

File No. 250603

Committee Item No. 14

Board Item No. 20

## COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Appropriations Committee Date June 25, 2025

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date July 15, 2025

#### Cmte Board

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

#### OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

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

Completed by: Brent Jalipa Date June 20, 2025

Completed by: Brent Jalipa Date July 2, 2025

[Park Code - Court Reservations]

**Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.**

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

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

Section 1. Environmental Findings. The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 250603 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

Section 2. Article 12 of the Park Code is hereby amended by revising Section 12.41, to read as follows:

**SEC. 12.41. TENNIS/PICKLEBALL FEES.**

*(a) The following hourly fees shall be charged to reserve tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center:*

*(1) Reservations made by Individuals not more than one week in advance: \$5*

1                    (2) Reservations made more than one week in advance:

2                    (A) Not-for-Profit Organization or Individual: \$20 per hour

3                    (B) For-Profit Organization: \$40 per hour

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

8                    \* \* \* \*

9  
10                   Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after  
11 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the  
12 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board  
13 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

14  
15                   Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors  
16 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,  
17 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal  
18 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment  
19 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under  
20 the official title of the ordinance.

21  
22 APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
23 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

24 By: /s/  
25        MANU PRADHAN  
         Deputy City Attorney  
         n:\legana\as2025\2500297\01844099.docx

# San Francisco Recreation & Parks

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



**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
BUDGET & APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

June 20, 2025

# Budget: Recreation – Proposed Reductions

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

### Recreation Staffing Model

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

### Aquatics

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

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





# Budget: Partnerships – Policy Recommendation

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


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

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

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



# Utility Cost Recovery Surcharge



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

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

## Proposed surcharges to offset utility increases


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

## Estimated revenue

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



# Court Reservations



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

**For reservations made more than one week in advance:**

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

**28 out of 66 locations will have reservations**

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

**Other Major Cities:**

- Seattle: \$7–\$15/hour
- Berkeley: \$12/hour
- Santa Cruz: \$20–\$30/hour
- Oakland: \$10–\$15/hour
- New York, Los Angeles, Portland, Chicago: All charge for reservable court access



# Recreation Scholarships and Cost Recovery

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

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

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

Program categories

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

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

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



# Recreation Scholarships and Cost Recovery



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

25% of all program participants are currently on scholarship

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

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



# Golden Gate Park Paid Parking



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

**Rate:**

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

**Projected Schedule:**

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

**How to Pay:**

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

**Implementation Date:**

Scheduled for January **2027**

**Net Revenue:**

\$4.9M for six months



# Golf

## Original proposal

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

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

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





# Golf Affordability



## Maintaining Affordable Access to Municipal Golf For All

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



# Potential service reductions October 2025

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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





**Thank You**



BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
**BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**  
**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

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

**Date:** June 18, 2025

**Time:** 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102


**Subject:** **File No. 250603.** Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

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

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

Brent Jalipa ([Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org) ~ (415) 554-7712)



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

bjj:vy:ams

# CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

## DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

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

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

### COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description

BJJ Fee Ad File No. 250603

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

06/08/2025 , 06/15/2025

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

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

EXM# 3935408

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250603**, Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, a fee of \$5 will be established to reserve tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center by individuals not more than one week in advance. It will also establish fees for reservations made more than one week in advance by Not-for-Profit Organizations or an individual at \$20 per hour, and \$40 per hour for For-Profit Organizations. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email ([board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda

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



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



**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY  
OF SAN FRANCISCO  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,  
2025 - 10:00 AM  
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,  
ROOM 250, CITY HALL  
1 DR. CARLTON B.**

\$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2,47 to \$2.83; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$0,218 to \$12,998 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$6.97 to \$8.38; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$1,000,000 will increase from \$3,759 to \$4,479 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.47 to \$2.83; and no plans permit issuance fee shall be established for the first \$1,000,000 plus \$2.83 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000,000. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$500,000.00 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$30,457 to \$35,117 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.35 to \$2.66; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$13,648 to \$15,803 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.29 to \$1.47; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$38,116 to \$46,532 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.02 to \$2.57; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$13,648 to \$15,803 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.29 to \$1.47; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$15,803 will be established for the first \$500,000 plus \$1.47 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$500,000.00 to \$1,000,000.00 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$135,479 to \$154,996 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.10 to \$2.17; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$1,46 to \$1.69; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$500,000 will increase from \$17,672 to \$28,049 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.46 to \$1.69; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$28,049 will be established for the first \$500,000 plus \$1.69 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$1,000,000.00 to \$200,000,000 will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$240,442 to \$263,263 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.39 to \$2.68; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$100,000,000 will increase from \$144,627 to \$166,419 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.37 to \$2.66; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$166,419 will be established for the first \$100,000,000 plus \$2.66 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. Building Permit Fees with total valuation of \$200,000,000 and over will be as follows: new construction plan review fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$479,707 to \$531,050 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.39 to \$2.68; new construction permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$381,396 to \$432,116 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.91 to \$2.16; alterations to plan review fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$534,326 to \$590,988 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$2.67 to \$2.87; alterations to permit issuance fees for the first \$200,000,000 will increase from \$432,116 plus each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof will increase from \$1.91 to \$2.66; and no plans permit issuance fees of \$432,116 will be established for the first \$200,000,000 plus \$2.66 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof. Table 1A-B will be modified to increase plan review fees not covered in Table 1A-A and back check fee from \$280 to \$399 per hour (minimum one hour); Category 1A-C will be modified to increase hourly permit issuance/inspection rates from \$280 to \$399 per hour (minimum of four hours) and from \$300 to \$457 per hour (minimum of two hours) for off-hour inspections for plan review fee not covered in the table for Permit Issuance Fees by Category. Permit issuance fees for Category 1P will include mechanical/plumbing service, sewer replacement, single plumbing fixture installation, shower pan installation, or kitchen or bathroom remodels will increase from \$205.28 to \$273.19; Category 1M - Residential Unit – mechanical gas appliance (furnace, hydronic heat, heat pump) will increase from \$192.55 to \$264; Category 2PA Plumbing installation for residential construction with 5 dwelling units or guest rooms without underground plumbing installation (includes water, gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$352.24 to \$477; Category 2PB Plumbing installation for residential construction with 5 dwelling units or guest rooms or less; and underground plumbing installation (includes water, gas, waste, and vent) will increase from \$513.49 to \$692; Category 2MC Mechanical installation for residential construction with 6 dwelling units or guest rooms or less will increase from \$309.16 to \$395; Category 3PA - 7-12 Dwelling Units - Increase from \$78.97 to \$78.97; Category 3B - 13-36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$1,478.93 to \$1,957; Category 3PC - Over 36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$6,172.56 to \$7,887; Category 3MA - 7-12 Dwelling Units will increase from \$73.19 to \$100; Category 3MB - 13-36 Dwelling Units will increase from \$1,472.17 to \$1,957; Category 3MC - Over

Dwelling Units will increase from \$6,144.95 to \$58,293.33; Category 4PA - Fire sprinklers - one and two family dwelling units will increase from \$192.55 to \$264; Category 4PB - Fire sprinklers - 3 or more dwelling units or guest rooms will increase from \$321.90 to \$344; Category 5P/5M - Office, mercantile & retail buildings: New or Tenant Improvements: heating/cooling equipment to piping and/or equipment to be added to any floor, whichever is less will increase from \$418.54 to \$575; Category 6PA - Restaurants (new and remodel) fee includes 5 or less drainage and/or gas outlets - no fees required for public or private restaurants; fee will increase from \$398.37 to \$537; Category 6PB - Restaurants (new and remodel) fee includes 6 or more drainage and/or gas outlets - no fees required for public or private restaurants; fee will increase from \$1,125.42 to \$1,507; Category 8 - New boiler installations over 200 bblt will increase from \$353.30 to \$478; Category 9P/M - Surveys will increase from \$365.74 to \$450; Category 10 - Condominium conversions will increase from \$468.95 to \$609. Fees will be established for a new Category 11P/M: Miscellaneous of \$302; Boiler Maintenance Program for new buildings of \$200 per certificate issued online of \$121 and in-house of \$207; and connection to utility company-provided steam of \$207 per hour with a minimum of one-half hour. Table 1A-D will be modified to increase inspection rates for monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual review from \$439 to \$481 per hour; inspection rates from \$461 to \$555 per hour; off-hour inspections from \$511 to \$680; and administration from \$214 to \$298 per hour. Table 1B-D will be modified to increase hourly issuance/inspection rates from \$280 to \$399 per hour for regular inspections and from \$300 to \$457 per hour (minimum of two hours) for off-hour inspections for installations not covered by the fee schedule. Category 1 - General Wiring: Residential Buildings up to 10,000 sq. ft. up to 10 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$204.71 to \$270.11 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$207.06 to \$421; up to 40 outlets and/or devices, includes up to 200 AMP service upgrade, will increase from \$386.37 to \$527; more than 40 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$527.65 to \$725; and buildings of 5,000 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$772.40 to \$1,053. Category 2 - General Wiring: Nonresidential Buildings & Residential Buildings over 10,000 sq. ft. up to 10 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$307.06 to \$406; 6 to 20 outlets and/or devices will increase from \$460.94 to \$622; areas up to 2,500 sq. ft. will increase from \$617.19 to \$822; 2,501 to 5,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$927.65 to \$1,236; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$3,069 to \$4,122; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$5,153 to \$6,214; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$9,255 to \$12,505; 100,001 to 500,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$18,433 to \$25,337; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$41,519 to \$56,302; and more than 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$82,990 to \$112,544. Category 3 - Service Distribution and Utilization: Buildings with 225 amp service or less will increase from \$307.73 to \$393; 250 to 500 amps will increase from \$460.44 to \$602; 600 to 1,000 amps will increase from \$614.72 to \$811; 1,200 to 2,000 amps will increase from \$811.20 to \$932.40; 2,001 to 2,500 amps or more than 2,500 amps will increase from \$1,230.78 to \$1,597; 600 volts or more will increase from \$1,230.78 to \$1,650; 150 kva or less will increase from \$308.22 to \$393; 151 kva or more will increase from \$460.44 to \$602; and Fire Pump installations will increase from \$616.77 to \$813. Category 4 - Installations of Fire Warning and Controlled Devices up to 2,500 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 2,501 to 5,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$460.43 to \$617; 5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$927.68 to \$1,236; 10,001 to 30,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$1,539 to \$2,092; 30,001 to 50,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$3,069 to \$4,122; 50,001 to 100,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$5,153 to \$6,214; 100,001 to 500,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$9,255 to \$12,505; 500,001 to 1,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$18,433 to \$25,337; 1,000,001 to 2,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$41,519 to \$56,302; and more than 2,000,000 sq. ft. will increase from \$82,990 to \$112,544. Fire Warning and Controlled Devices (Retrofit Systems) for buildings of not more than 6 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 6 to 16 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 17 to 12 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 13 to 24 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 25 to 48 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 49 to 96 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 97 to 192 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 193 to 384 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 385 to 768 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 769 to 1,536 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 1,537 to 3,072 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 3,073 to 6,144 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 6,145 to 12,288 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 12,289 to 24,576 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 24,577 to 49,152 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 49,153 to 98,304 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 98,305 to 196,608 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 196,609 to 393,216 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 393,217 to 786,432 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 786,433 to 1,572,864 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 1,572,865 to 3,145,728 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 3,145,729 to 6,291,456 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 6,291,457 to 12,582,912 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 12,582,913 to 25,165,824 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 25,165,825 to 50,331,648 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 50,331,649 to 100,663,296 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 100,663,297 to 201,326,592 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 201,326,593 to 402,653,184 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 402,653,185 to 805,306,368 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 805,306,369 to 1,610,612,736 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 1,610,612,737 to 3,221,225,472 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 3,221,225,473 to 6,442,450,944 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 6,442,450,945 to 12,884,901,888 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 12,884,901,889 to 25,769,803,776 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 25,769,803,777 to 51,539,607,552 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 51,539,607,553 to 103,079,215,104 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 103,079,215,105 to 206,158,430,208 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 206,158,430,209 to 412,316,860,416 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 412,316,860,417 to 824,633,720,832 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 824,633,720,833 to 1,649,267,441,664 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 1,649,267,441,665 to 3,298,534,883,328 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 3,298,534,883,329 to 6,597,069,766,656 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 6,597,069,766,657 to 13,194,139,533,312 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 13,194,139,533,313 to 26,388,279,066,624 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 26,388,279,066,625 to 52,776,558,133,248 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 52,776,558,133,249 to 105,553,116,266,496 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 105,553,116,266,497 to 211,106,232,532,992 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 211,106,232,532,993 to 422,212,465,065,984 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 422,212,465,065,985 to 844,424,930,131,968 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 844,424,930,131,969 to 1,688,849,860,263,936 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 1,688,849,860,263,937 to 3,377,699,720,527,872 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 3,377,699,720,527,873 to 6,755,399,441,055,744 dwelling units will increase from \$1,538 to \$2,092; 6,755,399,441,055,745 to 13,510,798,882,111,488 dwelling units will increase from \$

research, and report preparation, per hour fraction thereof will increase from \$385.74 to \$532; witness testing: life safety, fire warning, emergency, and energy management systems hourly rate will increase from \$295 per hour to \$390; fire alarm and fire extinguishers hourly rate, two hour minimum, will increase from \$300 to \$457; energy management, HVAC controls, and low-voltage wiring systems for 10 floors (3 inspections) will increase from \$850 to \$850, and each additional floor will increase from \$64.19 to \$95; and solar photovoltaic systems with 10 KW rating or less will increase from \$218.16 to \$279, and each additional KW rating will increase from \$192.57 to \$235. Table 1A-G - Inspections, Surveys and Reports will be modified to increase the standard hourly rate, survey inspection rate, and inspection fee for nonresidential buildings with a minimum two hours from \$280 to \$399 per hour; off-hours inspection rate from \$300 to \$457 per hour, minimum two hours plus permit fee; survey of nonresidential buildings for purpose of or Conversions for a single unit will increase from \$2,804.07 to \$3,656; two to four units will increase from \$3,698.29 to \$4,679; and five plus units will increase from \$4,679 to \$5,093 plus Standard Hourly Inspection Rate; hotels including 10 guestrooms will increase from \$1,871.63 to \$3,497, and 11+ guestrooms will increase from \$2,459.85 to \$3,497; and 12+ guestrooms will increase from \$3,497 to \$59.30 to \$13 per guestroom over 10; and temporary certificate of occupancy will increase from \$545.46 to \$663. Fees will be established for demolition permits of \$629; moving permits of \$300 per hour; three-hour minimum; re-roofing permits for single-family homes and duplexes of \$306 and \$504 for all others; construction of impervious surface in the required front and setback areas of new and existing lots of \$663. Table 1A-J - Miscellaneous Fees will be modified to increase the general administrative fees not covered in Section 110A from \$166.64 to \$226 per hour for a building number (each building number addresses) from \$166.61 to \$317 and change of existing addresses will increase from \$335.91 to \$506; application extension (in plan view) will increase from \$20.36 to \$26; each plus 20% of plan review fees; each permit extension will increase from \$298.38 to \$452 each plus 10% of building permit inspection fees. Fees will be established for California Statewide Assessment Commission of \$4 per \$100,000 in valuation, as determined by the Building Official, with appropriate fractions thereof, but not less than \$1; strong motion testing of new and existing Group R occupancies of three stories or less, except hotels and motels of 0.00013 times the valuation; hotels and motels, all buildings greater than three stories, and all occupancies of 0.00024 times the valuation; with a minimum fee of \$1.60; subdivision of \$692; slope and seismic hazard zone protection act of \$2,888; and local equivalency fee of \$481 per hour with a minimum of \$100. Penalties, Hearings, Code Enforcement Assessments will be modified to increase the filing fee for an Abatement Appeals Board hearing from \$326.45 to \$526; hearing fee; and the filing fee for each appeal for variance from interpretation of code requirements, each appeal for approval of substitute materials or methods of construction from \$280 to \$372 per hour with a minimum of two hours and emergency order will increase from \$280 to \$493 with a minimum of two hours; Building Official's abatement order hearing will increase from \$280 to \$372 per hour with a minimum of two hours and emergency order will increase from \$280 to \$493 with a minimum of two hours; Commission filing fee/request for a rehearing will increase from \$280 to \$471 per hour with a minimum of two hours per appeal; lien recordation charges will increase from \$200 to \$372 per hearing; Commission hearing fees for notice of appeal, request for jurisdiction and rehearing and additional hearings required by Code will increase from \$280 to \$471 per hour with a minimum of two hours; established for subordination of \$894, and for vacant building - initial and annual registration of \$1,825. Table 1A-L - Public Information will be modified to increase the standard fee for a structural record keeping for structural addition notices, posting of notices (change of use), and requesting notice of permit issuance (each address) per year from \$214 to \$257 per year for a one-quarter hour minimum and for a one-half hour 30-inch sign from \$53 to \$64. Demolition notice of application and permit issuance by area/interested parties per area (1 area = 2 blocks) will increase from \$123.93 to \$205 per year for each area. Fees will be established for demolition notices for 300-foot notification letters of \$184 per hour with a minimum three hours, and residential tenant notification letters of \$184 per hour with a minimum half hour. Reproduction and dissemination of public information for certification of copies for each 10 pages or fraction thereof will increase from \$15 to \$33, and a fee of \$226 for each set of hard copy print. The records retention fee for each 20 pages or fraction thereof of plans or supporting documentation will increase from \$3 to \$74. Fees will be established for recordation of \$286, and duplication of plans administration of \$113. Table 1A-N - Energy Conservation will be modified for the initial inspection of single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings from \$273.45 to \$443, apartment houses and residential hotels up to 20 rooms to increase from \$409.46 to \$598 and each additional 10 rooms, or portion thereof, will increase from \$38.19 to \$53; energy reports and certificates will increase from \$83.64 to \$113; filing fees for permits will increase from \$226 to \$226; and certification of a qualified energy inspector will increase from \$319.88 to \$319.88.

444, Table 1A-P - Residential Code, Enforcement and License Fees will be modified to increase one and two-family dwelling unit fees from \$107 to \$136 per rental unit. Apartment house license fees to 13 to 30 units will increase from \$107 to \$153 per unit and more than 30 units for each additional 10 units or portion thereof will increase from \$107 to \$153. Hotel license fees will increase per year as follows: 6 to 29 rooms will increase from \$622 to \$622.30 to 59 rooms will increase from \$843 to \$933; 60 to 149 rooms will increase from \$1,012 to \$1,127; 150 to 200 rooms will increase from \$1,242 to \$1,418; and hotels with more than 200 rooms will increase from \$1,473 to \$1,804 and increase from \$107 to \$153 for each additional 25 rooms or portion thereof. Table 1A-Q - Hotel Conversion Ordinance Fees will be modified to increase from \$169.84 to \$228; increase the fee per hour of appeals of initial or annual status determination inspection staff review of requests for hearing to exceed 25% tourist season rental limit, and inspection staff review of unsuccessful challenge of a usage report and standard hourly inspection or request for winter rental from \$280 to \$399; challenges from claims of exemption usage reports will increase from \$83.64 to \$113; claims of exemption based on low-income housing will increase from \$546.46 to \$788; claims of exemption based on partially completed conversion will increase from \$1,183; complaint of unlawful conversion will increase from \$83.64 to \$113; initial usage report will increase from \$546.46 to \$788; permit to convert will increase from \$250 to \$1,300; and fee for exemption - Hearing Officer fee for requests for hearing to exceed 25% tourist season rental limit will increase from \$542.82 to \$785; and statements of exemption - Hearing Officer challenges of usage reports will increase from \$546.46 to \$788. Table 1A-S - Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Wall Building Retrofit will be modified to establish a \$372 per hour fee with a maximum of \$1,000. The reviews of inventory form and summary of the engineering report; Board of Examiners filing fee will be established at \$372 per hour with a minimum of two hours for each appeal. The interpretation of code requirements, and approval of substitute materials or methods of design or construction. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 17-1, the person who is unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record and the comments shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 444, San Francisco, CA 94102. Contact email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors. Legislative Committee: Committee on sfbo.org/legislative-research-center-lrc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions regarding this matter, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalava (Brent.Jalava@sfgov.org ~ (415) 554-7712). Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

**EXM-3935427#**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
**BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**  
**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**  
**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025**  
**LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER**  
**ROOM 250, CITY HALL**  
**1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as indicated below. All interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250608**. Ordinance amending the Public Works and Subdivision Codes to modify certain permit fees, including the sidewalk, tables and chairs and display merchandise registrants and certain minor sidewalk encroachments that are appurtenant building features, and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, fees for street improvement permits in an accepted or unaccepted right-of-way in order to satisfy requirements for sidewalk repair will increase from \$29.67 to \$35.45 per 100 square feet; special sidewalk permit fees will increase from \$750.90 to \$833.13, and from \$204.39 to \$295.44 for an existing special sidewalk or driveway permit; standard minor encroachment permits will increase from \$1,639.45 to \$1,988.87, and from \$283.45 to \$283.62 if existing or if needed in conjunction with a street improvement Permit (excavation shoring); street encroachment permit fees (also known as a major encroachment permit) fees will increase from \$6,533.75 to \$7,121.49; if a pipe barrier permit is associated with a street improvement Permit, but that pipe barrier permit does not specifically reference a Street Improvement Permit, the additional fee for each pipe barrier permit will increase from \$133.20 to \$257.62. The permit fee for a street improvement permits, and automobile driveway) permits associated with a Department of Public Works Notice to Repair, the permit fee will increase from \$678.32 per permit; sidewalk with change fees, minimum per block or less, will increase from \$3,875 to \$4,043.46; and nighttime work permits will increase from \$171.64

fees for each permit issued for a small excavation project and any block for which the permit has been extended or amended will increase from \$66 to \$135.90; each block contained in a medium excavation project will increase from \$117 to \$226.89. Fees for each permit issued to a small utility excavation project and any permit extension will increase from \$16 to \$33.91 and \$640 fee will be established for a small general excavation project related to buildings. An inspection fee of \$189.08 per hour will be established for inspection of underground tanks, pits, vaults, manholes or boring/monitoring wells. Fees for temporary street space occupancy for any purpose other than a building construction operation will increase from \$95.48 per hour to \$171.15 per hour. A nonrefundable additional permit application fee for temporary street occupancy will increase from \$353 to \$833.13, and applications to request extension of permit applications for temporary street occupancy permits will increase from \$200 to \$471.55. Fees payable to Public Works for air space for four lots or less will increase from \$8.58 to \$16,969.79; Lot Subdivision Final Map, including Vetting, Tentative Map, Subdivision Map, and whether condominium conversion or new construction of five or more units or lots from \$8,437 to \$16,651.90; Condominium conversion of four units or less from \$8,538 to \$16,453.90; Parcel Map new construction of four lots or less from \$7,770 to \$15,335.44; Amended Map from \$2,704 to \$5,337.92; Lot Line Adjustment from \$2,704 to \$5,337.92; certificate of completion from \$1,422.36 to \$2,222.36; certificate of correction from \$2,139 to \$4,222.36; record of survey from \$507 to \$1,010.39; and fees will be established for corner record at \$35.03, Recordable application stamp at \$295.00, and Application Reinstatement at \$1,027.60, and sidewalk vacation, minimum per block or less at \$4,043.46. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 25.050, applications are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public hearing. Written comments will be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or sent email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' website (<http://sfbor.org/legislation-research-center-irc/>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing please contact the Board of Supervisors' Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org or (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco.

**EXM-393542#**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
**BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**  
**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**  
**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025**  
**LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250, CITY HALL, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held on Wednesday, June 18, 2025 at the time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File NO. 250606.** Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code, Health Code, Administrative Code, and Food Safety Code to:

- 1) eliminate Department of Public Health permit requirement for veterinary hospitals and laundry facilities;
- 2) eliminate the food facility surcharge and certain fees for agricultural inspections;
- 3) establish a new food safety compliance activities for solid waste facilities, refuse service for commercial and residential properties, and licensing of refuse collectors;
- 4) establish a regulatory fee for food safety examinations;
- 5) increase existing regulatory fees for agricultural inspections, certified farmers' market permits, and hazardous waste management;
- 6) increase the fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health conducts inspections, food safety examinations, and refuse collection and enforcement;
- 7) when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour for service by environmental health technicians when the Department of Public Health offers training, classes, or examinations to the person in charge of the operation of a food facility and food handlers, such as a food safety managers and food safety certification and enforcement; California Health and Safety Code Sections 113947 et seq. San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations, Section 249.6, will establish an annual fee of \$251 per hour for health inspectors and a fee of \$229 per hour

total fee of \$1,000 payable to the Department of Public Health due upon filing documents for a dust control plan and for review and establish an additional fee of \$333 per hour exceeding three hours, a portion thereof for administrative costs. Sections 22B and 31. The Controller shall, if necessary, adjust the fees upward or downward for the upcoming fiscal year as appropriate to ensure that the program recovers the costs of administration without reducing revenue. Health Code, Section 38111, will be modified to increase the fees in review and approval of an enhanced ventilation proposal from \$225 to \$251. The Controller shall, if necessary, adjust the fees upward or downward for the upcoming fiscal year to ensure the program recovers the costs of administration without reducing revenue. Administrative Code, Section 1.10, will be modified to increase the fees for inspection and certificates for agricultural products to \$40 to \$45 and for a certificate of fumigation from \$30 to \$70, and the minimum charge for any single certificate from \$25 to \$70. Quarantine inspection fees will increase from a minimum of \$135 to \$165 plus any fee for a portion thereof. For access of three hours required to complete the inspection will increase from \$45 to \$90 per hour; and per mile traveled to perform such inspections will increase from \$35 to \$50 per mile. Inspections of quarantine shipments which require special handling will increase from \$35 to \$90 per hour, and from \$0.30 to \$0.56 per mile traveled to perform such inspections. The Controller, with Administrative Code Section 67-7.1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. Written comments shall be as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Director of Public Health, Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the public records of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on January 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalpa ([Brent.Jalpa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalpa@sfgov.org)) or Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY  
OF SAN FRANCISCO  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,  
2025 - 10:00 AM  
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,  
ROOM 250, CITY HALL  
1 DR. CARLTON B.**

**DR. CARLTON B. GOODLIEF, CLERK**  
**OFFICE OF THE CLERK**  
**SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing on the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250605.**

**Ordinance amending the Park Department's scholarship policy to allow the Recreation and Park Department to set fees for recreation programs based on the Departments' operating costs for those programs and various other factors, including whether the program is designated for youth with disabilities, subject to approval of the Recreation and Park Commission; directing the Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide for further discounts for recreation programs based on the estimated operating costs of those programs; and certain clarifying changes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.** If this legislation passes, a \$100 reservation fee for youth to hold a reservation for each tent site or cabin reserved at Camp Mather. The remaining balance of the reservation fee shall be due 30 days prior to the start of the reservation. The proposed Ordinance would require approval from the Recreation and Park Department to set recreation program fees based on the estimated operating costs of those programs. The Department generally could set fees intended to cover the programs' full operating costs, for youth or seniors or persons with disabilities could set fees that recovered only 75% of the operating costs. In addition, the Ordinance urges the Department to set fees for recreation programs for the community at large based on only 50% of the operating costs. All fees would require approval from the Recreation and Park Commission and, once approved, would be published on the Department's website. The Ordinance directs the Recreation and Park Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide for further discounts or recreation programs based on financial need. In accordance with the administrative code, Section 66, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public hearing record. Comments will be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 404, San Francisco, CA 94102, and sent to [angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Resources Center at <https://legisres.sfgov.org/legislativerecourcescenter/>. For more information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Board of Supervisors Committee: Brent Jalipa ([Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org)) - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY  
OF SAN FRANCISCO  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,  
2025 - 10:00 AM  
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,  
ROOM 250, CITY HALL**

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102  
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing on the following proposed ordinance, the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250604.** Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover the cost of maintenance related to maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation is adopted, the additional fees will be established for each player using City Golf Courses of \$4 per nine holes, or \$6 per 18 holes, as an additional surcharge to cover operating costs related to the golf courses; an additional surcharge of 10% for use of the parks for outdoor events, to cover operating costs related to the outdoor event facilities; an additional surcharge of \$5 for picnics with up to 25 participants, and \$25 for picnics with more than 100 participants, to cover operating costs related to the picnic areas; and an additional surcharge of \$1 per hour for the use of the athletic fields to cover the cost of maintenance of athletic fields. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the hearing. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be submitted to the Assistant Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email ([board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)). Information relating to this matter may be obtained from the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalpa ([Brent.Jalpa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalpa@sfgov.org)) or the Assistant Clerk for the City and County of San Francisco: Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY  
OF SAN FRANCISCO  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,  
2025 - 10:00 AM  
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,  
ROOM 250, CITY HALL  
100 BAY STREET**

**DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETTE JR.**  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

**NOTICE IS HEREBY** GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will be holding a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 256063**, Ordinance amending the rules of the Board of the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming said Reserving Department's determination to issue the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, a fee of \$5 will be established to reserve tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center by individuals not more than one week in advance. It will also establish fees for reservations made more than one week in advance by Not-for-Profit Organizations or an individual for a maximum of \$40 per hour for For-Profit Organizations. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to: Sandra A. Cavillio, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlette Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email ([board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)). Information relating to this hearing may be obtained from the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this hearing may be obtained via the public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalpa ([Brent.Jalpa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalpa@sfgov.org)) or Sandra A. Cavillio ([Sandra.Cavillio@sfgov.org](mailto:Sandra.Cavillio@sfgov.org)).  
Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY  
OF SAN FRANCISCO  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18,  
2025 - 10:00 AM  
LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,  
ROOM 250, CITY HALL  
100 BAY STREET**

**1 DR. CARLTON B.  
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN  
FRANCISCO, CA 94102**

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



# Classifieds

PLACE YOUR AD  
415.359.2686  
classads@sfxaminer.com

DEADLINES  
Weekdays: 2 p.m. ONE business day prior to publication.  
Sunday: 2 p.m. on Friday prior to publication.

Masco Card VISA Discover  
The publisher reserves the right to omit, classify, and/or modify ads not consistent with the policies of this publication.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

AUTOMOBILES

AUTOMOBILES

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

FINANCIAL SERVICES

FINANCIAL SERVICES

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

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

TO ADVERTISE IN HOME & GARDEN  
Call us at 415.359.2686  
**San Francisco Examiner**

HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS

HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS

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

PLACE YOUR AD  
Call us at 415.359.2686  
or e-mail classads@sfxaminer.com

**San Francisco Examiner**

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Cnslntr, Envrnmntl Engr (San Francisco, CA), WSP USA: Dsgn DOT piplns systms across pblne lfcycle inclngng pipline instlltn feasibility stdies (FEED) & route selctn, Pipline trmchss dsgn, pipline cnstrctn fld engnrng srvc & pipline deactvtn/demoltn plnng. Stnd corp bnfits. \$106,163.00/yr. EOE. Reqs: Bach (or frgn equiv) in Cvl/Envrnmntl Enngg or rltid + 3 yrs exp as a Muncpl Dsgnr, Envrnmntl Engr, or rltid. Email resume to [jobs@wsp.com](mailto:jobs@wsp.com). Ref: 3858.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

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

Joby Aero, Inc. (San Carlos, CA) F/T positions. Senior Design for Reliability Engineer: drive dsgn-FMEA efforts by wrkng w various functional teams; req MS in Reliability Engrng, ME, Materials Sci Engrng, EE, Sys Engrng, or clsly rltid; 18 months exp as Materials Engrn, or rltid+spec skills. \$168,300.08-\$175k. Standard benefits/401K. EOE. No Calls. Recruitment@joby.aero.

Card79 LLC is seeking Visual Designer to produce high-quality design solutions and create illustrations, and etc. Position requires a master's degree in Design or related, must have Knowledge of motion design, any interested applicants can mail their resume with code C791 to: Card79 LLC. 3435 Cesar Chavez Street, Suite 221, San Francisco, CA 94110.

Model N, Inc. seeks a Solutions Architect, Customer Supp in San Mateo, CA to act as lead, single POC for customers including escalations & running customer calls as appropriate. 100% telework permitted w/in U.S. \$104,416 - \$167,911 pr yr. Apply at [www.jobpostingtoday.com](http://www.jobpostingtoday.com) Ref #93252

Joby Aero, Inc. (San Carlos, CA) F/T positions. Senior Dimensional Quality Engineer lead devlpmt of dimensional quality objectives. BS in EE, ME, or rltid. 5 yrs exp as eng. Or rltid. +spec skills : \$167,000 until \$168,000. Standard benefits/401K. EOE. No Calls. Recruitment@joby.aero

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

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

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

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

TO ADVERTISE IN HOME & GARDEN  
Call us at 415.359.2686

**San Francisco Examiner**

REAL ESTATE SERVICES

REAL ESTATE SERVICES

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

TAX/BOOKKEEPING

TAX/BOOKKEEPING

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

## San Francisco Examiner

## PUBLIC NOTICES

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

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

addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco  
**EXM-3935412#**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025 - 10:00 AM LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250, CITY HALL, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**  
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250605.** Ordinance amending the Park Code to allow the Recreation and Park Department to set fees for recreation programs based on the Department's operating costs for those programs and various other factors, including whether the program is designated for youth, seniors, or persons with disabilities. The proposed Ordinance would allow the Recreation and Park Department to set recreation program fees based on the estimated operating costs of those programs. The Department generally could set fees intended to cover the programs' full operating costs, but for programs designated for youth or seniors or persons with disabilities could set fees that recovered only 75% of the operating costs. In addition, the Ordinance urges the Department to set fees for programs that benefit the community at large based on only 50% of the operating costs. All fees would require approval from the Recreation and Park Commission and, once approved, would be published on the Department's website. The Ordinance also directs the Recreation and Park Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide for further discounts for recreation programs based on Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco  
**EXM-3935412#**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025 - 10:00 AM LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250, CITY HALL, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**  
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250604.** Ordinance amending the Park Code to allow the Recreation and Park Department to add a cost recovery surcharge to the fees for the use of City golf courses, outdoor event facilities, picnic areas, and athletic fields, to help cover the cost of stormwater and other costs related to maintaining those City properties; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, a \$100 deposit will be established to hold a reservation for each tent site or cabin reserved at Camp Mather. The remaining balance of the reservation fee shall be due 30 days prior to the start of the reservation. The proposed Ordinance would allow the Recreation and Park Department to set recreation program fees based on the estimated operating costs of those programs. The Department generally could set fees intended to cover the programs' full operating costs, but for programs designated for youth or seniors or persons with disabilities could set fees that recovered only 75% of the operating costs. In addition, the Ordinance urges the Department to set fees for programs that benefit the community at large based on only 50% of the operating costs. All fees would require approval from the Recreation and Park Commission and, once approved, would be published on the Department's website. The Ordinance also directs the Recreation and Park Commission to update its scholarship policy to provide for further discounts for recreation programs based on Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco  
**EXM-3935412#**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025 - 10:00 AM LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250, CITY HALL, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**  
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250603.** Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. If this legislation passes, a fee of \$5 will be established to reserve tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center by individuals, not more than one week in advance. It will also establish fees for reservations made more than one week in advance by Not-for-Profit Organizations or an individual at \$20 per hour, and \$40 per hour for For-Profit Organizations. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco  
**EXM-3935401#**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025 - 10:00 AM LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250, CITY HALL, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**  
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250591.** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to modify the fees for the use of City Hall. If this legislation passes, Administrative Code, Section 4.1-2, will be modified to establish the short-term license or event fees for a party who enters into a Short Term License Agreement for the use of City Hall in accordance with the following fee schedule: \$1,200 for 1-100 guests; \$6,000 for a two-hour wedding for 1-100 guests; \$6,000 for a two-hour wedding for 1-200 guests plus \$4 for each guest over 200; \$6,500 for 1-200 guests for events in the North and South Light Courts; \$12,000 for 1-499 guests in the Rotunda and one Light Court; Rotunda and both light Courts as follows: \$15,000 for 1 - 999 guests; \$17,500 for 1,000 - 1,499 guests; \$22,500 for 1,500 - 1,999 guests; \$27,500 for 2,000 - 2,499 guests; and \$32,500 for 2,500 - 3,000 guests; \$1,000 per hour of weekday early access to the Rotunda before 4 p.m.; \$500 per hour per room for weekday early access before 2 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the South Light Court; \$500 per hour per room for weekend early access before 2 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the South Light Court and the Rotunda; \$5,000 per hour after 12 p.m. for late access (Guest Event); \$500 per hour after 2 a.m. for late access (Load-Out); 50% rental fee for set-up day; \$5,000 for exterior lighting; \$3.00 per guest for insurance; \$7.50 per event chair; \$3.50 per folding chair; \$7.00 per easel; \$200 per stage with skirting; \$15 per pair of stanchions; \$7.50 per banquet table (6 feet by 18 inches, 8 feet by 30 inches, 8 feet by 18 inches, 8 feet by 30 inches); and \$7.50 per round table (60 inches). Beginning with Fiscal Year 2026-2027, the fees set pursuant to subsection (a) of this Section 4.1-2 shall be adjusted each year, without further action by the Board of Supervisors (the "Board"), to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Controller without further action by the Board. The Director of Administrative Services may charge fees for filming and photographing activities at locations other than the Event Fees under Administrative Code, Section 4.1-2(a)(1), as adjusted from time to time. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco  
**EXM-3935390#**

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025 - 10:00 AM LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250, CITY HALL, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102**  
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco's Budget and Appropriations Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250591.** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to modify the fees for the use of City Hall. If this legislation passes, Administrative Code, Section 4.1-2, will be modified to establish the short-term license or event fees for a party who enters into a Short Term License Agreement for the use of City Hall in accordance with the following fee schedule: \$1,200 for 1-100 guests; \$6,000 for a two-hour wedding for 1-100 guests; \$6,000 for a two-hour wedding for 1-200 guests plus \$4 for each guest over 200; \$6,500 for 1-200 guests for events in the North and South Light Courts; \$12,000 for 1-499 guests in the Rotunda and one Light Court; Rotunda and both light Courts as follows: \$15,000 for 1 - 999 guests; \$17,500 for 1,000 - 1,499 guests; \$22,500 for 1,500 - 1,999 guests; \$27,500 for 2,000 - 2,499 guests; and \$32,500 for 2,500 - 3,000 guests; \$1,000 per hour of weekday early access to the Rotunda before 4 p.m.; \$500 per hour per room for weekday early access before 2 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the South Light Court; \$500 per hour per room for weekend early access before 2 p.m. for the North Light Court and before 4 p.m. for the South Light Court and the Rotunda; \$5,000 per hour after 12 p.m. for late access (Guest Event); \$500 per hour after 2 a.m. for late access (Load-Out); 50% rental fee for set-up day; \$5,000 for exterior lighting; \$3.00 per guest for insurance; \$7.50 per event chair; \$3.50 per folding chair; \$7.00 per easel; \$200 per stage with skirting; \$15 per pair of stanchions; \$7.50 per banquet table (6 feet by 18 inches, 8 feet by 30 inches, 8 feet by 18 inches, 8 feet by 30 inches); and \$7.50 per round table (60 inches). Beginning with Fiscal Year 2026-2027, the fees set pursuant to subsection (a) of this Section 4.1-2 shall be adjusted each year, without further action by the Board of Supervisors (the "Board"), to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Controller without further action by the Board. The Director of Administrative Services may charge fees for filming and photographing activities at locations other than the Event Fees under Administrative Code, Section 4.1-2(a)(1), as adjusted from time to time. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 13, 2025. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Appropriations Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org - (415) 554-7712) Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco  
**EXM-3935390#**

least once each week for four successive weeks before the date set for hearing on the petition in a newspaper of general circulation, printed in this county: SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER  
Date: JUNE 5, 2025  
MICHELLE TONG  
Judge of the Superior Court  
6/15, 6/22, 6/29, 7/6/25  
**CNS-393796#**  
**SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER**

**FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAMES**  
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:  
**CHIFFOUNDRY, 2705 DEBBIE CT, SAN CARLOS, CA 94070, County of SAN MATEO**  
U. B. R. A. L. O. G. I. C. TECHNOLOGIES LLC, 2705 DEBBIE CT, SAN CARLOS, CA 94070  
This business is conducted by LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY.  
OF ORGANIZATION: CALIFORNIA  
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 04/23/2025  
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)  
S/ JEFFREY DICORPO, MANAGER  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on MAY 20, 2025  
Mark Church, County Clerk 6/1, 6/8, 6/15, 6/22/25  
**NPEN-392637#**  
**EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER**

**FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT**  
File No. M-300629  
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:  
**PENINSULA ORAL SURGERY BURLINGAME, 1750 CAMINO REAL, SUITE #403, BURLINGAME, CA 94010 County of SAN MATEO**  
M. ELDER, D.D.S., A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION, 12770 MERIT DRIVE, SUITE 800, DALLAS, TX 75251  
This business is conducted by: A CORPORATION  
STATE OF INCORPORATION: CALIFORNIA  
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A.  
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)  
S/ TIMOTHY ELDER - PRESIDENT  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 05/15/2025.  
Mark Church, County Clerk 5/25, 6/1, 6/8, 6/15/25  
**NPEN-393039#**  
**EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER**

**FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT**  
File No. M-300802  
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:  
DALE PLUMBING & HEATING, 25 CROCKER AVE, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063  
DALE PLUMBING, INC., 25 CROCKER AVE, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063  
This business is conducted by N/A  
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on N/A.  
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)  
DALE PLUMBING, INC.  
S/ TIMOTHY SPOERL, PRESIDENT  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on 06/04/2025.  
Mark Church, County Clerk (Deputy), Deputy  
6/15, 6/22, 6/29, 7/6/25  
**NPEN-3928706#**  
**EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER**

**FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT**  
File No. M-300668  
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:  
**DR. BRISBANE, CA 94005, CITY OF SAN MATEO INTEGRATED RESOURCES GROUP, INC., 2314 WEBSTER STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115**  
This business is conducted by CORPORATION, STATE OF INCORPORATION: CALIFORNIA  
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 03/01/2025  
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)

**S/ DILMOHAN S. CHADHA-PRESIDENT**  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on MAY 20, 2025  
Mark Church, County Clerk 6/1, 6/8, 6/15, 6/22/25  
**NPEN-392726#**  
**EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER**

**FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT**  
File No. M-300666  
The following person(s) is (are) doing business as:  
**CHIFFOUNDRY, 2705 DEBBIE CT, SAN CARLOS, CA 94070, County of SAN MATEO**  
U. B. R. A. L. O. G. I. C. TECHNOLOGIES LLC, 2705 DEBBIE CT, SAN CARLOS, CA 94070  
This business is conducted by LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY.  
OF ORGANIZATION: CALIFORNIA  
The registrant(s) commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on 04/23/2025  
I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. (A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime.)  
S/ JEFFREY DICORPO, MANAGER  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Mateo County on MAY 20, 2025  
Mark Church, County Clerk 6/1, 6/8, 6/15, 6/22/25  
**NPEN-392637#**  
**EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER**

**LIEN SALE NOTICE**  
Notice is hereby given pursuant to sections 3071 and 3072 of the Civil Code of the State of California, the undersigned, **TEGSCO LLC 2650 BAYSHORE BLVD DALY CITY CA 94014**, will sell at public sale on: **JUNE 25, 2025 10:00AM**, the following property:  
**2014 KIA OPT LICE NONE VIN# 5XKGM479EG6316539**  
**2022 HOND HR-V LICE 9MYR847 CA VIN# 3CZRU5570N7M18866**  
**2017 MAZD 6 LICE 8ACM222 CA VIN# JM1GL1X57H113544**  
**2017 VW JETTA LICE 7ZMX043 CA VIN# 3VWLT1A7J3HM394466**  
**2012 TOY COR LICE 9DQP682 CA VIN# 2HGFE2F50PH501889**  
**2018 NISS VRSA LICE 8DHV677 CA VIN# 3N1CN7AP1JK442561**  
**2012 TOY COR LICE 8KJQJ255 CA VIN# 5YFBUJRHEDFP333847**  
**2008 MBZ C300 LICE 6DXN442 CA VIN# WDDGF54X98R016941**  
**2013 FIAT 500 LIC# AVIY FL VIN# 3C3CFARXDT54647**  
**2024 CHEV MALBU LICE# BP12402 CT VIN# 1G1ZE52T2RF189122**  
6/15/25  
**NPEN-393795#**  
**EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER**

**LIEN SALE NOTICE**  
Notice is hereby given pursuant to sections 3071 and 3072 of the Civil Code of the State of California, the undersigned, **TEGSCO LC 2650 BAYSHORE BLVD DALY CITY CA 94014**, will sell at public sale on: **JUNE 25, 2025 10:00AM**, the following property:  
**2010 JEEP COMNDR LICE# 1DH9147 AL VIN# 1J4RG4GT7AC107194**  
**2014 DODG CHRGR LICE# ESS115 MI VIN# 2C3CDXB6G4EH259084**  
**2014 HOND ACC LICE 7GMN932 CA VIN# 1HGCR2F5XE4278392**  
**2010 HOND CIV LICE NONE VIN# 19XFA4F53AE000763**  
**2011 PORS CAYEN LICE# 9BWFA79 CA VIN# WP1AA2A20BLA00173**  
**2015 BUICK ENCOR LICE# 7LUT271 CA VIN# KL4CJBSB1FB219660**  
**2012 VOLVO S60 LICE# W04740 LICE# VYV162ZFS1C2053317**  
**2015 DODG DART LICE# 9ENR381 CA VIN# 1C3CDFB64FD403066**  
**2015 CHEV TRAX LICE# 7UVK906 CA VIN# 3GNC1T5B4FL231500**  
**2013 BMW 740LI LICE# 7WSW474 CA VIN# WBAYF45G7DD127937**  
6/15/25  
**NPEN-393795#**  
**EXAMINER - BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER**

**PUBLIC AUCTION/SALES**  
LIEN SALE NOTICE  
Notice is hereby given pursuant to sections 3071 and 3072 of the Civil Code of the State of California, the undersigned, **TEGSCO LLC 2650 BAYSHORE BLVD**

Real Estate & Design

Sundays in The Examiner

If you'd like to advertise, e-mail [advertise@sfxaminer.com](mailto:advertise@sfxaminer.com)



BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

---

## MEMORANDUM

---

Date: June 2, 2025  
To: Planning Department / Commission  
From: Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Appropriations Committee  
Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 250603  
Park Code - Court Reservations

---

- ☒ California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination  
(*California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.*)
- ☒ Ordinance / Resolution  
☐ Ballot Measure
- Not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.
- 6/4/2025 *Joy Navarrete*
- ☐ Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  
(*Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review*)
- ☐ General Plan    ☐ Planning Code, Section 101.1    ☐ Planning Code, Section 302
- ☐ Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning  
(*Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review*)
- ☐ General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments  
(*Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53*)  
(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)
- ☐ Historic Preservation Commission
- ☐ Landmark (*Planning Code, Section 1004.3*)
- ☐ Cultural Districts (*Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23*)
- ☐ Mills Act Contract (*Government Code, Section 50280*)
- ☐ Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings (*Planning Code, Article 11*)

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at [Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org).

**From:** [Janine Watson](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 5:44:45 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Janine Watson

**From:** [Angelique Mahan](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 5:20:26 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent     Angelique Mahan  
  
Email                         Angelmahan@hotmail.com

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

**From:** [Griffin Lee](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 5:20:29 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Griffin Lee  
  
Email                              griffin.gregory.lee@gmail.com

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

**From:** [Sarah B McCourt](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 5:35:28 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Sarah B McCourt

Email [sarah@connectedsf.com](mailto:sarah@connectedsf.com)

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

**From:** [Alex Dworetzky](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 5:36:29 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Alex Dworetzky  
  
Email                              alex.dworetzky@gmail.com

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You



**From:** [Julie Sonnen](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:00:35 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Julie Sonnen  
  
Email                              aoicielo7@gmail.com

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You,  
Julie Sonnen

---

**From:** [Cecil Wong](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:30:26 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Cecil Wong  
Email                              cec8719@gmail.com

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

---

**From:** [Lance Mock](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:45:23 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Lance Mock  
Email                              [I\\_c\\_mock@hotmail.com](mailto:I_c_mock@hotmail.com)

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

---

**From:** [Charles Chou](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 6:51:20 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent Charles Chou

Email [topspincc@gmail.com](mailto:topspincc@gmail.com)

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

---

**From:** [Jeff Gee](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 7:44:25 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Jeff Gee

Email      [jas1883@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jas1883@sbcglobal.net)

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

---

**From:** [Susan Wheeler](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 8:06:28 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Susan Wheeler  
Email                              [swheeler47@comcast.net](mailto:swheeler47@comcast.net)

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

---



**From:** [Cassidy Trader](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 10:07:24 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Cassidy Trader  
Email                              cassidygboobear@gmail.com

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

---

**From:** [Christina Lim](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 18, 2025 10:08:25 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Christina Lim  
  
Email                              christinayn@gmail.com

### Say No to Charging for Use of Tennis Courts

Message:

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

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

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

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

Thank You

---

**From:** [Roberta Economidis](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 7:14:48 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Roberta Economidis  
  
Email                              reconomidis@yahoo.com

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

**From:** [Jeff Fong](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 7:23:31 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Jeff Fong

Email      [lindajeff2000@yahoo.com](mailto:lindajeff2000@yahoo.com)

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

Message:

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

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

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

Thank You

---

**From:** [Marie Hurabiell](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 11:22:23 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Marie Hurabiell  
  
Email                              mhurabie@yahoo.com

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Stephanie Lehman](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 2:43:25 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Stephanie Lehman  
Email                              slehman21@yahoo.com

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

Message:

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

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

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

Thank You,  
Stephanie Lehman

---



**From:** [Christina Pappas](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 2:46:20 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Christina Pappas  
  
Email                              scoutca66@gmail.com

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Teresa Shaw](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 2:53:29 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Teresa Shaw  
  
Email                              tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Mark Felix](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:43:28 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Mark Felix  
  
Email                              mafelix86@yahoo.com

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

**From:** [Linda Mathews](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 3:55:32 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Linda Mathews  
  
Email                              Linda.mathews@yahoo.com

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Judi Hurabiell](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 4:18:21 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Judi Hurabiell

Email      [jmhurabiell1@gmail.com](mailto:jmhurabiell1@gmail.com)

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

**From:** [Kelly Vinther](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 4:29:24 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Kelly Vinther  
Email                              kvercellino@sbcglobal.net

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You



**From:** [Ann Iannuccillo](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 5:01:26 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Ann Iannuccillo  
  
Email                              aiannuccillo@hotmail.com

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee as it is unfair and unwarranted!

Thank You

**From:** [Keith Kandarian](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 5:27:23 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Keith Kandarian  
Email                              tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com

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

Message:

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

**From:** [Daphne Alden](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2025 11:23:34 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Daphne Alden  
  
Email                              daphne.alden@me.com

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

Message:

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

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Celeste Lee](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 8:58:31 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Celeste Lee  
Email                              cleebobroff@yahoo.com

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

Message:

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

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

**From:** [Jennifer Z Yan](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 9:32:44 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Jennifer Z Yan  
  
Email                              popcorn-kidder.3s@icloud.com

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

Message:

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

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Tom Radulovich](#)  
**To:** [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Ginsburg, Phil \(REC\)](#); [Madland, Sarah \(REC\)](#); [Bishop, Lamonte" \(REC\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Madison.Tam@sfgov.org](#); [Ildiko Polony](#); [Peter Belden](#); [Kirschbaum, Julie \(MTA\)](#); [Eaken, Amanda \(MTA\)](#)  
**Subject:** Livable City supports Recreation and Parks" budget and revenue proposals, and R&P support community stewardship  
**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 10:11:06 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Tom Radulovich  
Livable City



**From:** [Jane Gaito](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 11:51:33 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Jane Gaito  
  
Email                              janeibrahimgaito@gmail.com

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

Message:

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

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Sonya Dreizler](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [ChenStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Budget Public Comment  
**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 3:06:57 PM

---

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

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

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

Kindly,  
Sonya

---

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

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

— The parks offer a **collective backyard** for all city families.

— The programs - from art classes to rock climbing, summer camps to sports teams (even a **swim team!**) - are amazing for both kids and adults.

— And the sense of **community** - though hard to articulate - may be the most valuable thing Rec & Park provides. All over the city, my kids see people they know - from Rec & Park baseball teams, art camp, swim lessons, or Camp Mather. And the instructors and park staff know and look out for all the kids.

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

---

**Sonya Dreizler**

she/ her  
[sonyadreizler.com](https://sonyadreizler.com)

**From:** [Tom Radulovich](#)  
**To:** [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Ginsburg, Phil \(REC\)](#); [Madland, Sarah \(REC\)](#); [Bishop, Lamonte" \(REC\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Madison.Tam@sfgov.org](#); [Ildiko Polony](#); [Peter Belden](#); [Kirschbaum, Julie \(MTA\)](#); [Eaken, Amanda \(MTA\)](#)  
**Subject:** Livable City supports Recreation and Parks" budget and revenue proposals, and R&P support community stewardship  
**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 4:00:49 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Tom Radulovich  
Livable City

**From:** [Nancy Jones](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Tennis Courts But Not Grass Fields, Really  
**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 4:55:30 PM

---

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

To Mayor Lurie and the Board of Supervisors:

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

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

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

Please think about the illogical step you plan to take.

Thank you.

Nancy Jones



**From:** [hello now](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 25, 2025 12:46:24 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      hello now  
Email                              hellonowforyou@gmail.com

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

Message:

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

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

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

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

Acquisition Method      Mobilization Method

---

**From:** [frantz.glasz](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:02:51 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [judith wing](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 11:42:22 AM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

Judy Wing  
District 2 resident  
159 Parker Ave  
94118

**From:** [Allison Stratton](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:48:20 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Allison Stratton

**From:** [ken garcia](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:10:18 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Mary DeVries](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 8:54:32 AM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Mary

Mary DeVries  
415.307.6122



**From:** [angie.glielmi](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:54:55 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Angie Glielmi

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Mary Kane](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:39:11 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Mary

**From:** [Peter Mueller](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:20:25 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Peter Mueller

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Mary DeVries](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:51:39 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Mary

Mary DeVries  
415.307.6122

**From:** [Kelsey](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:30:34 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks.

**From:** [debbie you](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 4:46:08 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Debbie



**From:** [Jennifer Leong](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 3:04:30 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Jennifer Leong

**From:** [Helen Vasquez](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 12:15:02 PM  
**Attachments:** [PastedGraphic-1.tiff](#)

---

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

BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

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



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



**From:** [Ellen Dai](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:35:01 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Ellen

**From:** [Margie Rogerson](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 9:51:26 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Margie Rogerson  
(415) 734-7305 cel  
(415) 921-4389

**From:** [Cyuaka Vu](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 6:13:06 AM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Cyuaka



**From:** [Billy Volkmann](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 6:11:06 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Billy Volkmann  
1 Locust.  
SF CA 94118

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Luisa Riccardi](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:53:14 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Dave Hollenberg](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:06:15 PM

---

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

Dear BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

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

**From:** [Jimmy Lin](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:33:29 PM

---

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

BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Jimmy

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jimmy Lin](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:32:46 PM

---

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

BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Jimmy

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Nancy Jones](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:29:43 PM

---

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

To Members of the Board of Supervisors

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.  
Nancy Jones



**From:** [Springer Teich](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:28:09 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Tony Oliver](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 7:45:45 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Mein En Lee](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 6:58:32 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [ANN CAPITAN](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 6:24:52 PM

---

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

BOS Members:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ann V. Capitan  
Native San Franciscan  
& Tennis Player

**From:** [shwang34@mail.ccsf.edu](mailto:shwang34@mail.ccsf.edu)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:33:01 PM

---

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

Hello,

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

~ Sara

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

**From:** [Kim Fleming](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:29:11 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [jennifer Lavins](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:28:00 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Jennifer Lavins  
1926 47th Avenue, SF, CA 94116  
415-753-1140



**From:** [jennifer Lavins](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:26:30 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Jenn

**From:** [Carlo Wong](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 4:01:33 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Carlo

**From:** [maywcbb@gmail.com](mailto:maywcbb@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 3:57:32 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
May Chong

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Louis Topper](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 3:10:39 PM

---

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

BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Louis

**From:** [Suzette Safdie](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 2:55:13 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Carlos Casellas](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:41:15 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Carlos Casellas Garza

**From:** [Stacie Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:43:10 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Stacie

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Sophia Luna](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:40:32 AM

---

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

BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Sophia

Envoyé de mon iPhone

**From:** [Celina Fine](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [sa207332@atsu.edu](mailto:sa207332@atsu.edu)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:31:39 AM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

-Celina Fine PA-S

303-912-4580

[Sa207332@atsu.edu](mailto:Sa207332@atsu.edu) or [Celinafine@gmail.com](mailto:Celinafine@gmail.com)

**Central Coast Physician Assistant Program**

A.T. Still University School of Health Sciences Class of 2023

**From:** [Farah Shirzadi](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:41:55 AM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

--

Farah Shirzadi  
[LinkedIn](#)

**From:** [Amy Xu](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:37:31 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Marshall Lambertson](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:34:54 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Marshall lambertson

**From:** [Vivienne Chow](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 12:52:00 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Amadeia Rector](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:52:35 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Amadeia Rector  
Resident of Potrero Hill  
Frequent user of the Jackson Park tennis courts and Potrero Hill Recreation Center tennis courts

**From:** [Thejas Prasad](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:22:14 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Thejas



**From:** [Beth Bedel](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:08:31 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Beth

**From:** [Stacy Suen](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:06:56 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Best,  
Stacy

**From:** [Erica Santos](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:48:34 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jacob Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:47:45 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Lance Zhou](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:45:01 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Lance Zhou

Lance Zhou  
Email: [lance.j.zhou@gmail.com](mailto:lance.j.zhou@gmail.com) | Phone: +1 857-210-6925 |

**From:** [Brandon Martinez](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:41:55 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Brandon Martinez, District 8 citizen

**From:** [Andrés Barraza](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:36:03 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Andrés Barraza

**From:** [devin.r.liu@gmail.com](mailto:devin.r.liu@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 9:15:41 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Devin



**From:** [Akshay Jha](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:52:23 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Akshay Jha

**From:** [Raaghav Devgon](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:46:07 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Arthur Lai](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:28:21 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Hazel Sun](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:14:35 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Adriana Angelini](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:12:58 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jatin Bhatia](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:10:25 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Miranda Chen](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:07:55 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Vince Wong](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:06:04 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Clara Aguiar Benedett](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:22:06 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**Clara Aguiar Benedett**

415 515 3878  
[claraabenedett@gmail.com](mailto:claraabenedett@gmail.com)

**From:** [Riss D](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:04:55 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Peter Su](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 6:34:55 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Peter Su

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jina Zhu](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 6:23:58 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Jina

**From:** [Sean Lee](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:51:39 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Sean Lee

**From:** [Sophia Mola](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:41:18 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Stephen Chang](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:24:49 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Stephen Chang

**From:** [Juliana](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:24:13 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,



**From:** [Yajun Gao](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:06:01 PM

---

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

Hi BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Yajun

**From:** [Eva Sinha](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 5:02:12 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [PC](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 4:38:36 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Patrick Colville  
3565 Market St, San Francisco 94131

**From:** [Toby Sachs-Quintana](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:56:04 PM

---

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

To the Esteemed Board Of Supervisors

I noticed that in the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). The revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting.

The framing is misleading; these points are not mutually exclusive. The RPD presentation occurred after public comment, with no chance for response. This denied the public a fair opportunity to address or rebut their statements.

As noted in public comment, raising Golden Gate parking meter rates by just 30 cents would replace all lost court fee revenue. This solution would protect jobs and preserve recreational programs. Please reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations] and consider alternatives that support community recreation.

Thanks,  
Toby

**From:** [Elizabeth Silvers](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:42:09 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

All my best,  
Elizabeth

**From:** [Chris Wilson](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:31:10 PM

---

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

BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Chris Wilson

**From:** [Flávia Oliveira](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:27:31 PM

---

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

BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Flávia Oliveira  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Danielle Fang](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:15:03 PM

---

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

Dear BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Danielle Fang



**From:** [Benjamin Malone](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:47:21 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Ben

**From:** [Mimi Dang](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:21:45 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Mimi

**From:** [harris nash](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 2:17:53 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

harris nash

**From:** [Kavya Ravikanti](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:21:37 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Kavya

**From:** [Anthony Bagnulo](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:19:05 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

-Anthony

**From:** [Vanessa C](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:14:10 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

**From:** [Morgan Scofield](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 1:05:49 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Morgan

**From:** [Julie Calnero](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:36:38 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,



**From:** [Czero100](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:19:30 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Margot

**From:** [Andre Natal](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:18:47 PM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

-----

Best,

André Natal  
[andrenatal.com](http://andrenatal.com)

**From:** [Indra Rucker](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:05:29 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Indra Rucker

**From:** [Lindsey Murphy](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:03:57 PM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [judy chow](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:03:26 PM

---

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

BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Magen Krage](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 12:01:49 PM

---

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

Dear BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Magen Krage

**From:** [Jake Whinnery](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:48:27 AM

---

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

BOS Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,  
Jake

**From:** [Danny](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:44:13 AM

---

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

## BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,



**From:** [Matthew Protacio](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:43:33 AM

---

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

#### BOS Members

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks,

Matthew Protacio  
Protac7@gmail.com

**From:** [westleyc30@gmail.com](mailto:westleyc30@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:37:10 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Westley Cho

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Christine Mai](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:36:53 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Michael O'Reilly](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:34:19 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

BOS Members In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday,

RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs. We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thank you,

Michael O'Reilly

**From:** [Christi Warren](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:29:47 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christi Warren  
Noe Valley

**From:** [Christi Warren](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:29:12 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christi Warren  
Noe Valley

**From:** [Victor Levin](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:28:51 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just the tennis and pickleball court fees.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance-250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,  
Victor Levin

**From:** [Collin Smith](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:23:18 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond.

We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting.

As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,  
Collin Smith



**From:** [Sharon Wong](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:20:49 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

**From:** [Anna Abrams](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:19:31 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,  
Anna Abrams  
Inner Sunset

**From:** [Bianca Alexis Villegas](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:18:57 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,  
Bianca

**From:** [Christian Rhally](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:18:07 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Christian

**From:** [Sanuja Das](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:41 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,  
Sunny

**From:** [Sanjay Prasad](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:19 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Billy Kurniawan](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:17:03 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

BOS Members In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive. Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community. When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees. This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs. We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented. Thanks,

**From:** [Daniel Dang](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:16:42 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Eric Jackson](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:16:35 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

**From:** [Nakul Chakrapani](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:11:02 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

#### BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Nakul

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Arianna Aldebot](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 11:08:34 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear BOS Members,

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, **the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's** items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, **an adjustment of just 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.**

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke today, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Arianna Aldebot, District 11

**From:** [Arjun Rao](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:26:58 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## BOS Members

In the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, RPD presented items 13-16 on sources of funding as a binary between keeping the employment and fees (specifically, court fees). This framing is misleading, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Their presentation was made after the public comment, and there was no opportunity to respond. We are not against all the fees, just against unfairly targeting the tennis community.

When compared with the other items, **the revenue from courts is minimal (~5%) of the revenue on RPD's** items 13-16 of the Budget and Appropriations meeting. As mentioned in the public comment, **an adjustment of iust 30 cents to the Golden Gate parking meters would cover the entire revenue generated from court fees.**

This would satisfy all the parties that spoke yesterday, including the employees at the golf course, RPD employees at risk of layoff, and those interested in the continuation of other recreational programs.

We continue to urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations], when better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thanks,

Arjun Rao

**From:** [Rick Yee](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Recreation and Parks Department Fee Proposal  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 9:30:41 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Whom it May Concern,

I am against RPD's proposal to charge a 'reservation fee' to use public facilities, especially pickleball and tennis courts. I am especially put off by their idea to charge pickleball 4 times as much to use the same court as tennis players. My reasoning: A single tennis court can accommodate 4 pickleball courts. To reserve the tennis court will cost \$5, but using the same court for pickleball will cost \$20. I think this is very unfair.

This fee will have a disproportionate impact on low income residents and seniors. It will discourage people on a fixed income from using facilities for exercise, recreation and social activities.

Thank You for your time,

Ricky Yee

**From:** [Nick Podell](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 8:00:33 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Nick Podell  
  
Email                              [nick@podell.com](mailto:nick@podell.com)

### **Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts**

Message:

Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Leslie Podell](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 7:59:32 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Leslie Podell  
Email                              lusher\_heckle\_0s@icloud.com

### **Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts**

Message:

Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

Thank You

---

**From:** [Ltw Jones](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Follow-up to Friday's discussion of RPD at the budget and appropriations meeting on Friday, agenda items 13-16  
**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 9:11:34 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to request that you vote against RPD's proposal to charge feed for use of public tennis and pickleball courts. The proposed fee is prejudiced against one of many activities managed by RPD.

Charging for only one activity is unfair. Why not charge for use of basketball courts, the polo field, the track at Kezar, the grassy areas used for baseball and soccer (these require a lot of maintenance) and playgrounds?

Consider charging usage fees at facilities that have working bathrooms because a working bathroom requires staff to check for supplies and cleanliness.

Currently RPD provides no maintenance at standalone public tennis and pickleball courts. That is evidenced by users of these courts bringing their own brooms to sweep the courts. A net at the Stern Grove tennis/pickleball courts has been broken for two months despite frequent requests that it be fixed. There are not enough nets for the pickleball courts at Rossi or Buena Vista. Will money raised from court fees be used solely to maintain tennis and pickleball courts, or will the money go into the general fund and be eligible for all RPD services?

Please take the time to consider the inequity of RPD's request.

I urge you to reject Ordinance -250603 [Park Code - Court Reservations] because better solutions that do not undermine community recreation exist and have been presented.

Thank you.



**From:** [Ted Wint](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment and Rebuttal to RPD Presentation  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 8:10:55 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I am a resident in the Marina and I'm writing to oppose the proposed fees on public tennis and pickleball courts.

Public courts provide affordable, accessible recreation and should not be the source of balancing the budget. I respectfully request that you vote against these fees at the upcoming meeting this Wednesday.

Thank you for your time and for keeping these public spaces free and open to everyone.

Sincerely,

Ted Wint



**Ted Wint**

[hello@tedwint.com](mailto:hello@tedwint.com)

510.493.1767 | [tedwint.com](http://tedwint.com)

Sent via [Superhuman iOS](#)

**From:** [Danny Talavera](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [SherrillStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Please Keep Tennis Reservations Free for All  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:27:11 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I grew playing tennis with my dad and two brothers in the city. I would never had had such an opportunity if there were financial barriers to accessing the courts.

Please reject this proposed barrier to our public spaces and vote no on court reservation fees.

Thank you,

Danny

**From:** [Maurice Rivers](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts  
**Date:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 7:26:29 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Message to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor

From your constituent      Maurice Rivers  
Email                              jumpstreet1983@gmail.com

### **Vote Against Charging for Use of Public Tennis Courts**

Message:

Dear San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department and the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed \$5/hour reservation fee for public tennis and pickleball courts. This policy undermines equitable access to public space and places a financial burden on the communities that San Francisco claims to prioritize. These courts are essential civic infrastructure, paid for with taxpayer dollars.

It should not be the public's burden to bail out city departments from the consequences of their own fiscal irresponsibility

Please reject the fee.

Respectfully,  
Maurice Rivers  
OMI Cultural Participation Project

---

**From:** [Celina](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Tennis rec fee,  
**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2025 2:27:27 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

My name is Celina Fine & I live in SF in district 5.

I wanted to communicate my high love for tennis & the court fee possibility,

I am one of 2k members of The Mission Athletic club, a volunteer led tennis club based in Mission SF. We have existed for >3yrs and are a club that focuses on community n& tennis.

Without tennis my mental health would be at risk, I am a primary care provider and being 1yr outside grad school & 1yr into living in SF my mental health, wellbeing and work success is due to this tennis club.

My dad also just passed about a month ago & this club has stepped up and been supportive -- moving my body through exercise has also helped increase my guilt path when negative neurotransmitters would have otherwise taken over.

In addition the courts are free: this means the foster kids mentioned today to the elderly trying to stay fit to the common SF population use this as a free resource that provides a vital impact on health.

As a medical primary care provider I understand and preach the importance of exercise, community and happiness as a core role in health longevity. Exercise is highly impactful in preventing cardiac risks - as my dad just passed from a cardiac event I understand this importance.

Some research for you from the New England Journal of Medicine,

- exercise, laughing with friends increases positive neurotransmitters: dopamine, serotonin which contribute to improved mood, resilience and neuroprotection and also decrease cardiac risk and prevent dementia.
- regular exercise is associated with 20-30% decrease in risk of heart attacks
- regular positive social interactions and laughing is associated with 45% decrease in coronary heart disease in individuals.
- Improved mental health through positive social engagement and enhanced positive neurotransmitters lowered mortality causes of death by 19-31%.

Please consider my plea to vote no against the tennis court & park rec fees.

Thank you,  
Celina Fine PA-C Primary Care district 5

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE  
MAYOR

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
From: Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director  
Date: May 30, 2025  
Re: Mayor's FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27 Budget Submission

RECEIVED AK  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2025 MAY 30 PM04:18

Madam Clerk,

In accordance with City and County of San Francisco Charter, Article IX, Section 9.100, the Mayor's Office hereby submits the Mayor's proposed budget by May 30<sup>th</sup>, corresponding legislation, and related materials for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-26 and FY 2026-27.

In addition to the Mayor's Proposed FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27 Budget Book, the following items are included in the Mayor's submission:

- Proposed Interim Budget and Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO)
- Proposed Interim Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO)
- Proposed Budget and Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO)
- Proposed Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO)
- Administrative Provisions for both, but separate documents of the AAO and ASO, in tracked changes, and on pleading paper
- Proposed Budget for the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
- A Transfer of Function letter detailing the transfer of positions from one City department to another
- An Interim Exception letter to the ASO
- PUC Capital Amendment and Debt Authorization
- Prop J Certification Letters
- A letter addressing funding levels for consumer price index increases for nonprofit corporations or public entities for the coming two fiscal years
- 40 pieces of trailing legislation
- Memo to the Board President requesting for 30-day rule waivers on ordinances

Please note the following:

- Technical adjustments to the June 1 budget are being prepared, but are not submitted with this set of materials.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in green ink, appearing to read "SK", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Sophia Kittler  
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors  
Budget & Legislative Analyst's Office  
Controller

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681  
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

No	DEPT	Item	Description	Type of Legislation	File #
1	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to modify the fees for the use of City Hall	Ordinance	250591
2	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to transfer responsibilities for oversight of the collection of sexual orientation and gender identity data from the City Administrator to the Human Rights Commission and removing obsolete reporting requirements	Ordinance	250593
3	ADM	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to clarify the status of the Treasure Island Development Authority ("TIDA") as a City department	Ordinance	250594
4	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Convention Facilities Management	Resolution	250615
5	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Security Services for RED Buildings	Resolution	250615
6	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Custodial Services for RED Buildings	Resolution	250615
7	ADM	Continuing Prop J	Security Guard Service at Central Shops	Resolution	250615
8	BOS	Continuing Prop J	Budget and Legislative Analyst Services	Resolution	250615
9	CON	Access Line Tax	Resolution concurring with the Controller's establishment of the Consumer Price Index for 2025, and adjusting the Access Line Tax by the same rate.	Resolution	250612
10	CON	Code Amendment	Amending the Administrative Code to eliminate the Budget Savings Incentive Fund	Ordinance	250595
11	CON	Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax	Adopting the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax designation ceiling for tax year 2025	Ordinance	250596
12	DBI	DBI Fee Changes	Amending the Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes to adjust fees charged by the Department of Building Inspection and to establish Subfunds within the Building Inspection Fund; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Ordinance	250592
13	DEC	Early Care and Education	Modifying the baseline funding requirements for early care and	Ordinance	250597



		Commercial Rents Tax Baseline	education programs in Fiscal Years (FYs) 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, to enable the City to use the interest earned from the Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax for those baseline programs		cont'd 250597
14	DPH	State Recurring Grants FY25-36	Authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of Recurring State grant funds by the San Francisco Department of Public Health for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2026	Resolution	250618
15	DPH	CCE Expansion Grant	Grant Agreement - California Department of Social Services - Community Care Expansion Program - Anticipated Revenue to the City \$9,895,834	Resolution	250619
16	DPH	Code Amendment	Various Codes - Environmental Health Permit, Fee, and Penalties Revisions	Ordinance	250606
17	DPH	HHIP Grant	Delegation of 9.118 Authority - Accept and Expend Grant - San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Housing and Homelessness Incentive Program ("HHIP") Expanding San Francisco Department of Public Health Recuperative Care Community Supports - \$2,489,698.63	Resolution	250620
18	DPH	IPP Grant	Delegation of 9.118 Authority - Accept and Expend Grant - San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Incentive Payment Program ("IPP") San Francisco Department of Public Health Epic Enhancement Implementation Project - \$6,000,000	Resolution	250621
19	DPH	Patient Revenues	Amending the Health Code to set patient rates for services provided by the Department of Public Health (DPH), for Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027; and authorizing DPH to waive or reduce fees to meet the needs of low-income patients through its	<del>Resolution</del> Ordinance	250607

			provision of charity care and other discounted <b>payment programs</b>		cont'd 250607
20	DPH	Continuing Prop J	Healthcare Security at Primary Care Clinics	Resolution	250615
21	DPW	DPW Fee Changes	Public Works, Subdivision Codes - Fee Modification and Waiver	Ordinance	250608
22	DPW	Continuing Prop J	Yard Operations and Street Tree Nursery	Resolution	250615
23	HOM	Continuing Prop J	Security Services	Resolution	250615
24	HOM	Continuing Prop J	Homelessness and Supportive Housing security services	Resolution	250615
25	HOM	Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund	Approving the FYs 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 Expenditure Plan for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund	Resolution	250613
26	HOM	Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax	Funding Reallocation - Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax - Services to Address Homelessness - \$88,495,000 Plus Future Revenue Through FY 2027-28	Ordinance	250609
27	LIB	Friends of the Library A&E	Annual Accept & Expend legislation for the SFPL's Friends of the Library Fund	Resolution	250614
28	MOHCD	Continuing Prop J	Treeline Security Inc services for City-owned properties in predevelopment for affordable housing sites	Resolution	250615
29	OCII	OCII Budget Resolution	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget	Resolution	250611
30	OCII	OCII Interim Budget Resolution	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Interim Budget	Resolution	250610
31	PDR	Crankstart Foundation Grant A&E	Accept and Expend Grant - Retroactive - Immigration Defense Unit - Crankstart Foundation - Amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance for FYs 2024-25 and 2025-26 - \$3,400,000	Ordinance	250598
32	POL	Code Amendment	Registration Fees and Fingerprint ID Fund	Ordinance	250599
33	PUC	Fixed Budget Amendment	Continues waiving certain small business first-year permit, license, and business registration fees	Ordinance	250602



34	REC	Bobo Estate A&E	Accept and Expend Bequest - Estate of William Benjamin Bobo - Benches, Park Furnishings and Park Improvements Across San Francisco - \$3,600,000	Resolution	250616
35	REC	Code Amendment	Amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Ordinance	250603
36	REC	Authorizing Paid Parking in Golden Gate Park	Authorizing the Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to set parking rates in Golden Gate Park in accordance with Park Code provisions that authorize SFMTA rate-setting on park property; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act	Resolution	250617
37	REC	Code Amendment	PUC Cost Recovery Fee	Ordinance	250604
38	REC	Code Amendment	Scholarship Recovery Fee	Ordinance	250605
39	REG	Continuing Prop J	Assembly and mailing of vote-by-mail ballot packets	Resolution	250615
40	SHF	Continuing Prop J	Jail Food Service	Resolution	250615

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE  
MAYOR

To: Rafael Mandelman, President of the Board of Supervisors  
From: Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director  
Date: May 30, 2025  
Re: 30-Day Waiver Requests

---

RECEIVED **Ak**  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2025 MAY 30 PM04:19

President Mandelman,

The Mayor's Office Respectfully requests 30-day hold waivers for the following pieces of trailing legislation:


- City Administrator's Office:
  - Administrative Code - City Hall Short Term License Fees
  - Administrative Code - Transferring Data Collection Oversight Duties from the City Administrator to the Human Rights Commission
  - Administrative Code - Treasure Island Development Authority
- Controller's Office:
  - Resolution Adjusting the Access Line Tax with the Consumer Price Index of 2025
  - Administrative Code - Eliminating Budget Savings Incentive Fund
  - Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund Tax Designation Ceiling
- Department of Building Inspection:
  - Building, Subdivision, and Administrative Codes - Fee Adjustment and Building Inspection Fund Subfunds
- Department of Early Childhood:
  - Business and Tax Regulations Code - Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax Baseline - FY 2025-2026 and 2026-2027
- Department of Public Health:
  - Accept and Expend Grants - Recurring State Grant Funds - Department of Public Health - FY2025-2026
  - Grant Agreement - California Department of Social Services - Community Care Expansion Program - Anticipated Revenue to the City \$9,895,834
  - Various Codes - Environmental Health Permit, Fee, and Penalties Revisions
  - Delegation of 9.118 Authority - Accept and Expend Grant - San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Housing and Homelessness Incentive Program ("HHIP") Expanding San Francisco Department of Public Health Recuperative Care Community Supports - \$2,489,698.63
  - Delegation of 9.118 Authority - Accept and Expend Grant - San Francisco Health Authority, a local governmental entity doing business as the San Francisco Health Plan ("Health Plan" or "SFHP") - Incentive Payment Program ("IPP") San Francisco Department of Public Health Epic Enhancement Implementation Project - \$6,000,000
  - Health Code - Patient Rates for Fiscal Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027
- Department of Public Works:
  - Public Works, Subdivision Codes - Fee Modification and Waiver
- Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing:
  - Homelessness and Supportive Housing Fund - FYs 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 Expenditure Plan

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681  
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

- Funding Reallocation - Our City, Our Home Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax - Services to Address Homelessness - \$88,495,000 Plus Future Revenue Through FY 2027-28
- Public Library:
  - Accept and Expend Grant - Friends of San Francisco Public Library - Annual Grant Award - Up to \$1,072,600 of In-Kind Gifts, Services, and Cash Monies - FY2025-2026
- Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure:
  - Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Budget
  - Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, operating as Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Fiscal Year 2025-26 Interim Budget
- Office of the Public Defender:
  - Accept and Expend Grant - Retroactive - Immigration Defense Unit - Crankstart Foundation - Amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance for FYs 2024-25 and 2025-26 - \$3,400,000
- Police Department:
  - Administrative Code - Vehicle Registration Fees and Police Fingerprint Identification Fund
- Public Utilities Commission:
  - De-appropriation – San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Capital Projects Budget - \$86,916 - FY2025-2026
  - De-appropriation – San Francisco Public Utilities Commission - \$12,990,064 - FY2025-2026
  - San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue Bond and Other Forms of Indebtedness Issuance - Not to Exceed \$1,054,138,857
- Recreation and Parks Department:
  - Accept and Expend Bequest - Estate of William Benjamin Bobo - Benches, Park Furnishings and Park Improvements Across San Francisco - \$3,600,000
  - Park Code - Court Reservations
  - Authorizing Paid Parking in Golden Gate Park
  - Park Code - Cost Recovery for Use of Golf Courses, Outdoor Event Facilities, Picnic Areas, and Athletic Fields
  - Park Code - Recreation Program Fees

Should you have any questions, please email Adam Thongsavat at [adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org](mailto:adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org).

Sincerely,



Sophia Kittler  
Mayor's Budget Director

President, District 8  
BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
Tel. No. 554-6968  
Fax No. 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

**RAFAEL MANDELMAN**

---

---

**PRESIDENTIAL ACTION**

Date:

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

---

---

Madam Clerk,

Pursuant to Board Rules, I am hereby:

Waiving 30-Day Rule (Board Rule No. 3.23)

File No.

(Primary Sponsor)

Title.

Transferring (Board Rule No 3.3)

File No.

(Primary Sponsor)

Title.

From:

Committee

To:

Committee

Assigning Temporary Committee Appointment (Board Rule No. 3.1)

Supervisor:

Replacing Supervisor:

For:

Meeting

(Date)

(Committee)

Start Time:

End Time:

Temporary Assignment:

Partial

Full Meeting

---

Rafael Mandelman, President  
Board of Supervisors

**BOARD of SUPERVISORS**



**City Hall**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102-4689**  
**Tel. No. (415) 554-5184**  
**Fax No. (415) 554-5163**  
**TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

---

Date: June 2, 2025  
To: Planning Department / Commission  
From: Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Appropriations Committee  
Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 250603  
Park Code - Court Reservations

---

- ☒ California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination  
(*California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.*)
  - ☒ Ordinance / Resolution
  - ☐ Ballot Measure
- ☐ Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  
(*Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review*)
  - ☐ General Plan    ☐ Planning Code, Section 101.1    ☐ Planning Code, Section 302
- ☐ Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning  
(*Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review*)
- ☐ General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments  
(*Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53*)  
(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)
- ☐ Historic Preservation Commission
  - ☐ Landmark (*Planning Code, Section 1004.3*)
  - ☐ Cultural Districts (*Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23*)
  - ☐ Mills Act Contract (*Government Code, Section 50280*)
  - ☐ Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings (*Planning Code, Article 11*)

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at [Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org).



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE  
MAYOR

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
From: Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director  
Date: May 30, 2025  
Re: Park Code - Court Reservations

RECEIVED **AK**  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2025 MAY 30 PM04:36

---

**Ordinance amending the Park Code to authorize the Recreation and Park Department to charge fees for reserving tennis/pickleball courts at locations other than the Golden Gate Park Tennis Center; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.**

Should you have any questions, please email Adam Thongsavat at [adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org](mailto:adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org).