commission

Kevin Benedicto, Commissioner
San Francisco Police Commission

Cc: William Scott, Chief of Police
Paul Henderson, DPA Director

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 12B Waivers
Date: Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:37:00 PM
Attachments: [Elisa Baeza 12B Waiver.pdf](#)
[Vincent Lee 12B Waiver.pdf](#)
[Feng Ling Jiang 12B Waiver.pdf](#)
[Vincent Lee 12B Waiver \(2\).pdf](#)
[Susan Hou 12B Waiver.pdf](#)
[Karen Tsang 12B Waiver.pdf](#)
[Samuel Hoffman 12B Waiver.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached recently approved 12B Waivers.

Requester: Elisa Baeza
Department: JUV
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000011707
Requested total cost: \$7,000.00
Short Description: Safeway - food purchases for SFJPD youth culinary program

Requester: Vincent Lee
Department: POL
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000025978
Requested total cost: \$1,350,000.00
Short Description: Alameda County Sheriff's Office will provide access to critical drug analysis services

Requester: Karen Tsang
Department: DEM
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000010196
Requested total cost: \$384.00
Short Description: SurveyMonkey

Requester: Susan Hou
Department: PUC
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000023620
Requested total cost: \$1,500.00
Short Description: Waiver requested for Dept of Water Resources/DSOD Dam Alteration permitting fees

Requester: Feng Ling Jiang
Department: LIB
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000049995
Requested total cost: \$1,955.25
Short Description: Adult materials

Requester: Vincent Lee

Department: POL

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

Supplier ID: 0000025978

Requested total cost: \$1,350,000.00

Short Description: Alameda County Sheriff's Office will provide access to critical drug analysis services

Requester: Samuel Hoffman

Department: DPH

Waiver Justification: 21A - GPO Health Related Commodities and Services (DPH Only)

Supplier ID: 0000008403

Requested total cost: \$25,000.00

Short Description: Welch Allyn: Vital Sign Monitors Equipment and Repair

Sincerely,

Joe Adkins

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2022-09-15 11:48:56 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0001496	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval
Requested for:	Elisa Baeza	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Veronica Martinez	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2022-08-31 15:25:00	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	JUV
		Requester Phone:	
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Elisa Baeza
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Safeway - food purchases for SFJPD youth culinary program

Supplier ID:	0000011707	Requested Amount:	\$7,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$7,000.00
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000000000
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
		Waiver Start Date:	2022-09-26
		Waiver End Date:	2024-09-25

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

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

- a) Safeway, Inc.; Supplier 0000011707.
- b) To purchase smaller quantity bulk food items for SFJPD's youth culinary program; these purchases would not require minimum order amounts, and purchases can be made on an as needed basis depending on program need.
- c) Safeway is the only supplier with the most locations within City & County limits, including one very close to SFJPD (in Diamond Heights), which will be convenient for programs staff doing the purchasing. Safeway also accepts the City's PO terms & conditions, and has had multiple 12B waivers approved over the years while working with several other City departments for similar purchases (see attachments for reference)

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

The supplier's 12B status is pending according to PeopleSoft. They've also had multiple 12B waivers approved over the years while working with several other City departments for similar purchases (see attachments for reference).

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Director:

CMD Analyst Decision:

Select the reason for this request:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract

Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

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

City Property Status:

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

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

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

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Public Entity Sole Source – Non
Property Contract Justification
Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)
Question2:

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

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

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

To purchase smaller quantity bulk food items for SFJPD's culinary program, in which youth detainees learn to prepare meals for their peers. The program supports the growth and development of its participants.

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

To be able to purchase smaller quantity bulk food items for SFJPD's youth culinary program; these purchases would not require minimum order amounts, and purchases can be made on an as needed basis depending on program need.

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

SFJPD conducted a search in PeopleSoft for grocery store vendors that have done business with the City and that are 12B compliant. We found Safeway, which the City has conducted business with for several years, and they accept the City's PO terms and conditions. However, they are not 12B compliant at this time and their 12B status shows as "pending" on PeopleSoft.

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

This waiver request does not defeat the intent of 12B requirements.

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

Not Applicable

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0001496
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Veronica Martinez	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	2022-09-13 10:27:43		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 4d9803531b29d9504cc655392a4bcb37
Sort Order: None

8 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-14 16:01:05	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-14 16:01:04			false
2022-09-13 10:27:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-13 10:27:44	2022-09-14 16:01:04	1 Day 5 Hours 33 Minutes	true
2022-08-31 15:28:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	Draft	2022-08-31 15:28:24	2022-09-13 10:27:44	12 Days 18 Hours 59 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 10:27:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	Draft	2022-09-13 10:27:44	2022-09-13 10:27:44	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 10:27:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	Draft	2022-09-13 10:27:44	2022-09-13 10:27:44	0 Seconds	true
2022-08-31 15:28:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	Draft	2022-08-31 15:28:24	2022-09-13 10:27:44	12 Days 18 Hours 59 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-13 10:27:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-13 10:27:44	2022-09-14 16:01:04	1 Day 5 Hours 33 Minutes	true
2022-09-14 16:01:05	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001496	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-14 16:01:04			false

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2022-09-15 11:53:07 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0001575	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Feng Ling Jiang	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2022-09-12 13:50:10	12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
		Requesting Department:	LIB
		Requester Phone:	+14155574247
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Feng Ling Jiang
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Adult materials

Supplier ID:	0000049995	Requested Amount:	\$1,955.25
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$1,955.25
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000656033
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
		Waiver Start Date:	2022-09-12
		Waiver End Date:	2023-06-30

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

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

Arkipelago is a source for speciality books outside of the Philippines. The items we acquired are hard-to-find items that are not carried by national vendors.

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

We have emailed the vendor encouraging them to be 12B compliant and attached the 12B compliance process to vendor.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Tamra Winchester	CMD Director:	Romulus Asenloo
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	No compliant source for speciality books outside of the Philippines that are not carried by national vendors.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Romulus Asenloo	CMD Director Decision:	
Reason for Determination:			

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Explain why this is a Sole Source:	

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

City Property Status:	
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:	
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:	

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

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:	
---	--

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

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

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

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :	
12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:	

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
---------------------------------	--

Public Entity Sole Source – Non
Property Contract Justification
Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)
Question2:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0001575
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	2022-09-12 13:56:39		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 09f5645fdbb515d0646d4cd239961959
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-13 18:30:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2022-09-13 18:30:23			false
2022-09-12 13:56:26	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Draft	2022-09-12 13:56:22	2022-09-12 13:56:39	17 Seconds	true
2022-09-12 13:56:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-12 13:56:39	2022-09-12 13:56:39	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-12 14:42:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-12 14:42:33	2022-09-13 18:30:23	1 Day 3 Hours 47 Minutes	true
2022-09-12 13:56:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Draft	2022-09-12 13:56:39	2022-09-12 14:42:33	45 Minutes	true
2022-09-12 13:56:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Draft	2022-09-12 13:56:39	2022-09-12 14:42:33	45 Minutes	true
2022-09-12 14:42:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-12 14:42:33	2022-09-13 18:30:23	1 Day 3 Hours 47 Minutes	true
2022-09-12 13:56:26	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Draft	2022-09-12 13:56:22	2022-09-12 13:56:39	17 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 18:30:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2022-09-13 18:30:23			false
2022-09-12 13:56:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001575	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-12 13:56:39	2022-09-12 13:56:39	0 Seconds	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2022-09-15 11:51:49 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0001587	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Karen Tsang	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Craig Dziedzic	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2022-09-13 10:35:03	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	DEM
		Requester Phone:	+14155544538
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Karen Tsang
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

SurveyMonkey

Supplier ID:	0000010196	Requested Amount:	\$384.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$384.00
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000656056
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
		Waiver Start Date:	2022-09-13
		Waiver End Date:	2024-12-31

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

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

The Department of Emergency Management (DEM) Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) division hereby requests a waiver of the Administrative Code's 12B Equal Benefits Ordinance for Survey Monkey Inc., Supplier 0000010196. Survey Monkey Inc. is a survey development company that has worked with several City agencies with creating surveys to gather opinions and people powered data. DEM-UASI is currently using the services offered by Survey Monkey as approved by PO 0000556872 with a prior 12B compliance waiver approved by Tamra Winchester on 10/15/21. Current Department's needs require an annual renewal subscription to continue using the services offered by SurveyMonkey. DEM-UASI is unable to find another supplier that provides the same services that Survey Monkey Inc. provides, and that is compliant with the City's ordinances.

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

Survey Monkey Inc. has professional relationships with other City agencies, as demonstrated by the list of past and present purchase orders in the next page. We do not know whether these agencies have their own 12B waivers for their Survey Monkey Inc. work agreements. We have attempted to get SurveyMonkey, Inc. to complete their 12B Declaration as evidenced by the email correspondence in the attachment from the previous year, but we have been unsuccessful so far.

DEM-UASI wishes to continue working with Survey Monkey Inc. to continue gathering opinions and important information from its constituents. Denial of this waiver will prevent DEM-UASI from moving forward in its communication goals.

If you have questions or need additional information, I can be reached at karen.tsang@sfgov.org. Thank you.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Tamra Winchester	CMD Director:	Romulus Asenloo
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	No compliant source for continuation of existing survey development services.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Romulus Asenloo	CMD Director Decision:	
---------------	-----------------	------------------------	--

Reason for Determination:

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

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

City Property Status:	
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:	
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:	

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

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:	
---	--

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Public Entity Sole Source – Non
Property Contract Justification
Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)
Question2:

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

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

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

SurveyMonkey is a survey development company that has worked with several City agencies with creating surveys to gather opinions and people powered data. We need this service to gather data whether our programs / classes are meeting the public's needs.

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

Current Department's needs require an annual renewal subscription to continue using the services offered by SurveyMonkey. DEM-UASI is unable to find another supplier that provides the same services that Survey Monkey Inc. provides, and that is compliant with the City's ordinances. We have attempted to get SurveyMonkey, Inc. to complete their 12B Declaration as evidenced by the email correspondence in the attachment from the previous year, but we have been unsuccessful so far.

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

SurveyMonkey is sole source as we already have data there and need to renew our subscription to continue using the data.

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

SurveyMonkey is a CA based company, so I do not think they discriminate. We only have been unsuccessful getting them to comply because they could not forward to the right department to be 12b compliant. Please see attachment for proof of getting them to comply.

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

Not Applicable

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0001587
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Craig Dziejcz	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	2022-09-13 10:52:18		2022-09-13 13:36:22 - Craig Dziejcz (Comments) reply from: craig.dziejcz@sfgov.org Ref:TIS3696697_MSXR JzlixEJ3FdE945ux 2022-09-13 13:36:17 - Craig Dziejcz (Comments) reply from: craig.dziejcz@sfgov.org g Ref:TIS3696697_MSXR JzlixEJ3FdE945ux

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = ece2496bdbfd1110646d4cd2399619a1
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-13 13:36:21	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-13 13:36:18	2022-09-13 19:04:06	5 Hours 27 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 10:52:21	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-13 10:52:18	2022-09-13 10:52:18	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 10:51:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Draft	2022-09-13 10:51:46	2022-09-13 10:52:18	32 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 10:52:21	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Draft	2022-09-13 10:52:18	2022-09-13 13:36:18	2 Hours 44 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 19:04:11	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2022-09-13 19:04:06			false
2022-09-13 10:51:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Draft	2022-09-13 10:51:46	2022-09-13 10:52:18	32 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 19:04:11	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2022-09-13 19:04:06			false
2022-09-13 10:52:21	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Draft	2022-09-13 10:52:18	2022-09-13 13:36:18	2 Hours 44 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 10:52:21	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-13 10:52:18	2022-09-13 10:52:18	0 Seconds	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-13 13:36:21	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001587	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-13 13:36:18	2022-09-13 19:04:06	5 Hours 27 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2022-09-15 11:55:32 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0001552	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Samuel Hoffman	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2022-09-08 16:05:46	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 206-4937
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Samuel Hoffman
		Watch list:	David Lawlor, Eunice Santiago, Elkin Lara-Mejia, Alejandro Garcia, Jaclyn Apelo

Short Description:

Welch Allyn: Vital Sign Monitors Equipment and Repair

Supplier ID:	0000008403	Requested Amount:	\$25,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$25,000.00

Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	21A - GPO Health Related Commodities and Services (DPH Only)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000655263
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
		Waiver Start Date:	2022-09-12
		Waiver End Date:	2023-06-30

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

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

Welch Allyn Inc. S: 0000008403. Welch Allyn vital monitors are used throughout SF Heath Network (including ZSFG, LHH, Primary Care Clinics). Additional purchases of complementary equipment is required to replace unrepairabe equipment. Also, repairable equipment must be serviced by Welch Allyn and/or authorized Biomedical equipment technicians at ZSFG to avoid any voiding of warranties.

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

We have provided Welch Allyn with documentation and contact information at CMD to move forward with compliance process.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Tamra Winchester	CMD Director:	Romulus Asenloo
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	No compliant source can provide complementary equipment to replace unrepairable health monitoring equipment without voiding the warranties.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Romulus Asenloo	CMD Director Decision:
---------------	-----------------	------------------------

Reason for Determination:

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

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

City Property Status:
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

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

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:

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

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

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

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :
12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Public Entity Sole Source – Non
Property Contract Justification
Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)
Question2:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

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

- Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
- Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

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

- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:
Welch Allyn vital monitors are used throughout SF Heath Network (including ZSFG, LHH, Primary Care Clinics). Additional purchases of complementary equipment is required to replace unrepairabe equipment. Also, repairable equipment must be serviced by Welch Allyn and/or authorized Biomedical equipment technicians at ZSFG to avoid any voiding of warranties.

Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

- Explain why this is a Sole Source:
- Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0001552
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	2022-09-08 16:13:42		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = d8ae9882dbf5d990646d4cd2399619c0
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-13 17:43:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2022-09-13 17:43:30			false
2022-09-08 16:13:46	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Draft	2022-09-08 16:13:42	2022-09-08 16:19:22	5 Minutes	true
2022-09-08 16:19:26	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-08 16:19:22	2022-09-13 17:43:30	5 Days 1 Hour 24 Minutes	true
2022-09-08 16:13:46	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-08 16:13:42	2022-09-08 16:13:42	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-08 16:13:41	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Draft	2022-09-08 16:13:37	2022-09-08 16:13:42	5 Seconds	true
2022-09-08 16:13:46	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-08 16:13:42	2022-09-08 16:13:42	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-08 16:19:26	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-08 16:19:22	2022-09-13 17:43:30	5 Days 1 Hour 24 Minutes	true
2022-09-08 16:13:46	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Draft	2022-09-08 16:13:42	2022-09-08 16:19:22	5 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 17:43:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2022-09-13 17:43:30			false

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-08 16:13:41	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001552	Draft	2022-09-08 16:13:37	2022-09-08 16:13:42	5 Seconds	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2022-09-15 11:52:27 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0001554	Request Status:	Rejected by CMD Analyst
Requested for:	Susan Hou	State:	Rejected
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Ivy Fine	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2022-09-08 16:48:36	12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
		Requesting Department:	PUC
		Requester Phone:	(415) 516-1614
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Michelle Quon
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Waiver requested for Dept of Water Resources/DSOD Dam Alteration permitting fees

Supplier ID:	0000023620	Requested Amount:	\$1,500.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$1,500.00
Document Type:	Direct Voucher	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	UC090822
		Waiver Start Date:	2022-10-01
		Waiver End Date:	2023-09-30

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

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

Purpose of CA Dept of Water Resources - Division of Safety of Dams, Dam Alteration permit application relates to work on project Turner Dam Phase 3 Condition Assessment – 10036998.

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

PeopleSoft supplier profile indicates that 12B is required, CA Dept of Water Resources - Division of Safety of Dams is a California state department.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst: Tamra Winchester CMD Director: Romulus Asenloo

CMD Analyst Decision: Rejected Select the reason for this request:

CMD Analyst Comments: A waiver is not necessary for permits with a state governmental entity to the extent the contract is related to the regulatory functions of the agency.

CMD Director

CMD Director: Romulus Asenloo CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason: Periodicals, journals, newspapers and online content

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

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

City Property Status:

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

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

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

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question2:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

N/A CA Dept of Water Resources - Division of Safety of Dams is a sole source supplier for this permit.

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

Not aware of 12B compliance review.

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

CA Dept of Water Resources - Division of Safety of Dams is a sole source supplier.

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

Yes

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0001554
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Ivy Fine	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	2022-09-08 17:14:36		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = ef68ac8edb39d990646d4cd239961968
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-08 17:14:41	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-08 17:14:36	2022-09-13 11:59:29	4 Days 18 Hours 44 Minutes	true
2022-09-08 16:48:41	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Draft	2022-09-08 16:48:37	2022-09-08 17:14:36	25 Minutes	true
2022-09-08 17:14:41	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Draft	2022-09-08 17:14:36	2022-09-08 17:14:36	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 11:59:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-13 11:59:29	2022-09-13 18:42:46	6 Hours 43 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 18:42:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2022-09-13 18:42:46			false
2022-09-08 17:14:41	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Draft	2022-09-08 17:14:36	2022-09-08 17:14:36	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-08 16:48:41	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Draft	2022-09-08 16:48:37	2022-09-08 17:14:36	25 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 11:59:31	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-13 11:59:29	2022-09-13 18:42:46	6 Hours 43 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 18:42:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2022-09-13 18:42:46			false
2022-09-08 17:14:41	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001554	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-08 17:14:36	2022-09-13 11:59:29	4 Days 18 Hours 44 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2022-09-15 11:54:53 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0001455	Request Status:	Cancelled
Requested for:	Vincent Lee	State:	Cancelled
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Patrick Leung	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2022-08-25 08:47:16	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	POL
		Requester Phone:	(415) 837-7116
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Vincent Lee
		Watch list:	Vincent Lee, Patrick Leung

Short Description:

Alameda County Sheriff's Office will provide access to critical drug analysis services

Supplier ID:	0000025978	Requested Amount:	\$1,350,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$1,350,000.00
Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000012165
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
		Waiver Start Date:	2023-03-01
		Waiver End Date:	2025-02-28

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

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

The ALAMEDA COUNTY SHF'S OFC REGNL TRNG CTR will provide access to critical drug analysis services. The contractor has previously submitted confirmation that they use the State of California definition for employee benefits in compliance with San Francisco Admin Code 12B.

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

The vendor has policies equivalent to SF Admin Code 12B but would like to waive the requirement of submitting a 12B declaration

Cancel Notes:

9-13-22 cancelled at Vincent Lee's request.

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Director:

CMD Analyst Decision:

Select the reason for this request:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract

Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

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

City Property Status:

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

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

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

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non

Property Contract Justification

Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)
Question2:

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

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

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

contractor will provide access to critical drug analysis services.

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

Alameda County uses the State of California definition for employee benefits in compliance with San Francisco City and County Administrative Code Section 12B. Alameda County also ACSO has an existing equal benefits for domestic partners policy that is more restrictive than the City and County of San Francisco's 12B policy. As such, we are requesting a waiver of the requirement to submit a 12B Compliance Declaration.

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

Contractor is compliant and has previously provided verification that they have existing employee benefits in compliance to Admin Code 12B.

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

n/a

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

Not Applicable

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

- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

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

- Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
- Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

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

- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

- Explain why this is a Sole Source:

SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

- Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

- Explain why this is a Sole Source:
- Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

Activities

- Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0001455
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Patrick Leung	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	2022-09-12 09:43:18		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = d4047a151bad1d104cc655392a4bcbb7
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-12 09:43:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-12 09:43:18	2022-09-12 09:43:18	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 15:07:31	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Cancelled	2022-09-13 15:07:30			false
2022-09-12 09:48:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-12 09:48:43	2022-09-13 15:07:30	1 Day 5 Hours 18 Minutes	true
2022-08-25 09:05:01	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Draft	2022-08-25 09:05:00	2022-09-12 09:43:18	18 Days 38 Minutes	true
2022-09-12 09:43:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Draft	2022-09-12 09:43:18	2022-09-12 09:48:43	5 Minutes	true
2022-09-12 09:43:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Draft	2022-09-12 09:43:18	2022-09-12 09:48:43	5 Minutes	true
2022-09-12 09:48:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-12 09:48:43	2022-09-13 15:07:30	1 Day 5 Hours 18 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 15:07:31	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Cancelled	2022-09-13 15:07:30			false
2022-08-25 09:05:01	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Draft	2022-08-25 09:05:00	2022-09-12 09:43:18	18 Days 38 Minutes	true
2022-09-12 09:43:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001455	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-12 09:43:18	2022-09-12 09:43:18	0 Seconds	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2022-09-15 11:50:54 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0001592	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval
Requested for:	Vincent Lee	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Patrick Leung	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2022-09-13 13:40:06	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	POL
		Requester Phone:	(415) 837-7116
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Vincent Lee
		Watch list:	Vincent Lee, Patrick Leung

Short Description:

Alameda County Sheriff's Office will provide access to critical drug analysis services

Supplier ID:	0000025978	Requested Amount:	\$1,350,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	Modification – Prior Waiver NOT Approved in ServiceNow	Increase Amount:	\$450,000.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$900,000.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$1,350,000.00
Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000012165
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
		Waiver Start Date:	2023-03-01
		Waiver End Date:	2025-02-28

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

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

The ALAMEDA COUNTY SHF'S OFC REGNL TRNG CTR will provide access to critical drug analysis services. The contractor has previously submitted confirmation that they use the State of California definition for employee benefits in compliance with San Francisco Admin Code 12B.

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

The vendor has policies equivalent to SF Admin Code 12B but would like to waive the requirement of submitting a 12B declaration

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Director:

CMD Analyst Decision:

Select the reason for this request:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract

Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

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

City Property Status:

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

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

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

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non

Property Contract Justification

Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)
Question2:

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

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

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

contractor will provide access to critical drug analysis services.

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

Alameda County uses the State of California definition for employee benefits in compliance with San Francisco City and County Administrative Code Section 12B. Alameda County also ACSO has an existing equal benefits for domestic partners policy that is more restrictive than the City and County of San Francisco's 12B policy. As such, we are requesting a waiver of the requirement to submit a 12B Compliance Declaration.

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

Contractor is compliant and has previously provided verification that they have existing employee benefits in compliance to Admin Code 12B.

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

n/a

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

Not Applicable

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

- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

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

- Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
- Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:
- 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

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

- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

- Explain why this is a Sole Source:

SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

- Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

- Explain why this is a Sole Source:
- Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:
- 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

Activities

- Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0001592
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Patrick Leung	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	2022-09-13 13:42:22		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 033d6de31bb999d04cc655392a4bcb49
Sort Order: None

8 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2022-09-14 11:03:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-14 11:03:27			false
2022-09-13 13:42:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	Draft	2022-09-13 13:42:22	2022-09-13 13:42:22	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 13:42:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-13 13:42:22	2022-09-14 11:03:27	21 Hours 21 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 13:40:06	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	Draft	2022-09-13 13:40:06	2022-09-13 13:42:22	2 Minutes	true
2022-09-13 13:42:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	Draft	2022-09-13 13:42:22	2022-09-13 13:42:22	0 Seconds	true
2022-09-13 13:40:06	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	Draft	2022-09-13 13:40:06	2022-09-13 13:42:22	2 Minutes	true
2022-09-14 11:03:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2022-09-14 11:03:27			false
2022-09-13 13:42:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0001592	Dept. Head approval	2022-09-13 13:42:22	2022-09-14 11:03:27	21 Hours 21 Minutes	true

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SF Bd of Supervisors Land Use Committee / Public Hearing Monday, Sept. 12, 1:30 / File No. 220654 / City Cemetery Landmark Designation / Lincoln Park / Public Testimony of San Francisco Public Golf Alliance
Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 9:48:00 AM
Attachments: [Ltr.SFPGA.Bofs.LandUse.City.Cemetery.LincolnPark.9.7.22.pdf](#)

File No. 220654

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

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

From: Richard Harris Jr. <rharrisjr1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 2:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; conie.chan@sfgov.org; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; 'Larry Yee' <larryyee99@yahoo.com>; Mark Buell <mtakei@buellofficesf.com>; 'Woody LaBounty' <wlabounty@sfheritage.org>
Cc: Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>; Bradley, Stacy (REC) <stacy.bradley@sfgov.org>; Golan, Yael (REC) <yael.golan@sfgov.org>; Ng, Beverly (REC) <beverly.ng@sfgov.org>; dapro@sbcglobal.net; kharrington2k@yahoo.com; 'Paul Lord' <paul.lord.jr@gmail.com>; Grant Ingram <grant.ingram@yahoo.com>; Mike Wallach <mwallach@sfpublishing.org>; Bo Links <bo@slotelaw.com>; Tom Snow <tomsnow24@gmail.com>; Equinox Information <info@equinox-llc.com>; jason@stateapparel.com; 'Lily Achatz' <lilyachatz@gmail.com>; 'HELEN DUFFY' <hmduffy@comcast.net>; Nelson, Lyn (REC) <lyn.nelson@sfgov.org>; Teahan, Kevin (REC)

<kevin.teahan@sfgov.org>

Subject: SF Bd of Supervisors Land Use Committee / Public Hearing Monday, Sept. 12, 1:30 / File No. 220654 / City Cemetery Landmark Designation / Lincoln Park / Public Testimony of San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

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

Board of Supervisors, attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors, Land Use etc Committee, Erica Major, Assistant Clerk

Dear Mss. Calvillo and Major

Enclosed above, for filing and for circulation to all Supervisors and to members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee is the comment letter of the nonprofit San Francisco Public Golf Alliance on the

City Cemetery Landmark Designation matter, File No. 220654, set for public hearing on Monday, Sept. 12 at 1:30 p.m. in the Land Use Committee. Please include this in the Committee's meeting packet for that meeting. And please confirm your receipt and that the letter has been included in the meeting packet and circulated to the Supervisors and Committee members.

Thank you.

Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

1370 Masonic Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94117-4012

Phone: (415) 290-5718



September 7, 2022

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use Committee of the Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

**Re: Proposed Landmark Designation of City Cemetery at Lincoln Park,
Board File # 210426
Land Use Committee Hearing, September 12, 2022, 1:30 p.m.**

Dear Board and Land Use Committee Members,

The non-profit, public benefit San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, with a membership of 7,000-plus mostly public golfers in San Francisco and northern San Mateo Counties, is dedicated to preserving, improving, and advocating for San Francisco's historic and beautiful municipal golf courses.

Our initial reaction to Supervisor Chan's proposed landmarking of City Cemetery at Lincoln Park was concern that landmark designation of the historic 19th Century public cemetery could potentially preclude golf and necessary maintenance, repairs, and improvements at the equally historic Lincoln Park Golf Course -- one of the oldest municipal golf courses west of the Mississippi. We expressed this concern in our May 25, 2021 letter to the Supervisors and Land Use Committee

detailing the recreational history of the park, a copy of which is enclosed and incorporated herein by this reference as **Exhibit 1**.¹

Our concerns for the viability of golf and the current and future maintenance and good repair of the golf course were echoed in more than 150 letters to your Board and Committee sent in June 2021 by golfers from virtually every corner of San Francisco.² Typical is a July 25, 2021 letter from the traditionally Chinese-American Golden Hill Golf Club. (A copy of this letter is attached and incorporated herein by this reference as **Exhibit 2**.)³

Lance Wong, a native San Franciscan and golfer since childhood, and current high school golf coach and manager of Lincoln Park Golf Course, told the Board in a June 26, 2021 letter that he has ' . . . a special place in my heart for SF public golf courses like Lincoln because they are affordable for residents. . . . regular people like grocers, postal workers, plumbers, and other service industry workers who can afford to play there once or twice a week. It has been a particular honor to watch kids grow up playing at Lincoln and seniors ending their golf careers there.' He is concerned that landmarking the cemetery may stall or somehow preclude trenching to install water pipes for a much-needed new recycled water golf course irrigation system.⁴

Christina Shih, an Outer Richmond District neighbor and self-described Lincoln Park “duffer”, is a fourth-generation San Franciscan whose great grandparents moved to Chinatown when their home in the historic Chinese fishing village at Pacific Grove was torched in the mid-19th Century. In a June 23, 2021 e-mail, she tells the Land Use Committee:

“We enjoy playing at Lincoln Park because of its convenience and a few truly beautiful holes although we have been dismayed at the poor maintenance, particularly of the club house. . . . Public golf courses are needed for duffers like me who enjoy golf but not at \$400 greens fees or pricey membership in private country clubs. . . . I truly support designation of the currently existing or maybe even future memorials explaining the history of this property as historical landmarks. I do not support designation of the entire golf course property as a historical landmark because it is unknown as to whether that would prohibit or make too onerous any improvements to the current use as a golf course.”⁵

A copy of Ms. Shih’s letter is attached and incorporated herein as **Exhibit 4**.

¹ Letter, May 25, 2021, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance to Supervisors and Land Use & Transportation Committee: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1z69-cSqrRQBGNQEOqVAVhGNOWN638zv0/view?usp=sharing> Copy attached, **Exhibit 1**.

² About 80 of these letters are found in the Board’s July 26, 2021 public correspondence packets in the City Cemetery matter, Board File No. 201426 file (<https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4921601&GUID=7E9898AD-337D-493A-BCA7-FA0E1F1653A5>), Attachment 10, at pages numbers 20, 21, 67, 72-81, 86-95, 98-107, and 108-119 (<https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9674553&GUID=7B13DEF9-6B8A-4EC4-92CA-9D38273290D6>) and Attachment 11, at pages 2-11, 14-23, 26-35, 39-47, 49-51, 54-63, 66-75, 78-87, 98-102, 106-107, and 112-115 (<https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9674562&GUID=FB1CDDBF-E65B-470F-AAAE-FD39A61ECD7A>).

³ Letter, July 25, 2021, Golden Hill Golf Club Committee to Supervisors and Land Use & Transportation Committee https://drive.google.com/file/d/1tFbbpAv6e475-Eg_a0YK_FIWbY5PfdWA/view?usp=sharing Copy attached, **Exhibit 2**.

⁴ Letter, June 26, 2021, Lance Wong to Supervisors and Land Use & Transportation Committee <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1E99bJuTTfxMbH0QnwxHG4cK7nZ8KIL5/view?usp=sharing>. Copy attached, **Exhibit 3**.

⁵ E-mail, July 23, 2021, Christina Shih to Land Use Committee: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_tAuqnwhCNAIbu-fdBpcuy2_-i3FzfXi/view?usp=sharing Copy attached, **Exhibit 4**.

Supervisor Connie Chan, whose First Supervisorial District includes most of Lincoln Park and who is the original sponsor of the City Cemetery Landmarking ordinance, addressed the golfers' concerns at the May 5, 2022 public hearing of the Historic Preservation Commission. She said her intent in the landmarking legislation includes "respect [for] the existing use . . . [by] the people that are now using that space for golf and recreation." Her full comment on the subject of golf was as follows:

“. . . the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance also has a letter. I want to recognize the effort of today's use. While we think about the past and think about the future, I do also want to recognize the existing space that is actually shared with a lot of people, not just those who came before us. So I want to respect the existing use and that is my intent in landmarking this space. So I do respectfully ask you to consider the people that are now using that space for golf and recreation. Know that I respect them and I also think they have been very respectful, frankly, in the process. So I know that they have some comments. I'm open to it and hope that you are too. After all, in my opinion after all the API community has been through in the past two years, inclusiveness is key to our future. And so with that I leave you that thought.”⁶

We support Supervisor Chan's call for mutual respect and inclusive use of a beautiful public park with a complex history and deep emotions all around. Lincoln Park and the City Cemetery are an ideal place to practice these ideals. On behalf of the golfers, past, present and future, who have been golfing these grounds – and respecting and protecting the remaining cemetery monuments since golf began at the property in or about 1903 – the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance respectfully requests Supervisor Chan, the Committee, and the Board to make clear that it is not the intent of the landmarking to stop or limit or impair the golf use at Lincoln Park or the maintenance and good repair and necessary improvement of the golf course.

And we look forward to working cooperatively with Supervisor Chan's office, with City Cemetery advocates, and with the Planning and Rec and Park Departments, to mutually recognize and celebrate and enjoy the history and the traditions of both the cemetery and the golf course.

Respectfully,

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

Richard Harris

Richard Harris, President

Exhibits Attached

cc:

Supervisor Connie Chan; Supervisor Myrna Melgar; Supervisor Aaron Peskin

Supervisor Dean Preston; Supervisor Catherine Stefani;

Phil Ginsburg, Gen. Mgr., SF Recreation and Park Dept.

Mark Buell, President, SF Recreation and Park Commission

Woody LaBounty, San Francisco Heritage

Larry Yee, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association

⁶ Partial transcription of Supervisor Chan's remarks to the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission, Public Hearing on the matter of the City Cemetery Landmark designation, May 4, 2022, Agenda Item No. 5, at 12:07 – 13:07: https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/41192?view_id=192&redirect=true&h=eaa110f69f9f57ab4f100f430ce35d5d

EXHIBITS

1. Letter, May 25, 2021, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance to Supervisors and Land Use & Transportation Committee
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1z69-cSqrRQBGNQEOqVAVhGNOWN638zv0/view?usp=sharing>
2. Letter, July 25, 2021, Golden Hill Golf Club Committee to Supervisors and Land Use & Transportation Committee
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1tFbbpAv6e475-Eg_a0YK_FIWbY5PfdWA/view?usp=sharing
3. Letter, June 26, 2021, Lance Wong to Supervisors and Land Use & Transportation Committee
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1E99bJuTTfxMbH0QnwvxHG4cK7nZ8KIL5/view?usp=sharing> .
4. E-mail, July 23, 2021, Christina Shih to Land Use Committee
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_tAugnwhCNAIbu-fdBpcuy2_-i3FzfXi/view?usp=sharing



From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Urgent - Crime at 1890 Clay Street
Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 10:20:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image855720.png](#)

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

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

From: Matthew Binczek <Matthew.Binczek@trinitysf.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 4:12 PM
To: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Jackson, Derrick (POL) <derrick.r.jackson@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>; SFPD, Chief (POL) <sfpdchief@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Crime Task Force <CrimeTaskForce@trinitysf.com>; Loren Atienza <Loren.Atienza@trinitysf.com>; Sean Halladay <Sean.Halladay@trinitysf.com>; Caitlin Barry <Caitlin.Barry@trinitysf.com>
Subject: Urgent - Crime at 1890 Clay Street



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

Dear Supervisor Stefani, and Captain Jackson,

Today, September 8, 2022, someone broke into our residential apartment building at 1890 Clay Street during the early morning hours. They gained entry by opening/vandalizing the call box and fob reader with a screwdriver.

Once inside, the thief was seen on camera trying to force their way into the mailboxes using the same screwdriver but couldn't get them open, so they just stole packages off the floor instead.





This event could have threatened the safety of anyone who encountered the criminal during this event. Today's violence, theft, and destruction of property are by no means isolated incidents.

We have done everything we can to fortify this property, including installing upgraded cameras and a controlled entry system. Once more, we request your help to provide the other necessary resources to deter and combat the untenable amount of criminal enterprise we are experiencing across the City.

The overwhelming feedback from our many residents across the City is that safety is their primary concern and priority when choosing a home. We continue to support your efforts to impact the City by working to reduce crime, add additional officers, and see that criminals face the consequences. We will

partner with you in every way possible to support these goals.

Sincerely,

Matthew Binczek
General Manager
(415) 575-3355



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

trinitysf.com

[Email Disclaimer](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 4 Letters regarding File No. 220783
Date: Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:35:00 PM
Attachments: [4 Letters regarding File No. 220783.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 4 letters regarding File No. 220783.

File No. 220783 - Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Renewal and Expansion - Tourism Improvement District - September 13, 2022, at 3:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

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

From: [Chris Wright](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Wade Rose](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Letter in Support of File #220783 - Renewal and Expansion - Tourism Improvement District
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 12:00:44 PM
Attachments: [SF Partnership Letter in Support of File#220783 - Toursim Improvement District.pdf](#)

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

Hello,

Please see the attached letter in support of File #220783 - Renewal and Expansion - Tourism Improvement District from the SF Partnership.

Thank you.

Chris

Chris Wright

SF Partnership
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 965
San Francisco, CA 94104
Work: 415-956-1007
Email: chris@sfpartnership.org



September 13, 2022

Board President Shamann Walton
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Drive, Room 244
San Francisco CA 94102

Re: File # #220783 - Renewal and Expansion - Tourism Improvement District

Dear Board President Walton and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

We are writing today on behalf of the SF Partnership to urge you to approve the renewal and expansion of the Tourism Improvement District (TID), File #220783. The SF Partnership is an organization made up of the City's leading employers and is focused on the economic vitality and livability of San Francisco. Our mission is to be a leading voice in efforts to make the City an affordable, thriving place for everyone.

Right now, San Francisco's Economic Core (e.g., the Financial District, East Cut, Union Square, Yerba Buena, Embarcadero, Market Street, and Mission Bay), the economic driver for our city and region, faces unprecedented challenges. With office vacancies hovering at around 22% and fewer than half of San Francisco's 570,000 office jobs expected to return in-person five days a week, our downtown area needs to pursue many solutions, and the renewal and expansion of the Tourism Improvement District (TID) is an essential one.

Through the increased sales and promotions attributed to the TID, San Francisco went from being mid-range to the top of the leading 25 tourist destination markets in the United States, bringing in more visitors and economic vitality to San Francisco than ever before.

The TID funds SF Travel, which promotes San Francisco for leisure and business travel and books small and large conventions. The City's small businesses, accommodations, restaurants, attractions, retail establishments, and cultural institutions, including those in the Economic Core, rely significantly on these leisure and business visitors for their operations. Thanks to the funding from the TID, the City welcomed over 26 million visitors who spent over \$10.2 billion in our local economy. The travel and tourism industry also supported over 86,000 good jobs and brought in over \$750 million in local taxes that fund essential city services.

Renewing the TID is imperative for the City to recover and thrive in future years by bringing visitors back from all over the world to enjoy what San Francisco has to offer, all while supporting a significant local economic and workforce base. We ask that you support the renewal and expansion of the Tourism Improvement District.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Wade Rose". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "W" and "R".

Wade Rose
President

From: [Amy Cleary](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Laurie Thomas](#)
Subject: GGRA Letter of Support for TID Approval
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:58:02 AM
Attachments: [TID Letter of Support.pdf](#)

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

September 13, 2022

Dear President Walton and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing today on behalf of the Golden Gate Restaurant Association to urge you to approve the renewal and expansion of the Tourism Improvement District (TID).

The TID transformed how San Francisco competes against comparable destinations for leisure and business travel. Since the TID went into effect in 2009, the TID generated over \$20 million each year, prior to the pandemic, for San Francisco to market and attract domestic and international travelers. Through the increased sales and promotions attributed to the TID, San Francisco went from being in the mid-range to the top of the leading 25 markets in the United States, bringing in more visitors and economic impact to San Francisco than ever before.

The TID funds the San Francisco Travel Association, which promotes San Francisco for leisure and business travel and books small and large conventions in the city-owned Moscone Center. Thanks to the funding from the TID, San Francisco welcomed over 26 million visitors who spent over \$10.2 billion pre-pandemic in our local economy, making tourism San Francisco's number one industry. The travel and tourism industry also supported over 86,000 good jobs and brought in over \$750 million in local taxes supporting essential city services.

As our decimated hospitality industry continues to recover from the devastating effects of the covid pandemic and related closures, our downtown restaurants, cafes, and bars have been impacted the most as they rely on these leisure and business visitors. Renewal of the TID is imperative on San Francisco's ability to recover, regain our market share and thrive into future years by bringing visitors back from all over the world to enjoy what San Francisco has to offer all while supporting an important local economic and workforce base.

Sincerely,



Laurie Thomas, Executive Director
Golden Gate Restaurant Association

Board members:

Marie Trimble Holvick (Partner) Gordon & Rees
Steven Grant (Director of Food and Beverage) Hotel Nikko
Bryan Tublin (Owner) Kitava
Andy Chun(Owner) Press Club, Schroeders and Elite
Andrew Freeman (Founder) AF&CO and Carbonate
Benson Wang (Owner) Blue Plantain, LLC
Bob Partrite (Chief Operating Officer) Simco Restaurants
Cassie Corless (Director of Business Operations) Tastes on the Fly
Denise Tran (Founder / CEO) Bun Mee LLC
Doug Collister (Partner, Director of Marketing & IT) China Live Ventures
Douglas Marschke (CEO) Underdogs Too, Underdogs Tres, Tacko
Dylan MacNiven (Executive Director) Woodhouse Fish Co/Wooden Spoon/West of Pecos/Cafe Du Nord
Evan Kidera (Owner), Senor Sisig
Hanson Li (Managing Partner) Salt Partners
Jenna Johnson (Client Executive) NFP
John Konstin (Proprietor) John's Grill
Josh Harris (Owner) BV Hospitality
Justin Richardson (President) The City POS
Keba Konte (Founder/CEO) Red Bay Coffee Company
Lee Gregory (Executive Vice President) McCalls Catering
Lindsay Tusk (Owner) Quince & Co.
Margie Butler (Development & Marketing) Perry's San Francisco
Nghia Tran (COO) Burma Inc
Patric Yumul (CEO) Tableone Hospitality
Rachel Herbert (Owner) Park Cafe Group
Ranjan Dey (President) New Delhi Restaurant
Roberta Economidis (Partner) GE Law Group
Steve Sarver (Treasurer) Ladle & Leaf
Tony Marcell (Director of Operations) Wayfare Tavern

--

Amy Cleary
Director of Public Policy and Media Relations
Golden Gate Restaurant Association
415.370.9056
amy@ggra.org

September 13, 2022

Dear President Walton and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing today on behalf of the Golden Gate Restaurant Association to urge you to approve the renewal and expansion of the Tourism Improvement District (TID).

The TID transformed how San Francisco competes against comparable destinations for leisure and business travel. Since the TID went into effect in 2009, the TID generated over \$20 million each year, prior to the pandemic, for San Francisco to market and attract domestic and international travelers. Through the increased sales and promotions attributed to the TID, San Francisco went from being in the mid-range to the top of the leading 25 markets in the United States, bringing in more visitors and economic impact to San Francisco than ever before.

The TID funds the San Francisco Travel Association, which promotes San Francisco for leisure and business travel and books small and large conventions in the city-owned Moscone Center. Thanks to the funding from the TID, San Francisco welcomed over 26 million visitors who spent over \$10.2 billion pre-pandemic in our local economy, making tourism San Francisco's number one industry. The travel and tourism industry also supported over 86,000 good jobs and brought in over \$750 million in local taxes supporting essential city services.

As our decimated hospitality industry continues to recover from the devastating effects of the covid pandemic and related closures, our downtown restaurants, cafes, and bars have been impacted the most as they rely on these leisure and business visitors. Renewal of the TID is imperative on San Francisco's ability to recover, regain our market share and thrive into future years by bringing visitors back from all over the world to enjoy what San Francisco has to offer all while supporting an important local economic and workforce base.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Laurie Thomas".

Laurie Thomas, Executive Director
Golden Gate Restaurant Association

Board members:

Marie Trimble Holvick (Partner) Gordon & Rees
Steven Grant (Director of Food and Beverage) Hotel Nikko
Bryan Tublin (Owner) Kitava
Andy Chun(Owner) Press Club, Schroeders and Elite
Andrew Freeman (Founder) AF&CO and Carbonate
Benson Wang (Owner) Blue Plantain, LLC
Bob Partrite (Chief Operating Officer) Simco Restaurants
Cassie Corless (Director of Business Operations) Tastes on the Fly
Denise Tran (Founder / CEO) Bun Mee LLC
Doug Collister (Partner, Director of Marketing & IT) China Live Ventures
Douglas Marschke (CEO) Underdogs Too, Underdogs Tres, Tacko
Dylan MacNiven (Executive Director) Woodhouse Fish Co/Wooden Spoon/West of Pecos/Cafe Du Nord
Evan Kidera (Owner), Senor Sisig
Hanson Li (Managing Partner) Salt Partners
Jenna Johnson (Client Executive) NFP
John Konstin (Proprietor) John's Grill
Josh Harris (Owner) BV Hospitality
Justin Richardson (President) The City POS
Keba Konte (Founder/CEO) Red Bay Coffee Company
Lee Gregory (Executive Vice President) McCalls Catering
Lindsay Tusk (Owner) Quince & Co.
Margie Butler (Development & Marketing) Perry's San Francisco
Nghia Tran (COO) Burma Inc
Patric Yumul (CEO) Tableone Hospitality
Rachel Herbert (Owner) Park Cafe Group
Ranjan Dey (President) New Delhi Restaurant
Roberta Economidis (Partner) GE Law Group
Steve Sarver (Treasurer) Ladle & Leaf
Tony Marcell (Director of Operations) Wayfare Tavern

From: [Alison Price](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: TID Ballot
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:30:03 AM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board of Supervisor ,

I'm writing to give my opinion of the TID Ballot since I can't be there to speak.

I'm concerned that votes mailed in between July 29th and August 26th were based on incorrect and misleading information therefore disqualifying this election. Misinformation was initially sent out by the Dept. of Elections and then correct information was sent a month later, a few weeks before voting ended. The misinformation was on page under "Gross revenue from guest rooms does include", page 4 , and subsequently changed to DOES NOT.

I'm also concerned that the ballots are weighted incorrectly as I know mine was. I'm trying to correct that before noon. An average weighting is only correct if everyone that was averaged votes.

Finally , I haven't seen enough transparency in the S F Travel or the SF TID board meeting minutes and financial statements. I was able to find that SF Travel is deeply in debt and losing money though. It seems for such a large amount of money more oversight and transparency is needed.

Sincerely ,

Alison Price

From: [LF](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [greg miller](#)
Subject: Tourism Improvement District comment
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:13:43 AM

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

Hello,

I have been a San Francisco resident for over 22 years (my husband 16yrs) and are fortunate to own a house in bernal Heights. Our house has been a part of the short term rental program since it's inception and we rely on this program to help make ends meet, as a public-school family living in San Francisco with normal jobs, not tech millionaires.

We are against the City's proposal to create a broad sweeping tourism improvement district that would tax independent residences the same as commercial hotels. Individual homeowner residence that do short term rental (max allowed 90 days a year) do not need or benefit from the programs outlined in the legislation for TID revenues. We do not need or benefit from sales, marketing, promotional programs. We do not need or benefit from administration and personnel of San Francisco travel. Or the industry special event. We also already pay the City's annual business license fees, short term rental permit fees, Airbnb fees, and income tax on all of our short term rentals. Not to mention high property taxes & special assessments. With the cities restrictions on how often we can rent via STR program you can understand that any income we hope to make to support raising a family here is already very chipped away.

In fact, the city of San Francisco has worked very hard that it's short term rental program does not become a hotel oriented as it exists in residential neighborhoods. So this legislation seems completely counterintuitive to the role, tone, and skill of individual residence participating in the short term rental program versus our commercial hotels and other visitor services. I request that you redirect legislation to commercial businesses that may in fact see benefits from these programs that they will then contribute to.

Thank you
Neighbor Lisa

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 3 Letters regarding File Nos. 220783 and 220784
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:19:00 AM
Attachments: [3 Letters regarding File Nos. 220783 and 220784.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 3 letters regarding File Nos. 220783 and 220784, which are Item Nos. 17 and 18, respectively, on today's agenda.

File No. 220783 – Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Renewal and Expansion - Tourism Improvement District - September 13, 2022, at 3:00 p.m.

File No. 220784 – Resolution to Establish (Renew and Expand) - Tourism Improvement District

Sincerely,

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

From: [Lyle Sweeney](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#); brittany.harrell@sfgov.org; [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); contact@growsf.org
Subject: Re: Comments for Public Hearing 9/13/2022 re: Tourism Improvement District
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 7:01:03 PM

Thank you

Lyle
415-602-8817

On Sep 12, 2022, at 10:52, Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org> wrote:

Thank you, your comments have been added to the respective files for the TID package (File Nos. 220649, 220783, and 220784).

ERICA MAJOR

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

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

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

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

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

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

~~~~~

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

*addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Lyle <lyle.sweeney@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 5:05 PM

**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Lew, Lisa (BOS) <lisa.lew@sfgov.org>; brittany.harrell@sfgov.org; Wong, Jocelyn (BOS) <jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; contact@growsf.org

**Subject:** Comments for Public Hearing 9/13/2022 re: Tourism Improvement District

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

Angela,

Attached is my written comment for the Board of Supervisors meeting on 9/13/2022 @ 3p.

Thank you,

Lyle

--

Lyle Sweeney

San Francisco, CA

FROM: Lyle Sweeney  
 1251 Hampshire Street  
 San Francisco, CA 94110

**ATTENTION:**

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

**RE: Written Comments for public hearing on 9/13/2022 @ 3p: "Tourism Improvement District"**

I am a short-term rental owner and I am writing to encourage anyone eligible; **please vote "NO"**.

My primary reason to encourage a "NO" vote is that the city, the county, the Tourism board and all other public agencies have failed to manage their past and current budgets. This has resulted in complete and total degradation of our city, neighborhoods and parks. San Francisco is an eyesore and an embarrassment to all visitors, businesses, residents and tourists.

More taxes and fees will simply line the pockets of corrupt public officials; such as: Mohammad Nuru and many attending this hearing

My guests share their daily traumatic experiences that our public officials fail to address.

- Chronically homeless in need of help, left to die on the streets
- Used needles scattered on public sidewalks and in parks
- Human Shit on public sidewalks and in parks



All photos are from one small park in San Francisco - James Rolph Jr. Playground, located at 2850 Cesar Chavez St., San Francisco, CA 94110. Link to 400+ additional photos.

<https://zenofile.smugmug.com/Political-and-Parks/Rolph-Playground-and-Baseball-Field>

**From:** [Charley Goss](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Janan New](#)  
**Subject:** SFAA Letter of Support File No. 220784 (Tourism Improvement District)  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 12:52:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [SFAA Support Letter File No. 220783 and 220784.pdf](#)

---

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

Hello,

Attached please find the San Francisco Apartment Association's letter of support for File Numbers 220783 and 220784, which are agenda item 17 and 18 at the Board of Supervisors meeting tomorrow. Please include this letter in the legislative file for these items.

Thank you,

Charley Goss  
Government and Community Affairs Manager  
San Francisco Apartment Association  
265 Ivy Street  
p.415.255.2288 ext.114  
f.415.255.1112

Information and opinions provided by SFAA staff is not legal advice and may not be construed as such. SFAA staff members are not legal advisors or attorneys. No legal advice is conveyed by this email or through any telephone conversation between you and SFAA staff. Transmitted information and opinions are derived from industry customs and practices but are not to be construed or relied upon as representations of law or legal advice. You should confirm all information and opinions with your own attorney.





# San Francisco Apartment Association

September 12, 2022

President Shamann Walton  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Drive, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear President Walton and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing today on behalf of the San Francisco Apartment Association to urge you to approve the renewal and expansion of the Tourism Improvement District (TID), File No. 220783 and File No. 220784.

The TID transformed how San Francisco competes against comparable destinations for leisure and business travel. Since the TID went into effect in 2009, the TID generated over \$20 million each year, prior to the pandemic, for San Francisco to market and attract domestic and international travelers. Through the increased sales and promotions attributed to the TID, San Francisco went from being in the mid-range to the top of the leading 25 markets in the United States, bringing in more visitors and economic impact to San Francisco than ever before.

The TID funds the San Francisco Travel Association, which promotes San Francisco for leisure and business travel and books small and large conventions in the city owned Moscone Center. Our small businesses, accommodations, restaurants, attractions, retail establishments, and cultural institutions rely on these leisure and business visitors for their operations. Thanks to the funding from the TID, San Francisco welcomed over 26 million visitors who spent over \$10.2 billion pre-pandemic in our local economy, making tourism San Francisco's number one industry. The travel and tourism industry also supported over 86,000 good jobs and brought in over \$750 million in local taxes supporting essential city services.

The pandemic impacted the tourism and hospitality industry harder than any other sector and our recovery is also lagging behind any other industry sector in other US markets. Renewal of the TID is imperative on San Francisco's ability to recover, regain our market share and thrive into future years by bringing visitors back from all over the world to enjoy what San Francisco has to offer all while supporting an important local economic and workforce base.

Sincerely,

Charley Goss  
Government and Community Affairs  
San Francisco Apartment Association

**From:** [Dennis Montalto](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Tourism Improvement District  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:00:43 AM

---

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

Angela Calvillo,

I have a short term rental within my single family residence and I am opposed to the additional tax that will fund the:

1. Sales, marketing and promotional programs.
2. Administration and personnel of SF travel.
3. Industry special events.
4. Moscone convention center buy-down fund.

I believe SF can better use a TID tax revenue to fund homeless housing and programs that would clean up our streets.

Sincerely,

Dennis Montalto

**From:** [Lagunte, Richard \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** File Nos. 220783 and 220784 - comments from Jon Handlery  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 11:25:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [2207833 220784 Handlery comments.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Attached is a letter hand delivered by Jon Handlery of the Handlery Union Square Hotel regarding File Nos. 220783 and 220784.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 554-7709 | (415) 554-5163  
[richard.lagunte@sfgov.org](mailto:richard.lagunte@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



# HANDLERY UNION SQUARE HOTEL

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

SEP 13 2021  
CITY CLERK

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am the Owner and General Manager of the Handlery Union Square Hotel located at 351 Geary Street, San Francisco, CA 94102. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the public hearing on September 13th on the renewal and expansion of the business-based special assessment district to be known as the "Tourism Improvement District". I wish to first state that I am in support of the renewal of the current assessment that I am paying to fund the San Francisco Travel Association.

My objection is to the increases that San Francisco Travel Association is proposing. Given the lack of transparency of the specific use of and assessed benefits to be reaped from the additional funds, this proposed assessment as written is inadequate for responsible evaluation.

## 1. MOSCONE "BUY DOWN"

In 2020 and 2021, I had numerous meetings and correspondence with Paul Frentsos, Executive Vice President and Chief Operation Officer; and Cassandra Costello, Senior Vice President, Public Policy and Executive Programs of the San Francisco Travel Association. I inquired regarding the plan for how the proposed increase of .25% was intended to be utilized. In multiple presentations they indicated the "Moscone Buy Down" was to offset the costs for convention planners of Moscone Center. In the discussions with Mr. Frentsos and Ms. Costello, they stated it could be used for other matters which were not specified. In seeking clarification, Mr. Frentsos and Ms. Costello were unable to provide an answer as to specifically what these other matters may be. I also asked what their anticipated budget is if the proposed assessment passes. Furthermore, I asked how the sales team at SF Travel would use this money to assist in their sales efforts. Neither Mr. Frentsos and Ms. Costello could tell me what the projected budget was. Additionally, they told me there was no sales plan in place as to how these funds would be used.

## 2. INCREASE FOR CRITICAL AND UNFORESEEN CIRCUMSTANCES



In conversations with Mr. Frentzos and Ms. Costello, I also asked about the potential increase of up to 1% for a critical or unforeseen circumstance that should occur in our city. Both communicated that the San Francisco Travel Association had not defined what this critical and unforeseen circumstance may be. I questioned them, that we would be increasing the cost to our guests now with no immediate benefit to our visitors.

I have a grave concern that taxing a [tourism] customer with no known benefit or expected timing of use is inappropriate. Without clear communication on the use, it appears the funds are merely an increase to San Francisco Travel Agency's budget.

For 2019, SF Travel's budget was over \$40 million. If these two additional taxes should be approved, the hotels will pass through the cost of potentially 1.25%, taking our hotel tax to 17.5%. This does not include the State Tourism tax of .2% that the hotels pass through as well to our guests. Essentially, this would take our overall hotel tax to close to 18%.

Finally, the President and CEO, Joe D Alessandro, did not contact me or offer to go over my concerns. I would appreciate my letter be included in the minutes of the meeting to be held on September 13, 2022, and the official public record in this matter.

Transparency is key to financial support, fostering trust, and is critical to aid in developing relationships within the community. As I note at the start of this letter, I am in support of the renewal for the current TID for San Francisco Travel Association. I am not in support of increasing our hotel tax to our visitors that may reach nearly 18% without a clear budget or detailed operational plan.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jon S. Handlery', written over a white background.

Jon S. Handlery

General Manager, Handlery Union Square Hotel

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: File number:220619 : Laguna Honda Forced Discharges and Deaths  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:06:00 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication regarding Item 19 on today's agenda.

**Item 19 - 220619** Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan - September 13, 2022, at 3:00 p.m.

Thank you,

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

---

**From:** A. Colichidas <acolichidas@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 8:18 AM  
**To:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** File number:220619 : Laguna Honda Forced Discharges and Deaths

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

[File number:220619](#) [Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan - September 13, 2022, at 3:00 p.m.]

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Thank you for your serious investigation into this matter.

Laguna Honda is a San Francisco institution. This tortured process of patient transfer and relocation highlights the need for more nursing beds, not fewer. I am appalled at the deaths resulting from this travesty. The Gray Panthers have been involved in the LH struggle for many years and I support the position as follows.

- Laguna Honda be open to all San Franciscans who need nursing home care
- SFPD Stop the "flow" project & return admission decisions to LHH Staff
- No forced closures
- No discharges for Skilled-Nursing-Facility-eligible residents
- No discharge for non-SNF-eligible residents until safe and local arrangements are made.
- No loss of beds in this nearly new facility
- Funding for existing residents must continue until recertification
- Sufficient mental health and substance use programs and beds to give people the care they need, and sufficient services for elders and people with disabilities to stay in their communities where possible, to prevent inappropriate nursing home admissions.

Please represent all of your constituents, and put a stop to the danger and death that will occur, both now and in the future, if beds are lost or the most vulnerable residents are again ejected from Laguna Honda.

Sincerely,  
Ann Colichidas  
Gerontologist, San Francisco

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Laguna Honda Discharges  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:24:00 PM

---

**From:** Donna DEufemia <donna.deufemia@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 5:20 PM  
**To:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Re: Laguna Honda Discharges

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

Hello,

I spoke a remote comment but didn't get to finish. I am just learning how many words go into a 2minute comment. Here is my full comment (last two paragraphs were not included in comment):

Good afternoon Bd of Supervisors and all in attendance:

I would like to extend a huge thank you to the Bd for the unanimously voted resolution that petitioned the CMS to stop discharges at LHH. I believe that made a difference along with the law suits from the district attorneys of SF, to get the CMS to 'halt ' the deadly discharges. At least no one has had to die recently!

My name is Donna DEufemia and I have an elderly disabled brother currently at LHH. To be clear, he is getting good care there relative to any other available medi-cal SNF in the area and SF is his home and we both want him to reside there.

I have been very involved in the activism for the benefit of my brother and the spectrum of all surrounding LHH. It is very difficult to not feel terrified and outraged, especially toward the CMS's decision.

I absolutely align with the list of demands of the Gray Panthers and am grateful for their commitment to advocate on behalf of the patients of LHH and to demand a healthy and reasonable social safety net for those in need of a SNF and good care for others in need.

Most importantly, In November 2022, I understand the CMS will likely continue transfers



regardless of how many deaths, displacements and suffering it will cause. I understand this comes from their mandates about compliance and recertification. At least that is what they say. I believe any thinking and feeling person is on the same page with how insane and cruel this is. **I am imploring the BD once again to find a path to permanently stop these transfers and permanently separate this mandate from the recertification process.**

**Displacing another 600 people, plus taking away 120 beds, is clearly the wrong thing to do. There is literally no other place for them to go. What will it take to have the CMS permanently stop this insanity and what other measures can anyone do to support this happening immediately. ?? I implore you to take more action for our most vulnerable. This is still a crisis and we must do better; November 13 is just around the corner.**

Thank you!

*~Donna D'Eufemia~*

***A.A. Liberal Arts, CaCMT, Trainer,  
Masters in Intuition Medicine (Candidate)***

*~Deep Tissue, Swedish, Energy Clearing,  
PreNatal, Lymphatic, Cupping~*

***San Rafael Office: 415.302.8010***

***Resonance Marin, Corte Madera: 415.891.3328***

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Laguna Honda  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:41:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Rasa Gustaitis regarding File No. 220619.

**File No. 220619** - Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Rasa Gustaitis <Rasa@rasatime.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 12:56 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Laguna Honda

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

To shut down Laguna Honda would be cruel and irresponsible. It would mean casting out some of the most helpless among us, with nowhere for them to go.

I am glad to hear the City is working to avert that and urge you to make recertification the highest priority.

I have known people who have worked, volunteered, and lived at this unique refuge. It is irreplaceable. To shut it down is unthinkable.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 6 letters regarding File No. 220598  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:11:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [6 letters regarding File No. 220958.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached 6 letters regarding File No. 220598, which is Item No. 24 on today's agenda.

**File No. 220598** - Urging the Recreation and Parks Department to Develop and Install Signage Acknowledging Sharp Park Dark History as a Concentration Camp

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [Richard Hashimoto](#)  
**To:** [Moreno, Rafael \(ECN\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MeigarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [asha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:asha.safai@sfgov.org); [catherine.stafani@sfgov.org](mailto:catherine.stafani@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 220958  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 10:30:42 AM  
**Attachments:** [BoS 220958 - 9.13.22.pdf](#)

---

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

Dear Honorable Supervisor,

Please find attached my letter urging your support for the referenced agenda item at tomorrow's meeting.

Thank you,  
Richard Hashimoto

1521 O'Farrell Street  
San Francisco, CA 94115

September 12, 2022

Board of Supervisors

Shamann Walton, President

Connie Chan

Matt Dorsey

Rafael Mandelman

Gordon Mar

Myrna Melgar

Aaron Peskin

Dean Preston

Hillary Ronen

Asha Safai

Catherine Stefani

City and County of San Francisco  
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

I am writing to urge for your utmost support of Agenda Item 220958, which will be heard at your next Board of Supervisors meeting on September 13, 2022.

This Resolution will recommend the Recreation and Park Department to develop and install signage acknowledging Sharp Park as a site where Japanese Americans were unjustly incarcerated during World War II.

Currently, there is no formal or public acknowledgement that this site was used as a concentration camp. It is important that the public be informed of the great injustices that occurred there as a harsh reminder so that this dark chapter in our history is not repeated.

Therefore, I urge your support for a favorable vote.

Respectfully,



Richard Hashimoto

cc: Clerk, Board of Supervisors

**From:** [Joyce Nakamura](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: 9/13/2022 BOS Meeting Item 220958  
**Date:** Friday, September 9, 2022 7:09:10 PM

---

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

September 9, 2022

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge your support of Agenda Item 220958 which will be heard at your next Board of Supervisors Meeting on September 13, 2022. This Resolution will urge the Recreation and Parks Department to develop and install signage acknowledging Sharp Park as a site where Japanese Americans were incarcerated during World War II.

Currently, there is no formal or public acknowledgement that Sharp Park was used for this purpose. It is vital that the public be advised of what happened to Japanese Americans during the War, so that such incidences will never happen again in our history.

I urge your support.

Sincerely,

Joyce Nakamura  
District 3  
1469 Clay Street  
San Francisco, CA 94109

**From:** [Low, Allan E. \(SFO\)](#)  
**To:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Connie Chan \(conne.chan@sfgov.org\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [dianematsuda](#); [DPH-cally.wong](#)  
**Subject:** Letter in Support of Resolution Regarding Sharp Park  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 3:30:09 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Letter in Support of Resolution Regarding Sharp Park \(9-12-22\).PDF](#)

---

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

Supervisors,

On behalf of the Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown, attached is a letter of support for the Board of Supervisors resolution urging the Recreation and Park Department to install interpretative language at Sharp Park recognizing Sharp Park's dark and racist history.

Allan Low

**Allan Low | Perkins Coie LLP**

**PARTNER**  
505 Howard Street Suite 1000  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
D. +1.415.344.7008  
F. +1.415.344.7208  
E. [ALow@perkinscoie.com](mailto:ALow@perkinscoie.com)



---

NOTICE: This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.

# 華埠公園康樂會

Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown

September 12, 2022

Via Email ([Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org](mailto:Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org))

President Shamann Walton  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4689

Re: **Letter in Support of Resolution Urging the Recreation and Park Department to install appropriate interpretive signage onsite at Sharp Park**  
Board of Supervisor Hearing: Tuesday, September 12, 2022  
Item No.: 24  
File No.: 220958

Dear President Walton,

The **Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown** (CBPRC) strongly supports the Board of Supervisors resolution urging the Recreation and Park Department to develop and install appropriate interpretive signage onsite at Sharp Park, acknowledging the site's dark chapter in San Francisco as a concentration camp.

Founded in 1969, Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown (CBPRC) has advocated for open space and recreation areas in Chinatown. Because of Chinatown's high density, open space and parks are an especially important and a limited resource to our community. Our committee members have a long history of being engaged and active in the community processes in Chinatown including the renovation of many San Francisco Recreation and Park facilities and open spaces. Our members include volunteer architects, district council staff, community youth organizations, community childcare providers, and community members, as well as staff from neighborhood service providers like Chinatown Community Development Center, Community Youth Center, and Self-Help for the Elderly.

Our parks and open spaces should also be a symbol for our shared values of inclusion and diversity. There is a dark history of Sharp Park used as a concertation camp for many Japanese Americans, Japanese-South Americans, Italian Americans and German Americans. We should not demolish or erase this dark and racist history. In installing interpretive signage remembering this past, we can help ensure that this atrocity never happens again.



Letter of Support for Board of Supervisors Resolution  
September 12, 2022  
Page 2

The Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown fully supports this resolution and urges the Board of Supervisors to adopt the resolution to develop and install interpretive signage onsite at Sharp Park acknowledging this dark chapter in San Francisco and American history.

Best,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Allan Low".

Allan Low

on behalf of **Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown**

cc:

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
([board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org))

District 3 Supervisor Aaron Peskin  
(via email [aaron.peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:aaron.peskin@sfgov.org))

District 1 Supervisor Connie Chan  
(via email [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org))

District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston  
(via email [dean.preston@sfgov.org](mailto:dean.preston@sfgov.org))

Dianne Matsuda  
API Legal Outreach  
(via email)

Cally Wong  
API Council  
(via email)

**From:** [Emily Murase](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Diane Matsuda](#); [Rosalyn Tonai](#); [Judy Hamaguchi](#)  
**Subject:** [SF Japanese American Citizens League] SUPPORT for Signage at Sharp Park, File #220958  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 8:19:43 PM

---

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

To the Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of the San Francisco Japanese American Citizens League, I would like to express unequivocal support for the resolution on the September 13 agenda to urge the Recreation and Parks Department to develop and install signage acknowledging Sharp Park as a site where Japanese Americans were incarcerated during World War II (File #220958).

Currently, there is no formal or public acknowledgement that Sharp Park was used for this purpose. It is vital that the public be advised of the unconstitutional violations suffered by Japanese Americans who were incarcerated during World War II as the result of race hysteria, so that such incidents will never happen again in our history.

I want to recognize the bold step the Board of Supervisors took in February, adopting the resolution commemorating the 80th anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066 (File #220153). The explicit acknowledgement of the City and County of San Francisco's part in the forced removal of Japanese American families during World War II was a landmark action of reconciliation. This resolution under consideration is an important extension of this difficult but necessary work. I hope that you will support the resolution and advocate for its adoption by the full Board of Supervisors.

Yours sincerely,

*Emily*

Emily M. Murase, PhD

**"Nobody is free until everybody's free." - Fannie Lou Hamer, civil rights leader of the Mississippi Freedom Summer, the seminal campaign to register African American voters before the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.**

**From:** [Robert Sakai](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 220958  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 1:02:03 PM

---

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

September 10,2022.

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge your support of Agenda Item 220958 which will be heard at your next Board of Supervisors Meeting on 9-13-22.

This resolution will urge the Recreation and Parks Department to develop and install signage acknowledging Sharp Park as a site where Japanese Americans were incarcerated during World War II.

Currently, there is no formal or public acknowledgement that Sharp Park was used for this purpose. It is vital that the public be advised of what happened to Japanese Americans during the War, so that such incidents will never happen again .

I urge you to support this Agenda Item.

Sincerely,  
Robert K. Sakai  
K. Sakai Company  
1656 Post St., S.F., CA  
1680 Post LLC  
1680 Post St., S.F.,CA  
1415 Lake St., S.F.,CA

**From:** [Patty Wada](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** SF Bd of Supervisors Resolution on Sharp Park  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 12:10:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Ltr for Sharp Park 9-10-22.docx](#)

---

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

Attached, please find a letter in support of the resolution on Sharp Park that will come before you on September 13.

We thank Supervisor Peskin for introducing this resolution and Supervisors Preston, Chan and Walton for their co-sponsorship.

Sincerely,  
Patty Wada  
JACL



# JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

Masao Satow Building • 1765 Sutter Street • San Francisco, California 94115  
Phone: (415) 921-5225 • Fax: (415) 931-4671 • Internet: [www.jacl.org](http://www.jacl.org) • Email: [jacl@jacl.org](mailto:jacl@jacl.org)

September 10, 2022

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge your support of Agenda Item 220958, which will be heard at the next Board of Supervisors meeting on September 13, 2022.

This Resolution will urge the Recreation and Parks Department to develop and install signage acknowledging and memorializing Sharp Park as a site where Americans of Japanese ancestry were unjustly incarcerated during World War II. Currently, there is no formal or public acknowledgement that Sharp Park was used as part of the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans – and carried out without charges and due process. Our families were uprooted and imprisoned in sites like Sharp Park solely because of their race.

Such signage would educate the public on this dark chapter in U.S. history and serve as a reminder that we must remain vigilant to ensure that the Constitution - and the rights and privileges it affords us as citizens -- is never circumvented again.

I urge your support.

Sincerely,

***Patty Wada***

Patty Wada  
Regional Director  
JAACL



# **JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE**

Masao Satow Building • 1765 Sutter Street • San Francisco, California 94115  
Phone: (415) 921-5225 • Fax: (415) 931-4671 • Internet: [www.jacl.org](http://www.jacl.org) • Email: [jacl@jacl.org](mailto:jacl@jacl.org)

REGIONAL OFFICES: Chicago • Fresno • Los Angeles • San Francisco • Seattle • Washington, D.C.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SUPPORT for Signage at Sharp Park, File #220958  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:36:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Rosalyn Tonai regarding File No. 220958.

**File No. 220958** - Urging the Recreation and Parks Department to Develop and Install Signage Acknowledging Sharp Park Dark History as a Concentration Camp

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Rosalyn Tonai <rosalyn@njahs.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 7:16 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** SUPPORT for Signage at Sharp Park, File #220958

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

To the Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of the National Japanese American Historical Society, Inc. I would like to express our full-fledged support for the resolution on the September 13 agenda urging the Recreation and Parks Department to develop and install signage acknowledging Sharp Park as a site where Japanese Americans were detained as "enemy aliens" under the Immigration and Naturalization Service during World War II (File #220958).

It was just hours after the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, that US government agencies immediately implemented their plans for the internment of "enemy aliens"- a label placed on the non-US Citizens of Japanese, German, and Italian ancestry. A number of predetermined detention facilities were set up in places such as Sharp Park and Angel island in Northern California.

As noted from the Densho research website, "On March 22, 1942, nine permanent alien enemy internment camps were built with an additional fourteen more camps erected that would be reserved for enemy alien internees and their families. Camp Sharp Park, as it was then named, was an INS camp that held Japanese, German and Italian enemy alien men and a few alien women inmates. During the early months of 1942, the Sharp Park Internment Center became a processing center and was a minimum-security center. Additional barracks were built to increase capacity from 450 to 1,200, and at various times over 2,500 German, Italian, and Japanese internees would be imprisoned at Sharp Park Internment Center. Some Mexican and Canadian enemy aliens were housed there as well. "

Please direct formal or public acknowledgement that Sharp Park was used for this purpose. It is vital that the public be aware of this important but little known history of the DOJ /INS internment experience of Japanese, German and Italian alien residents at the outbreak of World War II.

The National Japanese American Historical Society will open its exhibition ENEMY ALIEN FILES at the new Angel Island Immigration Museum on Angel Island on October 1, 2022, illustrating the experience of these communities during WWII. We hope that you will support this resolution by the full Board of Supervisors.

Yours sincerely,

Rosalyn Tonai

Executive Director

National Japanese American Historical Society, Inc.

1684 Post Street  
San Francisco CA 94115  
[rosalyn@njahs.org](mailto:rosalyn@njahs.org)  
415.921.5007 x 104 -phone  
415.921.5087- fax  
[www.njahs.org](http://www.njahs.org)



**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CRUISE-TAXI MEDALLIONS  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 10:30:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Jay Chatfield regarding Cruise and taxi medallions.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Jay Chatfield <rockawayjay@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 7:29 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** CRUISE-TAXI MEDALLIONS

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

Dear Mayor, Supervisors, and SFMTA board,

My name is Jay Chatfield. I am a taxi medallion purchaser. I am currently still paying on the loan I had to take out to purchase the medallion needed to operate a “for hire” vehicle in San Francisco. I fail to understand how Cruise is able to operate as a “for hire” vehicle without having to purchase a medallion. Initially, Uber and Lyft were able to skirt the laws by claiming to be an app only. Cruise however is now strictly a vehicle for hire operation. They now have their own fleet of vehicles like a cab company, not just some guy driving his own car. I would be more than happy to sell my medallion to Cruise to allow them to adhere to San Francisco’s laws. I am an individual unable to pay lobbyists. Therefore I appeal to your sense of fairness to rectify this inequity against cab drivers who were coerced into purchasing taxi medallions. Thank you.

Jay Chatfield. Medallion #1528.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Keep the parklets  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 10:33:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Mariclare Ballard regarding parklets.

Sincerely,

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

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

From: Mariclare D Ballard <[marcyballard@me.com](mailto:marcyballard@me.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 7:46 AM  
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: Keep the parklets

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

Please

For older customer who eat out daily we only use outdoor dining - parklets Especially West Portal Ave.

Please do not penalize SF restaurants by confirmed Ning space or charging etc.

M Ballard

94131

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SF Chronicle Article for Land Use Committee  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 10:41:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Joshua Sclar regarding public approval of the Board of Supervisors as reported by the San Francisco Chronicle.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 3:38 PM  
**To:** Joshua Sclar <jsclar@gmail.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** RE: SF Chronicle Article for Land Use Committee

Thanks Joshua, we will add your comments to our communication page.

BOS – C page, no file.

**ERICA MAJOR**

**Assistant Clerk**

Board of Supervisors

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

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

[Erica.Major@sfgov.org](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

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

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

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

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

since August 1998.

~~~~~

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

From: Joshua Sclar <jsclar@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 1:19 PM
To: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: SF Chronicle Article for Land Use Comittee

Ms. Major,

A quick note of follow-up to our previous correspondence: I am sure the BOS has seen its job performance polling numbers in today's Chronicle, and will not cite them here which seems unnecessary as they speak for themselves. What I as a voter would like the BOS to know is how much the Chronicle's poll results *in total* (not just those measuring approval rating) reflect my personal views. To me these polls are direct evidence of the growing voter backlash that situations such as the one at "The Hub" are creating.

Voters are clearly concerned with homelessness and housing affordability in our city. Whatever the member's views may be with respect to how to address these and other problems, in the end I think the Board's performance is reflected in these poll numbers. I certainly feel that way myself.

Sincerely,
Joshua Sclar
District 6 Resident

On Tue, Sep 6, 2022 at 3:41 PM Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org> wrote:

Thanks Joshua, looping in the members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee.

BOS – Please add to c pages, no file.

ERICA MAJOR
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

[1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place](#), City Hall, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

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

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

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

~~~~~

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

---

**From:** Joshua Sclar <[jsclar@gmail.com](mailto:jsclar@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 1, 2022 6:01 PM  
**To:** Major, Erica (BOS) <[erica.major@sfgov.org](mailto:erica.major@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** SF Chronicle Article for Land Use Committee

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

Dear Ms. Major,

Please pass this article along to the members of the Land Use Committee and include the following message. Thank you.

-----

“Thousands of S.F. housing units delayed for a study that never happened.”

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/bayarea/heatherknight/article/san-francisco-housing-17408816.php>

Members of the Land Use Committee,

I am a District 6 resident, a renter, and live a few blocks from “The Hub” described in this article by Heather Knight in yesterday’s San Francisco Chronicle. Holding up zoning for badly needed new housing in the name of an equity study, then allowing that study to be conducted by a developer with a clear conflict of interest — one that in fact publicly professes they have no intention of ever completing such a study — is in my view totally unacceptable. The committee should be ashamed and work swiftly to correct this situation. The California Department of Housing has already begun to question our city’s Board of Supervisors for their use of CEQA to block new housing. Situations like the one on Stevenson St. (which attracted the State’s attention) and at “The Hub” are fueling a voter backlash based on the perception that the Board is made up of homeowners with no desire whatsoever to address the housing shortage. Please take acknowledge this mistake and correct it immediately.

Joshua Sclar  
District 6 Resident

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Demanding a full cleanup of all radioactive and hazardous waste at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Superfund Site  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 9:07:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Bay Area letter to San Francisco Board of Supervisors about Hunters Pt. Shipyard Superfund Site.docx.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication regarding File No. 220720, which is Item No. 3 on today's Government Audit and Oversight Committee agenda.

**File No. 220720** - Hearing - Civil Grand Jury Report - "Buried Problems and a Buried Process - The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change."

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** terri@greenaction.org <terri@greenaction.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 8:16 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Bradley Angel <bradley@greenaction.org>  
**Subject:** Demanding a full cleanup of all radioactive and hazardous waste at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Superfund Site

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the Bay Area letter to San Francisco Board of Supervisors, attached.

September 13, 2022

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

We the undersigned organizations from across the San Francisco Bay Area respectfully request

that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors officially require **full** cleanup of **all** radioactive and

hazardous waste contamination at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Superfund Site.

We make this request as the Navy plans on leaving significant amounts of radioactive and toxic

waste buried at the Shipyard despite the harmful impact this contamination has had and will continue to have on the health of residents and the environment, including San Francisco Bay.

As the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury documented in their well-researched report "Buried Problems and a Buried Process: The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change,"

the government regulatory agencies have never considered if rising groundwater and sea levels

could flood and spread the radioactive and toxic contaminated areas that the government plans

on capping and not removing.

We call on the Board of Supervisors to act immediately and join us in calling on the Navy, United

States Environmental Protection Agency, California Environmental Protection Agency, State Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board to require the following measures to protect public health and the environment:

- Conduct a total, comprehensive cleanup and removal of all, not some, radioactive and toxic contamination at the Shipyard Superfund Site – no capping of contamination
- Require new, comprehensive, and independent retesting of the entire Shipyard Superfund Site and adjacent areas, with community oversight



- Implement the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury's recommendations

Respectfully submitted, for environmental health and justice,

Julia Dowell, **San Francisco Baykeeper**

**Extinction Rebellion San Francisco Bay Area**

Sara Greenwald, **350 San Francisco**

**SF Climate Emergency Coalition**

**Democratic Socialists of America San Francisco**

Alma Soongi Beck, Tiffany Ngo, and S. Louie, Climate Justice Co-Chairs, **Climate Reality Project,**

**Bay Area Chapter**

Harriet Harvey-Horn and Bonnie Hamilton, Chapter Co-Chairs, **Climate Reality Project, Bay Area**

**Chapter**

Eric Brooks, **Our City**

Shirley Dean, President, and Robert Cheasty, Executive Director, **Citizens for East Shore Parks**

Ms. Margaret Gordon, **West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project**

--

**Terri Saul**

they/them

Special Projects and Environmental Justice Organizer

Greenaction

e: [terri@greenaction.org](mailto:terri@greenaction.org)

c: 510-304-6485

September 13, 2022

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

We the undersigned organizations from across the San Francisco Bay Area respectfully request that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors officially require **full** cleanup of **all** radioactive and hazardous waste contamination at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Superfund Site.

We make this request as the Navy plans on leaving significant amounts of radioactive and toxic waste buried at the Shipyard despite the harmful impact this contamination has had and will continue to have on the health of residents and the environment, including San Francisco Bay.

As the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury documented in their well-researched report "Buried Problems and a Buried Process: The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change," the government regulatory agencies have never considered if rising groundwater and sea levels could flood and spread the radioactive and toxic contaminated areas that the government plans on capping and not removing.

We call on the Board of Supervisors to act immediately and join us in calling on the Navy, United States Environmental Protection Agency, California Environmental Protection Agency, State Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board to require the following measures to protect public health and the environment:

- Conduct a total, comprehensive cleanup and removal of all, not some, radioactive and toxic contamination at the Shipyard Superfund Site – no capping of contamination
- Require new, comprehensive, and independent retesting of the entire Shipyard Superfund Site and adjacent areas, with community oversight
- Implement the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury's recommendations

Respectfully submitted, for environmental health and justice,

Julia Dowell, San Francisco Baykeeper

Extinction Rebellion San Francisco Bay Area

Sara Greenwald, 350 San Francisco

SF Climate Emergency Coalition

Democratic Socialists of America San Francisco

Alma Soongi Beck, Tiffany Ngo, and S. Louie, Climate Justice Co-Chairs, Climate Reality Project, Bay Area Chapter

Harriet Harvey-Horn and Bonnie Hamilton, Chapter Co-Chairs, Climate Reality Project, Bay Area Chapter

Eric Brooks, Our City

Shirley Dean, President, and Robert Cheasty, Executive Director, Citizens for East Shore Parks

Ms. Margaret Gordon, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Clean Up Hunters Point!  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 11:51:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Glen Thomas regarding File Nos. 220720 and 220721.

**File No. 220720** - Hearing - Civil Grand Jury Report - “Buried Problems and a Buried Process - The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change.”

**File No. 220721** - Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Buried Problems and a Buried Process: The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Glen Thomas <glenthusiast89@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 11:29 AM  
**To:** Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Clean Up Hunters Point!

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

Hello,

I'm writing to express my support as an SF District 15 constituent for the Hunters Point clean-up. It's past time that the Navy cleans up its toxic mess to protect SF citizens and local wildlife.

Please keep SF residents' best interests in mind and voice your support for the Hunters Point clean-up at the upcoming GAO Committee & Board of Supervisors meetings.

Thank you!!

--

Glen Thomas (he/him)

ACSM Certified Exercise Physiologist

EXOS Certified Health Fitness Specialist

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: GOA Agenda Item 220721 / Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:58:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Dave Rhody regarding File No. 220721, which is Item No. 4 at the Government Audit & Oversight Committee meeting scheduled for September 15, 2022.

**File No. 220721** – Board Response – Civil Grand Jury Report – Buried Problems and a Buried Process: The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Dave Rhody <dave@rhodyco.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:38 PM  
**To:** Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** GOA Agenda Item 220721 / Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard

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

Supervisors -

San Francisco shares the shame of the Navy's decades-long failure to clean up radioactive and toxic waste at the Hunters Point Shipyard. We have not pressed the point. We have failed the citizens of Bay View / Hunter's Point. Families from that area have tried to get the attention of the SF BOS and the Mayor for years. Their children are falling ill from respiratory illnesses; they have an unnecessarily high rate of cancer.

It's time we forced the Dept. of Defense to do its job. It's time to show San Franciscans that we

believe in climate justice!

Please, do what's right.

-Dave Rhody, Climate Reality Leader  
1594 45th Ave.  
SF, CA 94122

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 8 Letters regarding Slow Lake Street  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:38:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [8 Letters regarding Slow Lake Street.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached 8 letters regarding Slow Lake Street.

Sincerely,

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



**From:** [John Pickering](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keeping Lake Street car-free  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 9:22:19 AM

---

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

Dear Mayor Breed and the SFMTA Board,

I am writing to put my wholehearted support behind keeping Lake Street free of cars. The decision to make Lake a Slow Street has been truly transformative for the neighborhood as almost everyone (and your own study) can attest. We have used it to exercise more—both bicycling and walking—and it has made the area feel much more like a community. We've met neighbors who've lived next to us for 25 years but never knew. How great is that!

Please follow the SFMTA's own recommendations and keep the Slow Street permanent!

Sincerely,

John Pickering (District 1)

**From:** [Josh S](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Please keep Lake Street slow  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 7:13:24 PM

---

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

Dear Mayor Breed and SFMTA Board,

I have emailed you all a few times now, but one more time can't hurt. I live on Lake Street, and when I work from home my desk allows me to look out of my window and see Lake St. below. I have been a big supporter of Slow Lake street since the program started, and I own a car and occasionally drive. The folks claiming that Lake Street being closed to thru traffic is somehow impeding their ability to get where they need to go are spreading dishonest, empty rhetoric. I have had no problem driving one block to California Street when I need to get out of the neighborhood.

This minor inconvenience has brought huge benefits to the neighborhood. When I look out of my window I see people walking and biking. I see elderly folks with walkers taking advantage of the broad, smooth street. I see kids and parents cycling to school. I see people cycling to run errands. We should be embracing this affordance that does so much to enable alternate modes of transportation. Cities all around the world are remaking their streets to be more cycle- and pedestrian-friendly, and it's frankly ridiculous that San Francisco is considering reversing course on this. I see people say things like "we're not Amsterdam." It's true, we're not Amsterdam - we are smaller! A city that's only 7x7 square miles centering cars as the primary mode of transit does not make sense. We need a network of streets free of vehicular traffic so that people on bikes or foot can safely get around the city without having to worry about being killed or injured by an inattentive motorist.

Speaking of inattentive motorists, it is not enough that Slow Lake Street be maintained. There also need to be impediments installed on Lake St. to physically prevent motorists from driving dangerously. The other thing I frequently see when I look out of my window is motorists speeding and running the stop sign at 6th Avenue. They used to make "rolling stops", but they apparently have figured out that there is no longer any traffic enforcement in the city, as now they frequently blow through at full speed, often not even slowing down. I would say the speed limit should be reduced, but motorists ignore the speed limit as much as they ignore stop signs. There should be physical infrastructure at every intersection to discourage cut-through traffic from speeding. Speed cushions at a couple of intersections is not adequate - there need to be diverters or bollards to make speeding down Lake St. physically impossible.

It does not make sense for urban planners to optimize every road for motor vehicles. San Francisco was established long before the automobile existed, and the scale of our city means that we are in a unique position compared to many other cities in terms of our ability to mode shift to less polluting, less dangerous forms of transportation.

Thank you for reading,  
Josh S.  
530 Lake St.  
District 1

**From:** [Angie Sibelman](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Slow Lake Support  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 6:46:15 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

My name is Angie. I am a longtime renter in a one-bedroom apartment with my husband and I am a public school science teacher. I love Slow Lake Street because it allows me to walk to/from the 28 bus between 6th Ave and Park Presidio Blvd or between the 29 bus and 6th Ave on the lovely, safer slow street on work days. It allows me to walk to and from doctor appointments on Slow Lake and Clay during school breaks. It allows me to get exercise in a safer, cleaner environment everyday. (Although I do have two additional safety suggestions at the end of this email.)

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

I would also like to propose that you decrease the speed limit to 15 mph on Lake Street, since that is really the maximum safe speed (10 mph would be better) and add more raised crosswalks between 2nd and 8th to physically slow drivers and motorcycle riders down.

Respectfully,

Angela Sibelman  
Renter in D1

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [MacKenzie Huynh](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Please SAVE Slow Lake street!  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 12:30:35 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

Please save Slow Lake street! It's meant so much to me and my family ever since the pandemic started, and has been such a strong community builder. What a gift to have a safe pedestrian corridor where we don't have to worry about traffic while we're pushing our babies in strollers and giving our kids room to bike safely with groups of friends. Please listen to the community and protect this slow street for us!

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street

Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.

Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

The Huynh Family (MacKenzie, Tam, Felix & Gemma) in District 1

**From:** [Richard Watkins](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Important to SAVE Slow Lake Street  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 8:42:38 AM

---

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

SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed:

A SLOW Lake Street is an important benefit not just to its residents, but also to its surrounding neighborhoods as it provides a useful buffer to commuter congestion for children, pedestrians, recreational runners and bicyclists, and seniors.

As a bike rider in our beautiful City, prior to the advent of Slow Streets, it was becoming increasingly dangerous to ride in the City due to the number, aggressiveness and inattentiveness of car drivers - moving cars endanger moving people. Slow Streets make a tremendous difference in providing safe pathways throughout the City, and Lake Street is an essential thread in the network.

Please continue to lead us forward by supporting the current network and working to enhance and extend transportation corridors where people have priority.

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. I regularly ride from my home to Ocean Beach and around Lake Merced on weekends for fun, and use Lake Street to access merchants along California and Clement Streets routinely.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and all people traveling without cars.

**PLEASE:**

1. **Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street.**

2. **Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.**

3. **Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.**

Thank you for your public service.

Sincerely,

Richard Watkins

145 Laurel Street #7,

San Francisco, CA 94118



**From:** [Caroline Nassif](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Slow Lake Street Please!  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 12:46:27 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to go on walks at night after my kiddo's bedtime (my only alone time all day) without worrying about cars not seeing me and to take my 4 year old kiddo and her friends on scooter and bike rides to the Presidio and Mountain Lake without worrying about traffic.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,  
Caroline Nassif  
District 1 Resident (21st & Anza)

**From:** [Rachael Schaetz](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake SLOW!!!!  
**Date:** Thursday, September 8, 2022 6:01:00 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to:  
[ ]

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

[ ] District [ ]

Rachael Schaetz  
(415) 830-2540

iSent from my iPhone. iApologize for errors.

**From:** [Carol Brewer](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Please Keep Slow Lake Street!  
**Date:** Thursday, September 8, 2022 3:09:40 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

My husband and I live on 4th Ave between California St and Lake St. We use Slow Lake Street daily to walk our mini wire-haired dachshund Mattie. We love to see all the other dogs out walking, as well as kids on scooters and bikes, parents walking baby carriages, and people riding bikes to work. Slow Lake Street has also stopped what used to be a racetrack on our block of 4th Ave, with cars speeding from Lake Street to make the traffic light at 4th Ave and California Street.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Carol Brewer

Carol McLean Brewer  
Ogilvie & Brewer LLP  
carol@ogilvie-brewer.com  
Direct Dial 415-378-2597

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 70 Letters regarding algae bloom in the San Francisco Bay  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:32:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [70 Letters regarding algae bloom in the San Francisco Bay.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached 70 letters regarding algae bloom in the San Francisco Bay.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Lynn via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:25:04 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Lynn Locher  
Fremont California USA, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Sharon via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:08:54 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Sharon Hagen  
Pacifica, Ca



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Marina via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:05:29 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Marina Moreno  
San Francisco, Ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [JP via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:46:45 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to AGGRESSIVELY increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

JP Stephenson  
Emeryville, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Judie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:29:39 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Judie Guerriero  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Cynthia via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:18:52 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Cynthia Cooper  
Oakland, California



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Leah via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 7:59:16 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Leah Redwood  
Berkeley, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Elizabeth via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Elizabeth via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 7:58:25 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a mom, someone who drinks water, and someone who loves the Bay, I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling.

This is a smart and necessary strategy.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that “it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Stampe  
San Francisco , California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Sage via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Sage via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 7:04:58 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,  
Sage Bachman

Sage Bachman  
Oakland, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jasmine via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 5:25:33 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jasmine Markovich  
Oakland, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jon via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 5:05:48 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jon Rosenfield  
Berkeley , California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Kris via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:32:09 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kris Negulescu  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Steffanie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Steffanie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 1:57:56 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Steffanie Malla  
Oakland, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Joan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 8:17:21 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Joan Kruckewitt  
San Francisco, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Audrey via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 7:25:30 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Audrey Daniel  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Alex via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 5:47:16 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Alex Piper  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Steven via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 7:19:12 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I'm a diver and I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and

our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Steven Tiell  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Heidi via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Heidi via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 6:23:45 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Heidi Pickman  
Oakland, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [John via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 6:20:33 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

John Holtzclaw  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Paige via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Paige via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 3:52:05 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Paige Bierma  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Katja via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 3:28:13 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Katja Irvin  
San Jose, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [John via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 2:12:35 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

John McManus  
San Francisco, California



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Judy via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 1:18:09 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I swim in San Francisco Bay, and I can tell you, swimming in the algae bloom was NO FUN! The water was brownish-yellow, not its usual grayish-green. I knew something was very wrong, but I didn't know what it was until I read the news reports later.

Please order the San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today!

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water

quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that “it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Judy Irving  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Kate via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 1:14:54 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kate Poole  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Kate via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 1:14:51 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kate Poole  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [William L via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 1:05:53 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

William L Martin  
San Francisco, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [William L via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 1:05:52 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

William L Martin  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jean via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 9:54:46 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jean Allan  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jean via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 9:54:44 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jean Allan  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Andrew via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 8:06:20 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Andrew Carothers-Liske  
Oakland , CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Andrew via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 8:06:20 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Andrew Carothers-Liske  
Oakland , CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Blaise via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Blaise via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 12:56:35 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Blaise Cullen  
San Francisco, Ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Blaise via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Blaise via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 12:56:35 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Blaise Cullen  
San Francisco, Ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Nader via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:44:22 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Nader Rafjy  
Palo Alto, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Nader via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:44:20 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Nader Rafjy  
Palo Alto, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [BENJAMIN via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:39:12 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

BENJAMIN Clark  
San Francisco , Ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [BENJAMIN via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:39:10 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

BENJAMIN Clark  
San Francisco , Ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jim via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:28:41 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jim Bearden  
Arnold, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jim via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:28:40 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jim Bearden  
Arnold, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Sylvia via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 8:32:46 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Sylvia Seymour  
Grass Valley , CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Sylvia via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Sylvia via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 8:32:45 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Sylvia Seymour  
Grass Valley , CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Allen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 8:15:56 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Allen Aronson  
Wilmington, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Allen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 2022 8:15:56 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Allen Aronson  
Wilmington, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Isaac via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 9:03:26 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent. Also, reconsider removing the dam on Hetch Hetchy or relocating it downstream to return/restore the beautiful valley.

Thank you.

Isaac Castillo  
Orange, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Isaac via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 9:03:24 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent. Also, reconsider removing the dam on Hetch Hetchy or relocating it downstream to return/restore the beautiful valley.

Thank you.

Isaac Castillo  
Orange, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Peter via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 5:56:44 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Peter Standish-Lee  
Granite Bay, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Peter via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 5:56:44 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Peter Standish-Lee  
Granite Bay, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Noel via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 2:21:44 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Noel Park  
Rancho Palos Verdes, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Noel via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 2:21:42 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Noel Park  
Rancho Palos Verdes, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Ruth via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 11:35:15 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Ruth Gravanis  
San Francisco, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Ruth via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 11:35:15 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Ruth Gravanis  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Stephanie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 10:41:40 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Stephanie Smith  
San Francisco , California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Stephanie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Stephanie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 10:41:39 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Stephanie Smith  
San Francisco , California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Helen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 8:11:21 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Helen Londe  
Richmond, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Helen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 10, 2022 8:11:21 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Helen Londe  
Richmond, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Morgan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 9, 2022 3:42:32 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms. I have been finding dead sturgeon and striped bass on the shores of Marin and Sonoma.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and

our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Morgan Cantrell  
Fairfax, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Morgan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 9, 2022 3:42:30 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms. I have been finding dead sturgeon and striped bass on the shores of Marin and Sonoma.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and

our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Morgan Cantrell  
Fairfax, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Laurie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 9, 2022 2:05:24 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Laurie Berliner  
Tiburon, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Laurie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 9, 2022 2:05:22 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Laurie Berliner  
Tiburon, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Spreck via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Spreck via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 9, 2022 9:29:24 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Spreck Rosekrans  
Oakland , CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Spreck via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Spreck via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 9, 2022 9:29:24 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Spreck Rosekrans  
Oakland , CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Gwynne via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 8, 2022 9:46:00 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Gwynne Pratt  
SACRAMENTO, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Gwynne via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 8, 2022 9:45:59 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Gwynne Pratt  
SACRAMENTO, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Erin via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 8, 2022 5:19:06 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Erin Despard  
Berkeley, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Erin via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 8, 2022 5:19:04 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Erin Despard  
Berkeley, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Michelle via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 8, 2022 12:56:55 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Michelle MacKenzie  
Menlo Park, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Michelle via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 8, 2022 12:56:54 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Michelle MacKenzie  
Menlo Park, CA

**From:** [Sanae Rosen](#)  
**To:** [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [LivableStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Lasky, Matt \(MTA\)](#); [Leung, Kimberly \(MTA\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [dina.el-tawansy@dot.ca.gov](#); [rachel.carpenter@dot.ca.gov](#); [Tony.Tavares@dot.ca.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Safety improvements to address traffic death on Lombard & Steiner  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 1:05:55 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Stefani, Mayor Breed and staff, MTA Board & Staff, and Caltrans Directors,

Today, we held yet another Vision Zero vigil on Lombard & Steiner to bring attention to the pedestrian who was killed by a driver on September 8. This brings the total number of people killed by traffic violence in San Francisco this year to 21.

Lombard is on San Francisco's high-injury network and is a deadly corridor that must be immediately tamed. On June 18, the driver of an SUV traveling over 80 mph slammed into a 22 Fillmore bus just one block away, injuring 6 and sending 2 critically wounded to the hospital. In February a pedestrian crossing Lombard at Steiner was struck and injured. In 2016, Anthony Lowenstein was killed in a horrific crash at Lombard and Divisadero and in 2014 Lori Helmer was killed by a Golden Gate Transit bus driver at Lombard and Van Ness. Last year alone saw 11 collisions with pedestrians and bicyclists between Baker and Van Ness on the Lombard corridor. Steiner and Lombard has seen 18 collisions resulting in injury since 2012, 8 of them serious, and now a death.

SFMTA and Caltrans have ignored these clear warnings indicating a need for significant safety improvements, and as a result, failed to prevent this death. SFMTA needs to work with Caltrans to slow Lombard down. Drivers see Lombard as a highway and drive as if they were not in the middle of a vibrant residential and commercial district. Residents deserve calm, safe streets, and alternatives to driving for their own mobility choices. We are asking for:

A center-lane BRT, creating a fast, safe East-West transportation axis in the Marina, and connected to the Van Ness BRT.

Continuous protected bike lanes from the Presidio to Polk along Lombard.

A road diet. Lombard is a 6-lane freeway, and should instead be a 20 or 25 mph 2-lane street.

No turn-on-red intersections for all of Lombard between Baker and Van Ness.

Other traffic calming changes based on SFMTA analysis

If you, our elected officials, fail to take meaningful action now, more San Franciscans will continue to die. The 2024 Vision Zero deadline is just 15 months away, and we will only get there with decisive action.

We are asking you to honor your commitments to Vision Zero and prioritize permanent safety infrastructure improvements, as soon as possible, before someone is killed again. Please communicate publicly what is being done to address this fatality, and when we can expect improvements to be completed.

Thank you.



**From:** [James Duffy](#)  
**To:** [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [LivableStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Lasky, Matt \(MTA\)](#); [Leung, Kimberly \(MTA\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [dina.el-tawansy@dot.ca.gov](#); [rachel.carpenter@dot.ca.gov](#); [Tony.Tavares@dot.ca.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Safety improvements to address traffic death on Lombard & Steiner  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 12:52:48 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Stefani, Mayor Breed and staff, MTA Board & Staff, and Caltrans Directors,

Today, we held yet another Vision Zero vigil on Lombard & Steiner to bring attention to the pedestrian who was killed by a driver on September 8. This brings the total number of people killed by traffic violence in San Francisco this year to 21.

Lombard is on San Francisco's high-injury network and is a deadly corridor that must be immediately tamed. On June 18, the driver of an SUV traveling over 80 mph slammed into a 22 Fillmore bus just one block away, injuring 6 and sending 2 critically wounded to the hospital. In February a pedestrian crossing Lombard at Steiner was struck and injured. In 2016, Anthony Lowenstein was killed in a horrific crash at Lombard and Divisadero and in 2014 Lori Helmer was killed by a Golden Gate Transit bus driver at Lombard and Van Ness. Last year alone saw 11 collisions with pedestrians and bicyclists between Baker and Van Ness on the Lombard corridor. Steiner and Lombard has seen 18 collisions resulting in injury since 2012, 8 of them serious, and now a death.

SFMTA and Caltrans have ignored these clear warnings indicating a need for significant safety improvements, and as a result, failed to prevent this death. SFMTA needs to work with Caltrans to slow Lombard down. Drivers see Lombard as a highway and drive as if they were not in the middle of a vibrant residential and commercial district. Residents deserve calm, safe streets, and alternatives to driving for their own mobility choices. We are asking for:

A center-lane BRT, creating a fast, safe East-West transportation axis in the Marina, and connected to the Van Ness BRT.

Continuous protected bike lanes from the Presidio to Polk along Lombard.

A road diet. Lombard is a 6-lane freeway, and should instead be a 20 or 25 mph 2-lane street.

No turn-on-red intersections for all of Lombard between Baker and Van Ness.

Other traffic calming changes based on SFMTA analysis

If you, our elected officials, fail to take meaningful action now, more San Franciscans will continue to die. The 2024 Vision Zero deadline is just 15 months away, and we will only get there with decisive action.

We are asking you to honor your commitments to Vision Zero and prioritize permanent safety infrastructure improvements, as soon as possible, before someone is killed again. Please communicate publicly what is being done to address this fatality, and when we can expect improvements to be completed.

Thank you.



**From:** [Kate Blumberg](#)  
**To:** [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [LivableStreets@sfmta.com](mailto:LivableStreets@sfmta.com); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Lasky, Matt \(MTA\)](#); [Leung, Kimberly \(MTA\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [dina.el-tawansy@dot.ca.gov](mailto:dina.el-tawansy@dot.ca.gov); [rachel.carpenter@dot.ca.gov](mailto:rachel.carpenter@dot.ca.gov); [Tony.Tavares@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Tony.Tavares@dot.ca.gov)  
**Subject:** Safety improvements to address traffic death on Lombard & Steiner  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 12:40:39 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Stefani, Mayor Breed and staff, MTA Board & Staff, and Caltrans Directors,

Today, we held yet another Vision Zero vigil on Lombard & Steiner to bring attention to the pedestrian who was killed by a driver on September 8. This brings the total number of people killed by traffic violence in San Francisco this year to 21.

Lombard is on San Francisco's high-injury network and is a deadly corridor that must be immediately tamed. On June 18, the driver of an SUV traveling over 80 mph slammed into a 22 Fillmore bus just one block away, injuring 6 and sending 2 critically wounded to the hospital. In February a pedestrian crossing Lombard at Steiner was struck and injured. In 2016, Anthony Lowenstein was killed in a horrific crash at Lombard and Divisadero and in 2014 Lori Helmer was killed by a Golden Gate Transit bus driver at Lombard and Van Ness. Last year alone saw 11 collisions with pedestrians and bicyclists between Baker and Van Ness on the Lombard corridor. Steiner and Lombard has seen 18 collisions resulting in injury since 2012, 8 of them serious, and now a death.

SFMTA and Caltrans have ignored these clear warnings indicating a need for significant safety improvements, and as a result, failed to prevent this death. SFMTA needs to work with Caltrans to slow Lombard down. Drivers see Lombard as a highway and drive as if they were not in the middle of a vibrant residential and commercial district. Residents deserve calm, safe streets, and alternatives to driving for their own mobility choices. We are asking for:

A center-lane BRT, creating a fast, safe East-West transportation axis in the Marina, and connected to the Van Ness BRT.

Continuous protected bike lanes from the Presidio to Polk along Lombard.

A road diet. Lombard is a 6-lane freeway, and should instead be a 20 or 25 mph 2-lane street.

No turn-on-red intersections for all of Lombard between Baker and Van Ness.

Other traffic calming changes based on SFMTA analysis

If you, our elected officials, fail to take meaningful action now, more San Franciscans will continue to die. The 2024 Vision Zero deadline is just 15 months away, and we will only get there with decisive action.

We are asking you to honor your commitments to Vision Zero and prioritize permanent safety infrastructure improvements, as soon as possible, before someone is killed again. Please communicate publicly what is being done to address this fatality, and when we can expect improvements to be completed.

Thank you.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Services](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 3 Letters regarding File No. 220261  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:40:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [3 Letters regarding File No. 220261.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached 3 letters regarding File No. 220261.

**File No. 220261** - Park Code - Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program - Slow Street Road Closures

Sincerely,

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



**From:** [Marianne Owens](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** JFK  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 13, 2022 7:45:41 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Ableism and gatekeeping have no place in San Francisco. The current closure of JFK Drive is unfortunately both of those things.

The time for "close first, ask questions later" is over. It is time to revert back to the compromise that was struck over a decade ago and restore access for all to Golden Gate Park.

Marianne Owens

**From:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Keep JFK Kid Safe & Car-Free to give kids, families, and people of all ages, abilities, and backgrounds a safe space in the Park to commute, relax, connect, and recreate...  
**Date:** Monday, September 12, 2022 10:33:30 AM

---

Please add to c pages.

## ERICA MAJOR

### Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

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

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

[Erica.Major@sfgov.org](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

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

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

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

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

~~~~~

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

From: Sean Muranjan <sean@muranjan.com>

Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2022 4:21 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>

Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@SFGOV1.onmicrosoft.com>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; clerk@sfcta.org; Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; MTABoard@sfmta.com; Tumlin, Jeffrey (MTA) <Jeffrey.Tumlin@sfmta.com>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>;

GGPAccess@sfmta.com; MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; CAC@sfmta.com; sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; PROSAC, RPD (REC) <prosac@sfgov.org>; hello@kidsafesf.com

Subject: Keep JFK Kid Safe & Car-Free to give kids, families, and people of all ages, abilities, and backgrounds a safe space in the Park to commute, relax, connect, and recreate...

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

Dear Supervisors, Mayor Breed, and other city leaders,

I love Kid Safe JFK and want it to be made permanent as is without a private-car cut-through on 208th Ave or private cars on JFK east of Transverse Drive. I support the "Existing Car-Free Route Option" in SFMTA's official survey and, after over 8,000 survey responses, this option is desired by over 70% of the public — Kid Safe JFK is one of the most-popular policy decisions in San Francisco history, and it has been visited over 7 million times since it was created 18 months ago!

I join Kid Safe SF and its thousands of supporters and countless partners calling on you to save this Kid Safe, serene, and joyous space in the heart of Golden Gate Park — we need you to lead on this issue by making a clear decision to make this space permanent without a cut-through for private cars and ignoring dishonest lobbying by the de Young and California Academy of Sciences.

The "Private Vehicle Access Option" and related efforts to allow private cars to cut through the Park via 8th Avenue are dangerous for our kids, people with disabilities, and the planet. These efforts are being pushed by museum trustees and lobbyists in backroom meetings in an effort to secure more free parking for their employees rather than pay them a fair wage, including a parking benefit in the underutilized and mismanaged museum garage that museum insiders control. Don't let wealthy trustees and their lobbyists destroy Kid Safe JFK and destroy an amazing space with over 7 million visits since it was created 18 months ago and 70%+ support from the public.

We also need you to work towards improving Muni service to the park and reforming the museum garage to improve affordable and high quality access for low-income, disabled, and elderly visitors. Here are a few things:

- 1) Install Transit-Only Lanes to 8th Ave between Fulton and JFK, 9th Ave between Judah and Lincoln, and MLK between Lincoln and the Music Concourse — this will improve service and reliability of Muni for people taking the N, 43, 44, 52, and 66, including those visiting the park and especially on weekends.
- 2) Reform the underutilized museum garage: Offer free parking for ADA placard holders and low-income visitors, and double the number of ADA spots in the Garage from 32 to 64, so that visitors with disabilities have the best access available.

3) Restrict private-car cut-through traffic on other spaces in Golden Gate Park, like Transverse Drive where Kid Safe JFK transitions to the Kid Safe “Car-Free West End Route” proposed in the survey (which is also wildly popular and should be made permanent with even more Kid Safe space).

Please work with Kid Safe SF, SFMTA, RPD, and your colleagues to get this wildly popular space permanently Kid Safe (and car free). Will you publicly commit to supporting the “Existing Car-Free Route Option” and take action to make this option the permanent solution for JFK?

From: [Susan Deming](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: JFK
Date: Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:17:19 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

A compromise for John F. Kennedy Drive was reached in 2007 that allowed all users of Golden Gate Park to share the roads. It is time to reopen JFK Drive back to the way it was before COVID. The select few that are the most vocal are doing us all a disservice that want a reasonable compromise.

Please reopen JFK Drive like it was before COVID!

Regards,
Susan Deming
San Leandro, CA 94577

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Electric wheelchair charging stations
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 3:03:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Allen Jones regarding electric wheelchair charging stations.

Sincerely,

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

From: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:56 PM
To: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net>; MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Electric wheelchair charging stations

Thank you, your correspondence will be added to our communication page for the full Board of Supervisors.

BOS – C page, no file.

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

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

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

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

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

~~~~~

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

---

**From:** Allen Jones <[jones-allen@att.net](mailto:jones-allen@att.net)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 11:43 AM  
**To:** MOD, (ADM) <[mod@sfgov.org](mailto:mod@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Major, Erica (BOS) <[erica.major@sfgov.org](mailto:erica.major@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Electric wheelchair charging stations

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

Attention: MOD and BOS land use transportation committee,

My name is Allen Jones. I have been a resident of San Francisco since 1960. I have never been able to walk without crutches. In 2020, my ability to use crutches decreased to the point of using a mobility scooter wheelchair and I love it.

I am sending you a single photo to illustrate something I think would help members of the disabled community who use electric wheelchairs.

I am not sure of what country this is available but electric wheelchair charging stations throughout the city should be explored. Personally, I have had to sweat at making it back to my home on several occasions. And I see too many people in San Francisco who use these great machines to not believe they too could be helped by use of a charging station in all parts of this city.

Allen Jones  
(415) 756-7733  
[jones-allen@att.net](mailto:jones-allen@att.net)  
Californiaclemency.org

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



**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Quality of life requests  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 3:18:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from David Sundy regarding quality of life issues.

Sincerely,

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

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

From: David Sundy <[david.sundy@icloud.com](mailto:david.sundy@icloud.com)>  
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 3:11 PM  
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: Quality of life requests

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

Hello,

There are certain things that you all can do to improve the quality of life of SF taxpayers and business owners:

1. Automate more government interactions with the public.

i.e.) Anything that renews annually should have an automatic renewal capability. DMV registration, SFMTA parking permits, business registration, business personal property tax for a business (so long as there's no change to report), automate income tax when the improved crypto perma-web is created (all transactions can be stored indefinitely and programmed to go everywhere they need to go), this is just a few. The point here is to assign a task group and make a plan for more automation of annoying crap that the individual and business have to do annually due to lack of planning and execution by our local and federal government.

2. Put some more places to sit down. How come there's like never anywhere to sit down???

3. Trash cans.

4. Dog shit bags.

5. Places to shit and piss. There's so much on the street cause there's no where to go. I hear this all over the city all the time. It's mentioned on travel blogs. I heard some queens bitching about it yesterday in the Castro, then I almost stepped in a pile. There was a pile so dramatically huge two days ago that I recall it as well as the smell. I recall cleaning my shoes and boots several times this year.

6. Parking. I don't even go out 80% of the time I'm asked or interested because I don't want to deal with circling for parking. Build some F\*\*\*ing lots already. What is wrong with you? There needs to be an easy to access lot in each neighborhood if you want businesses to do well. And, I refuse to build my next business here bc parking is so bad. People arrive late for appointments or pissed that they had to circle for so long, and sometimes they can't find parking at all before their scheduled appointment and I lose money.

7. I love the new outdoor gym in the panhandle park. Can we please have more of these; one in Dolores for the adults??

8. Affordable office space. Office spaces in my neighborhood go for 5500 - 8500 for the most tiny dirty places that get tagged and shit on by whomever does that, and I have to pay to clean it up. I refuse to pay for all of that so I share an office with others that is hidden up in a medical building.

9. Take care of the homeless and insane already. Seriously, make a plan and do it already. Why are you torturing everyone with this issue?? Give them homes, education, rehab, something.... And don't make it so difficult to receive. I tried to get food stamps cuz my business was hurting so badly, but I couldn't complete the process bc there were too many steps and forms and calls. I just gave up. Even if I did complete the process then I only would have received \$250. Can you eat for the month on \$250. That's 2 days at most for me and my partner. My partner is no able to complete any of the processes to receive services bc they all give him a panic attach. He should have been on general assistance, food stamps, etc., but he literally cannot do the paperwork and every time we've called it's awful. They. say there's no one who can help.

These all seem reasonable, right? Automate annoying tasks that piss people off, and put out trash cans, places to sit, add bathrooms and parking, and add some more outdoor gyms and care for the homeless and insane. (Remember: many homeless and insane cannot access the internet, nor can they follow a gazillion rules, so make their processes easy with someone who can help for real).

The fact that I have to request these basic human necessities is ridiculous, right? Businesses and people are leaving SF permanently. And, there are far fewer international visitors. Make SF the City that supports a better Quality of Life for the average resident, visitor and business owner because we deserve it.

—David Sundy

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: San Francisco Police Must End Irresponsible Relationship with the Northern California Fusion Center  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 8:12:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Robert Rutkowski regarding the San Francisco Police Department.

Sincerely,

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

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

From: Robert Rutkowski <[r\\_e\\_rutkowski@att.net](mailto:r_e_rutkowski@att.net)>  
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2022 8:06 AM  
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <[mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; ChanStaff (BOS) <[chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <[DorseyStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:DorseyStaff@sfgov.org)>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <[mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org)>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <[gordon.mar@sfgov.org](mailto:gordon.mar@sfgov.org)>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <[melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org)>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <[aaron.peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:aaron.peskin@sfgov.org)>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <[dean.preston@sfgov.org](mailto:dean.preston@sfgov.org)>; Ronen, Hillary <[hillary.ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:hillary.ronen@sfgov.org)>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <[ahsha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:ahsha.safai@sfgov.org)>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <[catherine.stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:catherine.stefani@sfgov.org)>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <[shamann.walton@sfgov.org](mailto:shamann.walton@sfgov.org)>; SFPD, Chief (POL) <[sfpdchief@sfgov.org](mailto:sfpdchief@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Keith Abouchar <[keith.abouchar@mail.house.gov](mailto:keith.abouchar@mail.house.gov)>  
Subject: San Francisco Police Must End Irresponsible Relationship with the Northern California Fusion Center

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

Mayor London N. Breed  
City Hall, Room 200  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 554-6141  
Fax: (415) 554-6160  
Email: [MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org](mailto:MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org)

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
Phone: (415) 554-5184  
Fax: (415) 554-5163  
TTY: (415) 554-5227  
[Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org), [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org), [DorseyStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:DorseyStaff@sfgov.org), [MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org),  
[Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org](mailto:Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org), [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org), [Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org), [Dean.Preston@sfgov.org](mailto:Dean.Preston@sfgov.org),  
[Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org), [Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org](mailto:Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org), [Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org), [Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org](mailto:Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org)

Chief William "Bill" Scott  
San Francisco Police Department  
1245 3rd Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158  
SFPDchief@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco Police Must End Irresponsible Relationship with the Northern California Fusion Center

Dear Mayor, Board Members and Chief:

In yet another failure to follow the rules, the San Francisco Police Department is collaborating with the regional fusion center with nothing in writing—no agreements, no contracts, nothing—governing the relationship, according to new records released to EFF in its ongoing complaint against the agency.

This means that there is no document in place that establishes the limits and responsibilities for sharing and handling criminal justice data or intelligence between SFPD and the fusion center and other law enforcement agencies who access sensitive information through its network.

SFPD must withdraw immediately from any cooperation with the Northern California Regional Information Center (NCRIC). Any moment longer it continues to collaborate with NCRIC puts sensitive data and the civil rights of Bay Area residents at severe risk.

Fusion centers were started in the wake of 9/11 as part of a Department of Homeland Security program to improve data sharing between local, state, tribal, and federal law enforcement agencies. There are 79 fusion centers across the United States, each with slightly different missions and responsibilities, ranging from generating open-source intelligence reports to monitoring camera networks. NCRIC historically has served as the Bay Area hub for sharing data across agencies from automated license plate readers (ALPRs), face recognition, social media monitoring, drone operations, and "Suspicious Activity Reports" (SARS).

NCRIC requires all participating agencies to sign a data sharing agreement and non-disclosure agreement ("Safeguarding Sensitive But Unclassified Information"), which is consistent with federal guidelines for operating a fusion center. EFF has independently confirmed with NCRIC staff that SFPD has not signed such an agreement. This failure is even more surprising considering that SFPD has had two liaisons assigned to the fusion center and the police chief has served as chair of NCRIC's executive board.

In December 2020, EFF filed a public records request under the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, following a San Francisco Chronicle report suggesting that an SFPD officer had submitted a photo of a suspect to the fusion center's email list and received in response a match generated by face recognition, which would potentially violate San Francisco's face recognition ban. EFF sought records related to this particular case, but more generally, they sought communications related to other requests for photo identification submitted by SFPD, communications about face recognition, and any agreements between SFPD and NCRIC.

When SFPD failed to comply with our records request, we filed a complaint with the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, the citizen body assigned to oversee violations of open records and meetings laws. Many new documents were released and SFPD was found by the task force to have violated both the Sunshine Ordinance and the California Public Records Act. One document was missing though: the fusion center agreement.

New records released in the complaint now explain why: no such agreements exist. SFPD didn't sign any, according to multiple emails sent between staff.

SFPD can't simply solve this problem by signing the boilerplate agreement tomorrow. Any formal partnership or data-sharing relationship with NCRIC would have to go through the process required by the city's surveillance oversight ordinance, which requires public input into such agreements and the board of supervisors' approval. SFPD should expect public opposition to its involvement with the fusion center, just as there was opposition to its involvement in the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force.

Even if that process were to move forward, the public must be involved in crafting the exact language of the agreement. For example, when the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Police Department pursued an agreement with NCRIC, the grassroots advocacy group Oakland Privacy (an Electronic Frontier Alliance member) helped negotiate an agreement with stronger considerations for civil liberties and privacy.

This isn't the first time SFPD has played fast and loose with data regulations. EFF is currently suing the department for accessing a live camera network to spy on protesters without first following the process required by the surveillance oversight ordinance. EFF has also filed a second Sunshine Ordinance complaint against SFPD for failing to produce a mandated ALPR report in response to a public records request.

This latest episode re-emphasizes that SFPD has not earned the trust of the people when it comes to its use of technology and data. SFPD should be cut off from NCRIC immediately, and the Board of Supervisors should treat any claim about accountability from SFPD with skepticism. SFPD has proven it doesn't believe rules matter, and that should always be a deal-breaker when it comes to surveillance.

Yours sincerely,  
Robert E. Rutkowski

cc:  
Correspondence Team  
Longworth House Office Building  
Washington DC 20515  
keith.abouchar@mail.house.gov

2527 Faxon Court  
Topeka, Kansas 66605-2086  
P/F: 1 785 379-9671  
E-mail: r\_e\_rutkowski@att.net

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Correspondence  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 8:55:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [BHC Meeting Cancellations.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Wynship Hillier regarding the Behavioral Health Commission.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Wynship Hillier <wynship@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 8:32 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** DPH-San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission <sfbhc@sfdph.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Hillary.Kunins@sfgov.org  
**Subject:** Correspondence

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

Dear Madam, Mx., or Sir:

Please distribute the attached correspondence to all Supervisors and include in the communications packet for the next meeting.

Very truly yours,  
Wynship W. Hillier, M.S.

**Wynship W. Hillier, M.S.**  
3562 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Apartment 22  
San Francisco, California 94110  
(415) 505-3856  
[wynship@hotmail.com](mailto:wynship@hotmail.com)

September 15, 2022

Shamann Walton, Chair  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, California 94102

Sent via email to [board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)

**RE: THE MAYOR AND THE DIRECTOR OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SERVICES  
AND MENTAL HEALTH S.F. ARE ENEMIES OF THE CONSTITUTION.**

Honorable Chair Walton:

The Mayor and Hillary Kunins, the Director of Behavioral Health Services and Mental Health S.F., are enemies of the Constitution.

In 2020, the Mayor ordered that the Behavioral Health Commission and all of its committees not to meet, nor discuss any matter – even pursuant to the Governor’s and the Mayor’s emergency orders – in the latter half of March and all of April and May of that year.

What is past is prologue. On Tuesday, Sept. 13, the Behavioral Health Commission had duly posted notices for remote ZOOM meetings for its Site Visit Committee, Implementation Committee, and Executive Committee. The meetings, however, did not occur. When the times came, staff would not allow them to proceed, presumably by order of the Director.

These acts of the administration violate the Commission’s right to assemble protected by *U.S. Const.* Amend. I (“Congress shall make no law . . . abridging . . . the right of the people to peaceably assemble . . .”). Had the meetings been fully noticed according to law, the Director of Behavioral Health Services would be guilty of misdemeanors under *Cal. Penal Code* § 403 (“Every person who, without authority of law, willfully disturbs or breaks up any assembly or meeting that is not unlawful in its character . . . is guilty of a misdemeanor.”). These practices also offend a fundamental principle of parliamentary law. “Fundamentally, under the rules of parliamentary law, a deliberative body is a free agent—free to do what it wants to do with the greatest measure of protection to itself and of consideration for the rights of its members.”

I myself have publicly stated that the Commission's committee practice is broken, that their committee meetings are a waste of time, and that the problem will continue until they change their *Bylaws*. Had this week's committee meetings proceeded as planned, I also would have informed the participants at the meetings of violations of open meetings laws apparent from their agendas that ought to prevent them from proceeding. Nevertheless, the appropriate procedure would have been for the committee chairs to convene the meetings as planned, and then rule the first items on each agenda out of order for reason of their unlawfulness, RONR (12<sup>th</sup> ed.) 10:26(1) (“[T]o the extent that procedural rules applicable to the organization or assembly are prescribed by federal, state, or local law, no main motion is in order that conflicts with such rules.”), and then adjourn each of the meetings. This would have informed the public of why the meetings could not proceed, and would have given the members of each committee an opportunity to challenge the rulings of their committee chairs through motions to *Appeal*, or to raise *Points of Order* if the committee chairs failed to act on these issues.

The Behavioral Health Commission is able to address its own problems without Behavioral Health Services hovering over them like an overbearing parent. It is humiliating for them, the citizens whom you have chosen to advise you on behavioral health policy in San Francisco, and implicitly chosen by you for their leadership abilities, to have to put up with paternalistic interventions of this sort by BHS. In the words of Immanuel Kant, referring to such treatment:

[A]fter [‘those guardians who have kindly taken it upon themselves to supervise them’] have made their domesticated animals dumb and carefully prevented these placid creatures from daring to take a single step without the walking cart<sup>c</sup> in which they have confined them, they then show them the danger that threatens them if they try to walk alone. Now this danger is not in fact so great, for by a few falls they would eventually learn to walk; but an example of this kind makes them timid and usually frightens them away from any further attempt.

“An answer to the question: What is enlightenment?” in *Practical Philosophy* 17, trans. and ed. Mary J. Gregor. Note “<sup>c</sup>” states, “A *Gängelwage* was a device used by parents and nurses to provide support for young children while they were learning to walk.”

By preventing the committees from meeting at all, the Mayor and the Director of Behavioral Health Services violated their Oaths of Office and showed themselves to be enemies of the Constitution against whom they, you, and the Commission swore to defend it.

Very truly yours,

/s/  
Wynship Hillier



Chair Walton  
September 15, 2022  
Page 3

cc: Mayor London Breed  
Hillary Kunins, Director of Behavioral Health Services and Mental Health S.F.  
Behavioral Health Commission