

FILE NO. 260349

Petitions and Communications received from March 19, 2026, through April 2, 2026, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on April 7, 2026.

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

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18), making (re)appointments to the following bodies. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

- (Re)appointment pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 5.102, to the Veterans Affairs Commission:
  - o Joseph Baba - term ending March 17, 2027 (Reappointment)
  - o Aditya Lakshminarayan - term ending March 17, 2027 (Appointment)
- Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section F1.111; Administrative Code, Article V and Sections 5.30-5.36; to the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee:
  - o Patrick Boileau - term ending January 25, 2027

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100, submitting an Acting Mayor Notice designating Supervisor Stephen Sherrill as Acting-Mayor effective Saturday, March 21, 2026, from 8:45 a.m. until 11:59 p.m.; further designating President Rafael Mandelman as Acting-Mayor effective Sunday, March 22, 2026, from 12:00 a.m. until 11:59 p.m.; and further designating Supervisor Danny Sauter as Acting-Mayor effective Monday, March 23, 2026, from 12:00 a.m. until 11:59 p.m. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector (TTX), pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the Monthly Pooled Investment Report for the month of February 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the Department of Human Resources (DHR), the Police Department (SFPD), and the Department of Public Health, submitting responses to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Danny Sauter at the February 3, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 3.21, submitting a Memorandum regarding the approval of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Enterprise and Wastewater Enterprise Fiscal Years FY27 & FY28 Capital Budgets by the Capital Planning Committee. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Police Department (SFPD), submitting a report on the deployment of electronic location tracking devices. File No. 250979. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Office of Community Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA), submitting recommendations on priorities and service needs of immigrant communities provided by the Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC). Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), submitting Resolution No. 020325-01, Calling for Improvements to Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Infrastructure in San Francisco Parks and Open Spaces (also known as “Jessie’s Resolution”). Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS), submitting a summary of DAS funded grant reductions as of March, 2026. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the Arts Commission (ART), submitting an agenda for the April 6, 2026, Full Commission meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), submitting an agenda for the April 7, 2026, Entertainment Commission meeting, and the May 6, 2026, Entertainment Commission special meeting. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 23 A6(b), submitting annual update of the City’s surplus property list. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From the Planning Department (CPC), pursuant to Government Code Section 65400 and 65700, submitting a General Plan Annual Progress Report (APR) for Calendar Year (CY) 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From the Department of Public Works (DPW), submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Matt Dorsey at the January 27, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting, Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) minutes for the March 26, 2026, meeting and the agenda for the April 9, 2026 meeting. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Gen Fujioka, submitting a letter of resignation from the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms. 4 Forms. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From the Office of the Controller (CON), pursuant to Charter, Section 3.105, and Administrative Code, Chapter 2A.19, submitting the March 2026 update to the Five-Year Financial Plan (Joint Report). Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed changes in regulations regarding Central Valley and Klamath River Basin sport fishing; notice regarding the 2026 California recreational Pacific halibut fishery and automatic conformance of state regulations to federal regulations; agenda for the April 15-26, 2026, meeting; and announcement of new leadership. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), pursuant to General Order No. 159A, submitting notices of projects from Verizon Wireless. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) incident at the San Francisco International Airport. 11 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Ordinance amending the Health Code - Spaying, Neutering, and Sterilizing of Dogs. File No. 251162. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed housing development at 15 Marina Boulevard. 71 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Derek Lac, regarding various topics. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance repealing the existing San Francisco Fire Code in its entirety and enacting a new San Francisco Fire Code consisting of the 2025 California Fire Code and portions of the 2024 International Fire Code. Together with amendments specific to San Francisco, including provisions for fees for permits, inspections, and various City services, with an operative date of January 1, 2026. File No. 251247. 27 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution urging the California State Legislature and the Governor of California to allow local communities the right to vote on whether autonomous vehicles can operate in their counties. File No. 251117. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to, for transfers occurring on or after July 1, 2026: halve the real property transfer tax rate from 5.5% to 2.75% when the consideration or value of the property conveyed equals or exceeds \$10,000,000 but is less than \$25,000,000, and from 6% to 3% when the consideration or value equals or exceeds \$25,000,000;

exempt from these reductions the transfer of single-family residences; and reduce the penalties for delinquent real property transfer taxes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 260178. 77 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution expressing the intent of the City and County of San Francisco to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District to recognize and preserve the history, legacy, and living cultural traditions of the Irish and Irish American community in San Francisco's Sunset District. File No. 260267. 8 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From members of the public, regarding the Balboa Skate Park. 50 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From members of the public, regarding Cesar Chavez Street. 6 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From Kyle Whitney, regarding banning plastic cigarette filters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From Margot Warren-Bancquart, regarding the intersection of Ulloa and West Portal Avenue. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From Kevin Reed, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Health, Planning, Police, and Business and Tax Regulations Codes to establish a new permit type for cannabis cafés to be administered by the Office of Cannabis that will authorize the permittee to sell cannabis and cannabis products only for consumption on the premises of the café; exempt cannabis cafés from the prohibition on smoking in business establishments; eliminate the prohibition on establishments with a cannabis consumption permit requiring employees to enter a designated smoking room as a condition of employment; exempt cannabis cafés in certain circumstances from the 600-foot buffer rule that applies to cannabis retail establishments; restrict eligibility for cannabis café permits for one year to businesses that currently hold a cannabis storefront retailer permit or that have the same owners as such a business; require Equity Applicants that apply for a cannabis café permit to pay the \$2,000 application fee, any permit amendment processing costs, and the \$3,000 license fee for the first year of operation, associated with the cannabis café permit; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. File No. 260281. Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From Ferry Gunawan, regarding proposed E-Bike Incentive Program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)



From Stephanie Lehman, regarding the Department of Police Accountability. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From members of the public, regarding the intersection at 4th Street and Channel Street. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

From Lea McGeever, regarding Immigrations and Customs Enforcement incident in South of Market Area. Copy: Each Supervisor. (37)

From Richard Hylton, regarding the Ordinance approving the Police Surveillance Technology Policy for electronic location tracking devices and making required findings. File No. 250979. Copy: Each Supervisor. (38)

From members of the public, regarding the Commission Streamlining Task Force. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (39)

From the Moulton Coalition, regarding the Tesla Supercharger Station at 1965 Lombard. Copy: Each Supervisor. (40)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing (“PSH”) that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among residents (“Drug-Free PSH”) to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; bar the City from funding new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone (“Drug-Tolerant PSH”), except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding prohibition based on specific findings; and require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH’s strategies to meet PSH residents’ demands. File No. 251003. 41 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (41)

From Jonathan Weisman, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to authorize the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to establish a curbside electric vehicle charging station permit program for the installation and operation of curbside electric vehicle charging stations on City sidewalks and provide that permittees are not required to obtain a sidewalk encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works; amending the Public Works Code to reflect the authority of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to issue permits for the curbside electric vehicle charging station program; and affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 260238. Copy: Each Supervisor. (42)

From Anastasia Glikshtern, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Public Works Code to allow development projects to satisfy street tree planting requirements

through payment of an in lieu fee or providing alternative landscaping; exempt accessory dwelling units from street tree planting requirements; eliminate appeals to the Board of Appeals for tree removals undertaken by City departments and commissions; and update in lieu fee reporting requirements; amending the Administrative Code to create a separate account within the Adopt-A-Tree Fund to receive in lieu fees for street tree requirements; amending the Planning Code to update street tree applicability requirements; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302. File No. 251211. Copy: Each Supervisor. (43)

From members of the public, regarding the San Francisco budget. 27 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (44)

From Alejandro Chang, regarding cyclist and pedestrian interactions on Frederick Street (45)

From a member of the public, regarding adjusting permitted construction start time. Copy: Each Supervisor. (46)

From Michael Nulty, regarding the proposed Resolution approving and authorizing the Director of Property, on behalf of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS), to execute a lease agreement with Double Wood Investment, Inc., a California Corporation, as landlord, for use of a portion of 111 Pine Street, consisting of 47,482 rentable square feet for an initial term of 10 years with two five-year extension options to renew and 12 months of rent credit with an annual base rent of \$2,089,208 with 3% annual increases; SFERS to contribute up to \$4,748,200 on tenant improvement; effective upon approval of the Resolution by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor and upon execution of the lease by the Director of Property; and authorizing the Director of Property to execute any amendments, make certain modifications and take certain actions that do not materially increase the obligations or liabilities to the City, do not materially decrease the benefits to the City and are necessary or advisable to effectuate the purposes of the lease agreement or this Resolution. File No. 260017. Copy: Each Supervisor. (47)

From a member of the public, regarding Sunset Dunes. (48)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (49)

# Item 01

**From:** [Lagunte, Richard \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Mayoral appointments  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 3:17:12 PM  
**Attachments:** [3.30.26 Appointment Notice CGBOC.pdf](#)  
[3.30.26 Appointment Notice VAC.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached appointments.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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



## Notice of Appointment

March 30, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Administrative Code Chapter 5, Article V and § 5.30-5.36; Charter § F1.111 of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following:

Appointment of Patrick Boileau (seat 8) to the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending January 25, 2027 (previously held by Bartolomy Pantoja - resigned).

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

Should you have any questions, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

All my best,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "D. Lurie", written over a horizontal line.

Daniel Lurie  
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



## Notice of Appointment

March 31, 2026

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code §5.102, I make the following:

Reappointment of Joseph Baba (Seat 13) and appointment of Aditya Lakshminarayan (replacing Ikram Mansori, term ended – Seat 11), to the Veterans Affairs Commission for a four-year term ending March 17, 2027. Both candidates qualify for the seats listed in the attached vacancy notice.

I am confident that they will serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how their appointment represents the communities of interest of the City and County of San Francisco.

Should you have any questions about this appointment, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at (415) 554-4000.

All my best,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "DL", written over a light blue horizontal line.

Daniel Lurie  
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

# Item 02

**From:** [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Acting-Mayor Memo | 3.21.26  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 8:22:41 AM  
**Attachments:** [0884\\_001.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached communication from the Office of the Mayor, submitting an Acting-Mayor notice, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100, designating:

Supervisor Stephen Sherrill as Acting Mayor effective Saturday, March 21, 2026, from 8:45 AM until 11:59 PM;

Board President Rafael Mandelman as Acting Mayor effective Sunday, March 22, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and

Supervisor Danny Sauter as Acting Mayor effective Monday, March 23, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM.

—  
**Wilson L. Ng**  
Deputy Director of Operations  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Phone: (415) 554-5184  
Web: [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

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

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

---

**From:** Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 6:00:00 AM

**To:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Slaughter, Staci (MYR) <staci.slaughter@sfgov.org>; Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>; Zou, Han (MYR) <han.zou@sfgov.org>; Lutvak, Charles (MYR) <charles.lutvak@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Marie, Sophie (BOS) <sophie.marie@sfgov.org>; Huang, Grace (BOS) <Grace.ly.Huang@sfgov.org>; Bejoy, Renil (BOS) <renil.bejoy@sfgov.org>; Mathewson, Melanie (BOS) <melanie.mathewson@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Hebb, Jack (BOS) <jack.hebb@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; Del Rosario, Mick (BOS) <mick.delrosario@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Bell, Tita (BOS) <tita.bell@sfgov.org>; Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; Lee, Amy (BOS) <amy.lee5@sfgov.org>; RUSSI, BRAD (CAT) <Brad.Russi@sfcityatty.org>; PRADHAN, MANU (CAT) <Manu.Pradhan@sfcityatty.org>  
**Subject:** Acting-Mayor Memo | 3.21.26

Dear Clerk Calvillo:

Please see the attached memo designating Supervisor Stephen Sherrill as Acting Mayor effective Saturday, March 21, 2026, from 8:45 AM until 11:59 PM; Board President Rafael Mandelman as Acting Mayor effective Sunday, March 22, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and Supervisor Danny Sauter as Acting Mayor effective Monday, March 23, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM.

Please reach out if you have any questions — thank you.

Adam

Adam Thongsavat  
Liaison to the Board of Supervisors  
Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE  
MAYOR

March 21, 2026

Ms. Angela Calvillo  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100, I hereby designate Supervisor Stephen Sherrill as Acting Mayor effective Saturday, March 21, 2026, from 8:45 AM until 11:59 PM; Board President Rafael Mandelman as Acting Mayor effective Sunday, March 22, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM; and Supervisor Danny Sauter as Acting Mayor effective Monday, March 23, 2026, from 12:00 AM until 11:59 PM.

In the event I am delayed, I designate Supervisor Sauter to continue to be the Acting Mayor until my return to California.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "D. Lurie", written over a horizontal line.

Daniel Lurie  
Mayor

cc: Mr. David Chiu, City Attorney



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for February 2026  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 10:43:12 AM  
**Attachments:** [CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for February 2026.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

Good morning,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of February, 2026, pursuant to CA State Government Code, Section 53646.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <[ichieh.dion@sfgov.org](mailto:ichieh.dion@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2026 9:18 AM  
**To:** Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <[ichieh.dion@sfgov.org](mailto:ichieh.dion@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for February 2026

All-

Please find the CCSF Pooled Investment Report for the month of February attached for your use.

Regards,



**[Ichieh C. Dion](#)**  
*Investment Settlement Operations/Reporting*  
Investments  
Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector  
Office: 628.652.6404  
San Francisco only, call 311  
**[sftreasurer.org](http://sftreasurer.org)**



# Treasurer & Tax Collector

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

José Cisneros  
TREASURER

## Investment Report for the month of February 2026

March 15, 2026

The Honorable Daniel L. Lurie  
Mayor of San Francisco  
City Hall, Room 200  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of February 28, 2026. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of February 2026 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

### CCSF Pooled Fund Earnings Statistics

| Description                            | Current Month<br>Fiscal YTD | Current Month<br>February 2026 | Prior Month<br>Fiscal YTD | Prior Month<br>January 2026 |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Average Daily Balance (in \$ millions) | 17,307.4                    | 17,643.6                       | 17,263.6                  | 18,018.5                    |
| Net Earnings (in \$ millions)          | 435.3                       | 52.2                           | 383.2                     | 56.7                        |
| Earned Income Return                   | 3.78%                       | 3.85%                          | 3.77%                     | 3.71%                       |

### CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics: February 28, 2026

| Investment Type      | % of Portfolio | Book Value<br>(in \$ millions) | Market Value<br>(in \$ millions) | Wtd. Avg.    | Wtd. Avg. YTM | WAM        |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|------------|
| U.S. Treasuries      | 30.3%          | 5,391                          | 5,423                            | 3.18%        | 3.33%         | 780        |
| Federal Agencies     | 42.2%          | 7,515                          | 7,547                            | 3.54%        | 3.78%         | 710        |
| Negotiable CDs       | 10.9%          | 1,955                          | 1,956                            | 4.20%        | 4.20%         | 67         |
| Commercial Paper     | 5.9%           | 1,052                          | 1,052                            | 0.00%        | 4.10%         | 80         |
| Medium Term Notes    | 0.9%           | 163                            | 163                              | 3.98%        | 4.20%         | 390        |
| Money Market Funds   | 7.9%           | 1,418                          | 1,418                            | 3.60%        | 3.60%         | 1          |
| Supranationals       | 0.8%           | 141                            | 143                              | 3.33%        | 4.10%         | 713        |
| Secured Bank Deposit | 0.9%           | 166                            | 166                              | 3.60%        | 3.60%         | 1          |
| <b>Totals</b>        | <b>100.0%</b>  | <b>17,801</b>                  | <b>17,868</b>                    | <b>3.30%</b> | <b>3.70%</b>  | <b>557</b> |

In the remainder of this report, we provide additional information and analytics at the security-level and portfolio-level, as recommended by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission.

Respectfully,

José Cisneros  
Treasurer

cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Aimee Brown, Kevin Kone, Brenda Kwee McNulty, Nancy Hom  
Greg Wagner - Controller, Office of the Controller  
Mark de la Rosa - Director of Audits, Office of the Controller  
Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
San Francisco Public Library  
San Francisco Health Service System

# Portfolio Summary

## Pooled Fund

| Security Type                                        | Par Value<br>(in \$ millions) | Book Value<br>(in \$ millions) | Market Value<br>(in \$ millions) | Market Price /<br>Book Price | Current %<br>Allocation | Max. Policy<br>Allocation | Compliant? |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| U.S. Treasuries                                      | \$ 5,394.0                    | \$ 5,390.8                     | \$ 5,422.9                       | 100.60                       | 30.28%                  | 100%                      | Yes        |
| Federal Agencies                                     | 7,523.6                       | 7,515.5                        | 7,547.0                          | 100.42                       | 42.22%                  | 100%                      | Yes        |
| State & Local Government<br>Agency Obligations       | -                             | -                              | -                                | -                            | 0.00%                   | 20%                       | Yes        |
| Public Time Deposits                                 | -                             | -                              | -                                | -                            | 0.00%                   | 100%                      | Yes        |
| Negotiable CDs                                       | 1,955.0                       | 1,955.0                        | 1,956.2                          | 100.06                       | 10.98%                  | 30%                       | Yes        |
| Bankers Acceptances                                  | -                             | -                              | -                                | -                            | 0.00%                   | 40%                       | Yes        |
| Commercial Paper                                     | 1,061.0                       | 1,051.9                        | 1,052.0                          | 100.01                       | 5.91%                   | 25%                       | Yes        |
| Medium Term Notes                                    | 162.8                         | 162.6                          | 163.5                            | 100.53                       | 0.91%                   | 30%                       | Yes        |
| Repurchase Agreements                                | -                             | -                              | -                                | -                            | 0.00%                   | 10%                       | Yes        |
| Reverse Repurchase/<br>Securities Lending Agreements | -                             | -                              | -                                | -                            | 0.00%                   | \$75mm                    | Yes        |
| Money Market Funds                                   | 1,418.0                       | 1,418.0                        | 1,418.0                          | 100.00                       | 7.97%                   | 20%                       | Yes        |
| LAIF                                                 | -                             | -                              | -                                | -                            | 0.00%                   | \$50mm                    | Yes        |
| Supranationals                                       | 142.3                         | 141.2                          | 143.0                            | 101.26                       | 0.79%                   | 30%                       | Yes        |
| Secured Bank Deposit                                 | 165.7                         | 165.7                          | 165.7                            | 100.00                       | 0.93%                   | N/A                       | Yes        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                         | <b>\$ 17,822.5</b>            | <b>\$ 17,800.6</b>             | <b>\$ 17,868.2</b>               | <b>100.38</b>                | <b>100.00%</b>          | <b>-</b>                  | <b>Yes</b> |

The City and County of San Francisco uses the following methodology to determine compliance: Compliance is pre-trade and calculated on a book value basis of the overall portfolio value. Cash balances are included in the City's compliance calculations.



Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution.

The full Investment Policy can be found at <https://sftreasurer.org/banking-investments/investments>



Totals may not add due to rounding.

# Portfolio Analysis

## Pooled Fund



## Yield Curves



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name        | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon | Par Value   | Original Cost | Amortized Book | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797QD2 | U.S. Treasury Bill | 2/27/2026   | 4/16/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000  | 24,879,500    | 24,884,521     | 24,881,908   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 6/28/2021   | 4/30/2026     | 0.75   | 50,000,000  | 49,662,109    | 49,988,527     | 49,759,765   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/2/2021    | 4/30/2026     | 0.75   | 50,000,000  | 49,730,469    | 49,990,827     | 49,759,765   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797QN0 | U.S. Treasury Bill | 2/27/2026   | 5/14/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000  | 24,810,438    | 24,815,427     | 24,815,300   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/23/2021   | 5/15/2026     | 1.63   | 50,000,000  | 52,203,125    | 50,094,043     | 49,796,875   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/27/2021   | 5/15/2026     | 1.63   | 50,000,000  | 51,890,625    | 50,082,344     | 49,796,875   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHB0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/16/2025  | 5/15/2026     | 3.63   | 25,000,000  | 24,983,398    | 24,994,099     | 24,996,095   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797SW8 | U.S. Treasury Bill | 12/10/2025  | 5/28/2026     | 0.00   | 30,000,000  | 29,495,183    | 29,737,137     | 29,737,173   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797UA3 | U.S. Treasury Bill | 2/27/2026   | 6/16/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000  | 24,728,787    | 24,733,763     | 24,735,888   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/2/2021    | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 49,931,641    | 49,995,465     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/14/2021   | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 50,070,313    | 50,004,695     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/22/2021   | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 50,345,703    | 50,023,187     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/22/2021   | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 50,328,125    | 50,022,008     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/6/2021    | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 50,406,250    | 50,027,477     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/10/2021   | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 50,240,234    | 50,016,285     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 9/24/2021   | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 49,937,500    | 49,995,654     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/14/2021  | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 49,593,750    | 49,971,421     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 1/4/2022    | 6/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 49,027,344    | 49,928,149     | 49,544,920   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKY6 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/16/2025  | 6/30/2026     | 4.63   | 100,000,000 | 100,546,875   | 100,337,612    | 100,312,500  |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797TX5 | U.S. Treasury Bill | 2/19/2026   | 8/20/2026     | 0.00   | 100,000,000 | 98,230,556    | 98,327,778     | 98,276,890   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797TY3 | U.S. Treasury Bill | 2/26/2026   | 8/27/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000  | 24,554,226    | 24,561,574     | 24,570,418   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCW9 | U.S. Treasury Note | 9/28/2021   | 8/31/2026     | 0.75   | 50,000,000  | 49,449,219    | 49,943,942     | 49,296,875   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/8/2021   | 9/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 49,689,453    | 49,963,616     | 49,218,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/8/2021   | 9/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 49,671,875    | 49,961,556     | 49,218,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/19/2021  | 9/30/2026     | 0.88   | 50,000,000  | 49,318,359    | 49,919,652     | 49,218,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/3/2021   | 11/30/2026    | 1.25   | 50,000,000  | 50,072,266    | 50,010,862     | 49,156,250   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/7/2021   | 11/30/2026    | 1.25   | 50,000,000  | 50,117,188    | 50,017,652     | 49,156,250   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/29/2022   | 11/30/2026    | 1.25   | 50,000,000  | 47,078,125    | 49,530,994     | 49,156,250   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDQ1 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/29/2022   | 12/31/2026    | 1.25   | 50,000,000  | 47,107,422    | 49,492,384     | 49,072,265   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEF4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/6/2022    | 3/31/2027     | 2.50   | 25,000,000  | 24,757,813    | 24,947,437     | 24,741,210   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 6/26/2024   | 6/15/2027     | 4.63   | 50,000,000  | 50,199,219    | 50,086,561     | 50,708,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/9/2024    | 6/15/2027     | 4.63   | 50,000,000  | 50,292,969    | 50,128,841     | 50,708,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/8/2024   | 6/15/2027     | 4.63   | 50,000,000  | 50,906,250    | 50,435,555     | 50,708,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/15/2025   | 6/15/2027     | 4.63   | 50,000,000  | 50,603,516    | 50,373,529     | 50,708,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/8/2025    | 6/15/2027     | 4.63   | 50,000,000  | 50,667,969    | 50,444,998     | 50,708,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/9/2025    | 6/15/2027     | 4.63   | 50,000,000  | 50,654,297    | 50,436,507     | 50,708,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/25/2025   | 6/15/2027     | 4.63   | 50,000,000  | 50,632,813    | 50,431,963     | 50,708,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/21/2024   | 6/30/2027     | 3.25   | 50,000,000  | 48,203,125    | 49,269,832     | 49,875,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/3/2024    | 6/30/2027     | 3.25   | 50,000,000  | 48,113,281    | 49,224,898     | 49,875,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 9/26/2024   | 6/30/2027     | 3.25   | 50,000,000  | 49,683,594    | 49,847,295     | 49,875,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/25/2025   | 6/30/2027     | 3.25   | 50,000,000  | 49,398,438    | 49,585,306     | 49,875,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/12/2025  | 6/30/2027     | 3.25   | 50,000,000  | 49,728,516    | 49,778,250     | 49,875,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNV9 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/20/2025  | 8/31/2027     | 3.63   | 50,000,000  | 50,035,156    | 50,029,685     | 50,142,580   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNV9 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/21/2025  | 8/31/2027     | 3.63   | 75,000,000  | 75,058,594    | 75,049,552     | 75,213,870   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLL3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/1/2024   | 9/15/2027     | 3.38   | 50,000,000  | 49,785,156    | 49,887,899     | 49,968,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLQ2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/20/2025  | 10/15/2027    | 3.88   | 50,000,000  | 50,273,438    | 50,233,643     | 50,361,330   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLQ2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/18/2025  | 10/15/2027    | 3.88   | 75,000,000  | 75,363,281    | 75,309,520     | 75,541,995   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name        | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized Book | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPE5 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/18/2025  | 10/31/2027    | 3.50   | 75,000,000 | 74,835,938    | 74,859,671     | 75,020,250   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLX7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 2/12/2025   | 11/15/2027    | 4.13   | 61,000,000 | 60,692,617    | 60,809,337     | 61,726,760   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLX7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/12/2025  | 11/15/2027    | 4.13   | 70,000,000 | 70,738,281    | 70,628,496     | 70,833,987   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMB4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/16/2024  | 12/15/2027    | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,718,750    | 49,831,867     | 50,475,700   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMB4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/16/2024  | 12/15/2027    | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,712,891    | 49,828,364     | 50,475,700   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMB4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/8/2025   | 12/15/2027    | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 50,425,781    | 50,377,830     | 50,475,700   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMN8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/14/2025  | 2/15/2028     | 4.25   | 50,000,000 | 50,714,844    | 50,621,905     | 50,812,500   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMN8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/20/2025  | 2/15/2028     | 4.25   | 90,000,000 | 91,321,875    | 91,158,461     | 91,462,500   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 9128284N7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/9/2024    | 5/15/2028     | 2.88   | 65,000,000 | 61,082,227    | 62,890,631     | 64,314,452   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CND9 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/15/2025   | 5/15/2028     | 3.75   | 70,000,000 | 69,485,938    | 69,621,958     | 70,623,441   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNH0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/21/2025  | 6/15/2028     | 3.88   | 50,000,000 | 50,404,297    | 50,361,149     | 50,556,640   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNH0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 1/14/2026   | 6/15/2028     | 3.88   | 50,000,000 | 50,375,000    | 50,355,464     | 50,556,640   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 1/5/2024    | 6/30/2028     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,974,609    | 49,986,793     | 50,710,940   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 1/18/2024   | 6/30/2028     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,927,734    | 49,962,111     | 50,710,940   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 1/18/2024   | 6/30/2028     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,904,297    | 49,949,822     | 50,710,940   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 2/6/2024    | 6/30/2028     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,677,734    | 49,829,035     | 50,710,940   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 2/27/2024   | 6/30/2028     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,298,828    | 49,623,092     | 50,710,940   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/13/2024   | 6/30/2028     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 48,939,453    | 49,401,202     | 50,710,940   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHX2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/12/2023  | 8/31/2028     | 4.38   | 50,000,000 | 50,115,234    | 50,061,093     | 51,187,500   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHX2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/14/2025   | 8/31/2028     | 4.38   | 50,000,000 | 50,550,781    | 50,417,771     | 51,187,500   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNY3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/19/2025  | 9/15/2028     | 3.38   | 55,000,000 | 54,817,383    | 54,830,518     | 55,002,151   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPK1 | U.S. Treasury Note | 1/27/2026   | 11/15/2028    | 3.50   | 62,000,000 | 61,752,969    | 61,760,938     | 62,196,174   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CJW2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 1/27/2026   | 1/31/2029     | 4.00   | 55,000,000 | 55,524,219    | 55,508,492     | 55,941,017   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CJW2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/13/2025   | 1/31/2029     | 4.00   | 60,000,000 | 59,927,344    | 59,942,955     | 61,026,564   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CJW2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/8/2024   | 1/31/2029     | 4.00   | 65,000,000 | 65,266,602    | 65,180,497     | 66,112,111   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 9128286B1 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/11/2024   | 2/15/2029     | 2.63   | 50,000,000 | 45,710,938    | 47,379,579     | 48,937,500   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKD2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/8/2024    | 2/28/2029     | 4.25   | 50,000,000 | 49,773,438    | 49,861,172     | 51,218,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKD2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/13/2025   | 2/28/2029     | 4.25   | 75,000,000 | 75,568,359    | 75,448,705     | 76,828,125   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKP5 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/24/2024  | 4/30/2029     | 4.63   | 50,000,000 | 51,171,875    | 50,821,521     | 51,824,220   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKP5 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/20/2024  | 4/30/2029     | 4.63   | 51,000,000 | 51,448,242    | 51,325,482     | 52,860,704   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKT7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/23/2024  | 5/31/2029     | 4.50   | 50,000,000 | 51,039,063    | 50,733,710     | 51,675,780   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLC3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/1/2024   | 7/31/2029     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 51,046,875    | 50,740,646     | 50,820,500   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLC3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/24/2024  | 7/31/2029     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,888,672    | 49,920,197     | 50,820,500   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLC3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/7/2024   | 7/31/2029     | 4.00   | 65,000,000 | 65,563,672    | 65,400,149     | 66,066,650   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CFJ5 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/1/2024   | 8/31/2029     | 3.13   | 50,000,000 | 49,041,016    | 49,316,690     | 49,505,860   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CFJ5 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/3/2024   | 8/31/2029     | 3.13   | 65,000,000 | 63,664,453    | 64,047,315     | 64,357,618   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CFT3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/30/2025   | 10/31/2029    | 4.00   | 60,000,000 | 59,988,281    | 59,990,277     | 61,160,154   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLR0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 11/25/2024  | 10/31/2029    | 4.13   | 50,000,000 | 49,611,328    | 49,710,816     | 51,175,780   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CGQ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/10/2025   | 2/28/2030     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,927,734    | 49,940,892     | 51,003,905   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CGQ8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/10/2025  | 2/28/2030     | 4.00   | 75,000,000 | 75,785,156    | 75,743,886     | 76,505,858   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMZ1 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/22/2025   | 4/30/2030     | 3.88   | 50,000,000 | 49,468,750    | 49,552,089     | 50,787,110   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMZ1 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/8/2025   | 4/30/2030     | 3.88   | 60,000,000 | 60,478,125    | 60,453,384     | 60,944,532   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHF1 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/8/2025   | 5/31/2030     | 3.75   | 65,000,000 | 65,192,969    | 65,183,173     | 65,700,785   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/9/2025   | 7/31/2030     | 3.88   | 50,000,000 | 50,267,578    | 50,254,633     | 50,674,100   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/9/2025   | 7/31/2030     | 3.88   | 50,000,000 | 50,257,813    | 50,245,340     | 50,674,100   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/10/2025  | 7/31/2030     | 3.88   | 50,000,000 | 50,251,953    | 50,239,906     | 50,674,100   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/16/2025  | 7/31/2030     | 3.88   | 50,000,000 | 50,367,188    | 50,350,873     | 50,674,100   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                     | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon      | Par Value            | Original Cost        | Amortized Book       | Market Value         |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 12/16/2025  | 7/31/2030     | 3.88        | 50,000,000           | 50,343,750           | 50,328,477           | 50,674,100           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPA3 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 10/22/2025  | 9/30/2030     | 3.63        | 50,000,000           | 50,160,156           | 50,148,615           | 50,277,345           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPA3 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 10/24/2025  | 9/30/2030     | 3.63        | 50,000,000           | 50,097,656           | 50,090,720           | 50,277,345           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPA3 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 10/24/2025  | 9/30/2030     | 3.63        | 50,000,000           | 50,054,688           | 50,050,803           | 50,277,345           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPD7 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 12/8/2025   | 10/31/2030    | 3.63        | 60,000,000           | 59,779,688           | 59,789,915           | 60,318,750           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPR6 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 1/16/2026   | 12/31/2030    | 3.63        | 50,000,000           | 49,703,125           | 49,710,342           | 50,251,955           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPR6 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 1/20/2026   | 12/31/2030    | 3.63        | 50,000,000           | 49,562,500           | 49,572,190           | 50,251,955           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPR6 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 1/7/2026    | 12/31/2030    | 3.63        | 60,000,000           | 59,737,500           | 59,745,148           | 60,302,346           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                                 |             |               | <b>3.18</b> | <b>5,394,000,000</b> | <b>5,382,595,643</b> | <b>5,390,770,019</b> | <b>5,422,913,403</b> |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/2/2023   | 3/13/2026     | 4.88        | 10,000,000           | 9,953,900            | 9,999,358            | 10,007,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/2/2023   | 3/13/2026     | 4.88        | 10,000,000           | 9,950,700            | 9,999,314            | 10,007,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/2/2023   | 3/13/2026     | 4.88        | 10,000,000           | 9,950,700            | 9,999,314            | 10,007,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 4/5/2024    | 3/13/2026     | 4.88        | 25,000,000           | 25,053,750           | 25,000,912           | 25,017,500           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 4/2/2024    | 3/13/2026     | 4.88        | 36,730,000           | 36,803,460           | 36,731,242           | 36,755,711           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EP5K7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/2/2024    | 3/13/2026     | 4.50        | 50,000,000           | 49,758,000           | 49,995,910           | 50,027,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 912797SZ1 | U.S. Treasury Bill              | 2/27/2026   | 3/17/2026     | 0.00        | 25,000,000           | 24,954,844           | 24,959,861           | 24,955,710           |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385VE3 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 1/5/2026    | 4/6/2026      | 0.00        | 24,500,000           | 24,279,218           | 24,412,658           | 24,404,940           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMZ21 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/9/2021    | 4/6/2026      | 0.69        | 15,500,000           | 15,458,150           | 15,499,114           | 15,450,555           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/8/2022    | 4/8/2026      | 2.64        | 20,000,000           | 19,961,200           | 19,998,991           | 19,976,400           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/8/2022    | 4/8/2026      | 2.64        | 30,000,000           | 29,941,800           | 29,998,486           | 29,964,600           |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385VP8 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 9/2/2025    | 4/15/2026     | 0.00        | 25,000,000           | 24,403,125           | 24,880,625           | 24,880,675           |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385WN2 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 10/16/2025  | 5/8/2026      | 0.00        | 25,000,000           | 24,490,000           | 24,830,000           | 24,823,725           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVWS7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/10/2023   | 6/12/2026     | 3.75        | 17,045,000           | 16,991,479           | 17,040,117           | 17,052,227           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVWS7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/17/2023   | 6/12/2026     | 3.75        | 20,000,000           | 19,939,200           | 19,994,419           | 20,008,480           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWAH3 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/1/2023    | 6/12/2026     | 4.00        | 10,000,000           | 9,934,300            | 9,993,887            | 10,009,150           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWAH3 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/1/2023    | 6/12/2026     | 4.00        | 15,000,000           | 14,899,350           | 14,990,635           | 15,013,725           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWLZ1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/10/2023   | 6/12/2026     | 4.75        | 50,000,000           | 49,856,000           | 49,986,112           | 50,156,500           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B1BT3 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/18/2024   | 6/12/2026     | 4.88        | 13,485,000           | 13,505,093           | 13,487,858           | 13,532,481           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERHD6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/18/2024   | 6/12/2026     | 4.88        | 20,000,000           | 20,030,400           | 20,004,325           | 20,065,800           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERHD6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/18/2024   | 6/12/2026     | 4.88        | 32,000,000           | 32,051,200           | 32,007,284           | 32,105,280           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2026     | 4.25        | 20,000,000           | 19,969,200           | 19,997,021           | 20,033,200           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2026     | 4.25        | 24,700,000           | 24,640,226           | 24,694,219           | 24,741,002           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2026     | 4.25        | 30,000,000           | 29,951,400           | 29,995,300           | 30,049,800           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/23/2023   | 6/23/2026     | 4.38        | 25,000,000           | 24,986,750           | 24,998,622           | 25,054,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/23/2023   | 6/23/2026     | 4.38        | 25,000,000           | 24,986,750           | 24,998,622           | 25,054,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/23/2023   | 6/23/2026     | 4.38        | 50,000,000           | 49,973,500           | 49,997,244           | 50,109,500           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPVP7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 9/8/2023    | 7/8/2026      | 4.75        | 10,000,000           | 9,991,700            | 9,998,965            | 10,038,900           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPVP7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 9/8/2023    | 7/8/2026      | 4.75        | 19,000,000           | 18,984,800           | 18,998,104           | 19,073,910           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPVP7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 9/8/2023    | 7/8/2026      | 4.75        | 21,000,000           | 20,982,780           | 20,997,852           | 21,081,690           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/19/2021   | 7/13/2026     | 1.05        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,752,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/19/2021   | 7/13/2026     | 1.05        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,752,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/19/2021   | 7/13/2026     | 1.05        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,752,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/19/2021   | 7/13/2026     | 1.05        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,752,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385ZG4 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 1/6/2026    | 7/13/2026     | 0.00        | 15,000,000           | 14,729,358           | 14,807,096           | 14,797,350           |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385ZS8 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 1/6/2026    | 7/23/2026     | 0.00        | 15,000,000           | 14,715,375           | 14,793,000           | 14,782,500           |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385ZT6 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 1/6/2026    | 7/24/2026     | 0.00        | 50,000,000           | 49,043,694           | 49,303,194           | 49,270,500           |



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                     | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized Book | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/20/2021   | 7/27/2026     | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,730,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/20/2021   | 7/27/2026     | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,730,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/20/2021   | 7/27/2026     | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,730,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/20/2021   | 7/27/2026     | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,730,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZY4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 10/30/2023  | 7/30/2026     | 5.00   | 3,000,000  | 2,991,930     | 2,998,786      | 3,017,100    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZY4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 10/30/2023  | 7/30/2026     | 5.00   | 9,615,000  | 9,589,136     | 9,611,110      | 9,669,806    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZY4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 10/30/2023  | 7/30/2026     | 5.00   | 16,000,000 | 15,956,960    | 15,993,527     | 16,091,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZY4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 10/30/2023  | 7/30/2026     | 5.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,936,750    | 24,990,487     | 25,142,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385A97 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 1/13/2026   | 8/7/2026      | 0.00   | 10,000,000 | 9,800,867     | 9,846,300      | 9,841,600    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2021   | 8/10/2026     | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,703,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2021   | 8/10/2026     | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,703,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2021   | 8/10/2026     | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,703,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2021   | 8/10/2026     | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,703,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385B47 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 1/13/2026   | 8/10/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,495,642    | 24,609,062     | 24,596,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385B62 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 1/13/2026   | 8/12/2026     | 0.00   | 51,000,000 | 49,961,265    | 50,192,642     | 50,167,170   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385B88 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 2/17/2026   | 8/14/2026     | 0.00   | 22,900,000 | 22,500,872    | 22,527,780     | 22,521,600   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPSW6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/14/2023   | 8/14/2026     | 4.50   | 50,000,000 | 49,885,000    | 49,982,582     | 50,184,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 2/25/2026   | 8/24/2026     | 0.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,734,875    | 14,740,767     | 14,737,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 2/25/2026   | 8/24/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,558,125    | 24,567,944     | 24,562,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 2/25/2026   | 8/24/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,558,125    | 24,567,944     | 24,562,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/1/2021   | 9/3/2026      | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,664,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/1/2021   | 9/3/2026      | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,664,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/1/2021   | 9/3/2026      | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,664,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/1/2021   | 9/3/2026      | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,664,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2PJ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2024   | 9/4/2026      | 3.63   | 19,000,000 | 18,974,730    | 18,993,446     | 18,999,430   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2PJ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2024   | 9/4/2026      | 3.63   | 25,000,000 | 24,966,750    | 24,991,376     | 24,999,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2PJ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2024   | 9/4/2026      | 3.63   | 25,900,000 | 25,865,553    | 25,891,066     | 25,899,223   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2PJ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2024   | 9/4/2026      | 3.63   | 50,000,000 | 49,933,500    | 49,982,752     | 49,998,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM4X7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/12/2023  | 9/10/2026     | 0.80   | 28,975,000 | 26,174,277    | 28,436,077     | 28,530,813   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXCP1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/18/2023  | 9/11/2026     | 4.88   | 11,895,000 | 11,821,965    | 11,881,621     | 11,972,793   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385G91 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 2/24/2026   | 9/24/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,483,986    | 24,496,156     | 24,491,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385G91 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 2/24/2026   | 9/24/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,483,986    | 24,496,156     | 24,491,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385G91 | Federal Home Loan Bank Discount | 2/24/2026   | 9/24/2026     | 0.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,483,986    | 24,496,156     | 24,491,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3A29 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/11/2024  | 10/9/2026     | 4.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,996,850    | 14,999,039     | 15,037,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3A29 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/11/2024  | 10/9/2026     | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,994,750    | 24,998,399     | 25,063,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3A29 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/11/2024  | 10/9/2026     | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,994,750    | 24,998,399     | 25,063,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3A29 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/11/2024  | 10/9/2026     | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,989,500    | 49,996,798     | 50,126,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/18/2021  | 10/19/2026    | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,641,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/18/2021  | 10/19/2026    | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,641,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/18/2021  | 10/19/2026    | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,641,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/18/2021  | 10/19/2026    | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,641,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZA6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 10/20/2023  | 10/20/2026    | 4.88   | 14,000,000 | 13,904,940    | 13,979,791     | 14,102,480   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZA6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 10/20/2023  | 10/20/2026    | 4.88   | 30,000,000 | 29,834,100    | 29,964,731     | 30,219,600   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJS7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 5/29/2025   | 11/10/2026    | 4.00   | 12,600,000 | 12,581,352    | 12,591,063     | 12,621,672   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 12/16/2021  | 11/16/2026    | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,633,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 12/16/2021  | 11/16/2026    | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,633,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 12/16/2021  | 11/16/2026    | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,633,250   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name              | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized Book | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 12/16/2021  | 11/16/2026    | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,633,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXU63 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 11/17/2023  | 11/17/2026    | 4.63   | 50,000,000 | 49,911,500    | 49,978,925     | 50,350,700   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 1/14/2022   | 12/14/2026    | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,607,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 1/14/2022   | 12/14/2026    | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,607,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 1/14/2022   | 12/14/2026    | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,607,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 1/14/2022   | 12/14/2026    | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,607,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET5B9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/22/2025  | 12/22/2026    | 3.50   | 15,000,000 | 14,993,850    | 14,995,013     | 14,986,350   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET5B9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/22/2025  | 12/22/2026    | 3.50   | 37,000,000 | 36,984,830    | 36,987,698     | 36,966,330   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET5B9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/22/2025  | 12/22/2026    | 3.50   | 45,000,000 | 44,981,550    | 44,985,038     | 44,959,050   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERWR8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 10/8/2024   | 1/7/2027      | 3.50   | 12,500,000 | 12,373,750    | 12,452,022     | 12,483,263   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 1/29/2024   | 1/15/2027     | 4.13   | 12,000,000 | 11,973,000    | 11,992,015     | 12,043,296   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 12/9/2025   | 1/15/2027     | 4.13   | 20,000,000 | 20,101,800    | 20,081,035     | 20,072,160   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 1/29/2024   | 1/15/2027     | 4.13   | 25,000,000 | 24,943,750    | 24,983,364     | 25,090,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 1/29/2024   | 1/15/2027     | 4.13   | 29,350,000 | 29,283,963    | 29,330,470     | 29,455,895   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 1/29/2024   | 1/15/2027     | 4.13   | 50,000,000 | 49,887,500    | 49,966,728     | 50,180,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/25/2024   | 1/25/2027     | 4.13   | 5,000,000  | 4,992,850     | 4,997,847      | 5,022,050    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/25/2024   | 1/25/2027     | 4.13   | 10,000,000 | 9,986,600     | 9,995,965      | 10,044,100   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/25/2024   | 1/25/2027     | 4.13   | 25,000,000 | 24,968,500    | 24,990,516     | 25,110,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/25/2024   | 1/25/2027     | 4.13   | 35,000,000 | 34,955,900    | 34,986,722     | 35,154,350   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/25/2024   | 1/25/2027     | 4.13   | 50,000,000 | 49,933,000    | 49,979,827     | 50,220,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4A6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 2/18/2025   | 2/18/2027     | 4.25   | 2,000,000  | 1,997,860     | 1,998,962      | 2,011,840    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4A6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 2/18/2025   | 2/18/2027     | 4.25   | 25,000,000 | 24,974,250    | 24,987,513     | 25,148,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4A6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 2/18/2025   | 2/18/2027     | 4.25   | 30,000,000 | 29,967,600    | 29,984,288     | 30,177,600   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERD24 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/18/2024  | 2/18/2027     | 4.25   | 30,000,000 | 29,983,500    | 29,992,894     | 30,177,600   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETUE5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/22/2025   | 2/22/2027     | 3.75   | 15,000,000 | 14,980,050    | 14,986,991     | 15,025,515   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETUE5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/22/2025   | 2/22/2027     | 3.75   | 25,000,000 | 24,967,500    | 24,978,807     | 25,042,525   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETUE5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/22/2025   | 2/22/2027     | 3.75   | 35,000,000 | 34,950,650    | 34,967,819     | 35,059,535   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETUE5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/22/2025   | 2/22/2027     | 3.75   | 40,000,000 | 39,946,800    | 39,965,309     | 40,068,040   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJF5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 5/23/2025   | 2/23/2027     | 4.00   | 10,000,000 | 9,993,800     | 9,996,528      | 10,027,820   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJF5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 5/23/2025   | 2/23/2027     | 4.00   | 45,000,000 | 44,972,100    | 44,984,374     | 45,125,190   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 3/22/2022   | 3/8/2027      | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,689,650   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 3/22/2022   | 3/8/2027      | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,689,650   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 3/22/2022   | 3/8/2027      | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,689,650   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 3/22/2022   | 3/8/2027      | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,689,650   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENRD4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 3/16/2022   | 3/10/2027     | 1.68   | 48,573,000 | 47,432,020    | 48,338,535     | 47,670,514   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EP6K6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/2/2024    | 3/26/2027     | 4.50   | 50,000,000 | 49,910,000    | 49,967,739     | 50,524,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/6/2022    | 4/5/2027      | 2.60   | 22,500,000 | 22,392,338    | 22,476,403     | 22,265,775   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/6/2022    | 4/5/2027      | 2.60   | 24,500,000 | 24,377,010    | 24,473,043     | 24,244,955   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/6/2022    | 4/5/2027      | 2.60   | 25,000,000 | 24,804,000    | 24,957,041     | 24,739,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B0TY5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 4/11/2024   | 4/9/2027      | 4.75   | 17,000,000 | 16,955,120    | 16,983,411     | 17,220,728   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B0TY5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 4/11/2024   | 4/9/2027      | 4.75   | 20,000,000 | 19,947,200    | 19,980,484     | 20,259,680   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B0TY5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 4/11/2024   | 4/9/2027      | 4.75   | 40,000,000 | 39,894,400    | 39,960,968     | 40,519,360   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B0TY5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 4/11/2024   | 4/9/2027      | 4.75   | 48,000,000 | 47,873,280    | 47,953,161     | 48,623,232   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERDS7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 5/13/2024   | 5/6/2027      | 4.75   | 12,727,000 | 12,740,236    | 12,732,243     | 12,904,414   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/17/2022  | 5/17/2027     | 4.13   | 4,650,000  | 4,646,792     | 4,649,136      | 4,681,016    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/17/2022  | 5/17/2027     | 4.13   | 5,000,000  | 4,996,550     | 4,999,071      | 5,033,350    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/17/2022  | 5/17/2027     | 4.13   | 21,000,000 | 20,987,001    | 20,996,501     | 21,140,070   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name              | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized Book | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/17/2022  | 5/17/2027     | 4.13   | 25,000,000 | 24,982,750    | 24,995,357     | 25,166,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPP66 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/20/2023  | 5/20/2027     | 4.00   | 31,000,000 | 30,905,760    | 30,966,370     | 31,161,820   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPP66 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/20/2023  | 5/20/2027     | 4.00   | 58,850,000 | 58,662,269    | 58,783,007     | 59,157,197   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 6/13/2025   | 6/4/2027      | 3.88   | 10,000,000 | 9,986,700     | 9,991,515      | 10,048,070   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 6/13/2025   | 6/4/2027      | 3.88   | 13,000,000 | 12,982,710    | 12,988,969     | 13,062,491   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 6/13/2025   | 6/4/2027      | 3.88   | 16,500,000 | 16,478,055    | 16,485,999     | 16,579,316   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 6/13/2025   | 6/4/2027      | 3.88   | 20,000,000 | 19,973,400    | 19,983,029     | 20,096,140   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 6/13/2025   | 6/4/2027      | 3.88   | 36,000,000 | 35,952,120    | 35,969,452     | 36,173,052   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 7/19/2022   | 6/11/2027     | 3.50   | 10,000,000 | 10,141,500    | 10,036,958     | 9,985,500    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 7/19/2022   | 6/11/2027     | 3.50   | 12,375,000 | 12,552,829    | 12,421,446     | 12,357,056   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 7/20/2022   | 6/11/2027     | 3.50   | 21,725,000 | 22,016,550    | 21,801,191     | 21,693,499   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AX4E5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 5/13/2024   | 6/11/2027     | 4.50   | 11,000,000 | 10,937,190    | 10,973,904     | 11,137,522   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B1EF0 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 7/10/2024   | 6/11/2027     | 4.63   | 20,700,000 | 20,795,634    | 20,741,896     | 20,983,362   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMV4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2027     | 4.13   | 28,940,000 | 28,911,928    | 28,930,950     | 29,145,416   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZK9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/7/2022    | 6/28/2027     | 3.24   | 27,865,000 | 28,099,066    | 27,927,349     | 27,727,904   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJZ5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/28/2024   | 6/28/2027     | 4.50   | 30,000,000 | 29,985,840    | 29,993,741     | 30,364,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERVR9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 9/30/2024   | 7/1/2027      | 3.50   | 55,000,000 | 54,925,200    | 54,963,718     | 54,957,760   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERKM2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/9/2024    | 7/8/2027      | 4.50   | 25,000,000 | 25,033,250    | 25,015,014     | 25,310,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERKM2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/10/2024   | 7/8/2027      | 4.50   | 25,000,000 | 25,025,500    | 25,011,525     | 25,310,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERMB4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/23/2024   | 7/23/2027     | 4.25   | 10,000,000 | 9,996,500     | 9,998,373      | 10,099,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERMB4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/23/2024   | 7/23/2027     | 4.25   | 15,000,000 | 14,994,750    | 14,997,560     | 15,149,700   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETSX6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/11/2025   | 8/11/2027     | 3.63   | 5,000,000  | 4,989,950     | 4,992,731      | 5,004,950    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETSX6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/11/2025   | 8/11/2027     | 3.63   | 5,000,000  | 4,989,750     | 4,992,586      | 5,004,950    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETSX6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/11/2025   | 8/11/2027     | 3.63   | 7,000,000  | 6,985,930     | 6,989,823      | 7,006,930    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBM6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 2/23/2023   | 8/23/2027     | 4.13   | 10,000,000 | 9,974,000     | 9,991,449      | 10,089,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B82L5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/9/2025   | 10/4/2027     | 3.50   | 20,000,000 | 19,959,400    | 19,967,408     | 20,001,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B82L5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/9/2025   | 10/4/2027     | 3.50   | 25,000,000 | 24,949,250    | 24,959,260     | 25,002,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B82L5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/9/2025   | 10/4/2027     | 3.50   | 41,000,000 | 40,916,770    | 40,933,186     | 41,003,690   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B82L5 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/9/2025   | 10/4/2027     | 3.50   | 50,000,000 | 49,898,500    | 49,918,520     | 50,004,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET6R3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/8/2026    | 10/8/2027     | 3.38   | 15,000,000 | 14,977,650    | 14,979,472     | 14,966,790   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERXJ5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 10/15/2024  | 10/15/2027    | 3.88   | 5,000,000  | 4,997,250     | 4,998,511      | 5,025,745    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERXJ5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 10/15/2024  | 10/15/2027    | 3.88   | 8,000,000  | 7,996,160     | 7,997,920      | 8,041,192    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETM95 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 10/27/2025  | 10/27/2027    | 3.38   | 9,320,000  | 9,298,844     | 9,302,466      | 9,301,984    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETM95 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 10/27/2025  | 10/27/2027    | 3.38   | 60,000,000 | 59,863,800    | 59,887,122     | 59,884,020   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER2Z3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 2/4/2025    | 11/3/2027     | 4.25   | 5,000,000  | 4,999,350     | 4,999,603      | 5,057,100    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER2Z3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 2/4/2025    | 11/3/2027     | 4.25   | 41,880,000 | 41,877,738    | 41,878,619     | 42,358,270   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC60 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/15/2023  | 11/15/2027    | 4.63   | 27,950,000 | 27,834,008    | 27,900,459     | 28,462,603   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC60 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/15/2023  | 11/15/2027    | 4.63   | 33,300,000 | 33,161,472    | 33,240,834     | 33,910,722   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJ51 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/17/2024  | 12/10/2027    | 4.13   | 21,000,000 | 20,936,790    | 20,962,295     | 21,205,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJ51 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/17/2024  | 12/10/2027    | 4.13   | 25,505,000 | 25,428,485    | 25,459,358     | 25,754,949   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJ51 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/17/2024  | 12/10/2027    | 4.13   | 33,000,000 | 32,893,080    | 32,936,221     | 33,323,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJ51 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/17/2024  | 12/10/2027    | 4.13   | 38,343,000 | 38,227,588    | 38,274,156     | 38,718,761   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN5N6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/17/2025  | 1/6/2028      | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 50,486,000    | 50,438,048     | 50,488,900   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET6K8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/14/2026   | 1/7/2028      | 3.38   | 23,480,000 | 23,403,690    | 23,408,545     | 23,435,623   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET6K8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/7/2026    | 1/7/2028      | 3.38   | 30,000,000 | 29,941,500    | 29,945,747     | 29,943,300   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET6K8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/7/2026    | 1/7/2028      | 3.38   | 46,000,000 | 45,910,300    | 45,916,812     | 45,913,060   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERT84 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/14/2025   | 1/14/2028     | 4.25   | 29,750,000 | 29,575,963    | 29,641,286     | 30,092,125   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name              | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized Book | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET2W6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/8/2025   | 1/20/2028     | 3.50   | 5,000,000  | 4,991,800     | 4,992,680      | 5,002,400    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EWAU4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/21/2026   | 1/21/2028     | 3.50   | 35,000,000 | 34,926,150    | 34,930,095     | 35,025,550   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EWAU4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/21/2026   | 1/21/2028     | 3.50   | 35,000,000 | 34,926,150    | 34,930,095     | 35,025,550   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERZ46 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/31/2025   | 1/28/2028     | 4.25   | 47,000,000 | 46,976,030    | 46,984,679     | 47,673,040   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERZ46 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/31/2025   | 1/28/2028     | 4.25   | 50,000,000 | 49,974,500    | 49,983,701     | 50,716,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EP5S0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/9/2024    | 3/20/2028     | 4.25   | 4,971,000  | 4,916,667     | 4,942,721      | 5,044,173    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJZ1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/11/2025   | 6/5/2028      | 3.88   | 7,370,000  | 7,342,584     | 7,349,199      | 7,408,729    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJZ1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/5/2025    | 6/5/2028      | 3.88   | 25,000,000 | 24,957,250    | 24,967,742     | 25,131,375   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGL9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/26/2024   | 6/7/2028      | 4.50   | 14,934,000 | 14,962,076    | 14,950,141     | 15,256,126   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGL9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/7/2024    | 6/7/2028      | 4.50   | 15,000,000 | 14,994,600    | 14,996,936     | 15,323,550   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGL9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/26/2024   | 6/7/2028      | 4.50   | 20,000,000 | 20,037,600    | 20,021,616     | 20,431,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWC24 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 5/14/2025   | 6/9/2028      | 4.00   | 10,000,000 | 9,996,600     | 9,997,482      | 10,120,140   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETNU7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/7/2025    | 7/3/2028      | 3.75   | 22,500,000 | 22,424,175    | 22,440,632     | 22,640,130   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETNU7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/8/2025    | 7/3/2028      | 3.75   | 25,000,000 | 24,904,000    | 24,924,766     | 25,155,700   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETNU7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/7/2025    | 7/3/2028      | 3.75   | 50,000,000 | 49,829,500    | 49,866,504     | 50,311,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPSK2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/7/2023    | 8/7/2028      | 4.25   | 19,500,000 | 19,412,250    | 19,457,254     | 19,849,577   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/28/2023   | 8/28/2028     | 4.50   | 10,000,000 | 9,979,100     | 9,989,579      | 10,225,360   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/28/2023   | 8/28/2028     | 4.50   | 15,000,000 | 14,962,800    | 14,981,451     | 15,338,040   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/28/2023   | 8/28/2028     | 4.50   | 25,000,000 | 24,943,500    | 24,971,827     | 25,563,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 8/28/2023   | 8/28/2028     | 4.50   | 33,000,000 | 32,904,960    | 32,952,610     | 33,743,688   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET4Y0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/22/2025  | 9/22/2028     | 3.50   | 10,000,000 | 9,997,600     | 9,997,765      | 10,006,300   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET4Y0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/22/2025  | 9/22/2028     | 3.50   | 20,000,000 | 19,995,200    | 19,995,530     | 20,012,600   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERHN4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/20/2024   | 10/20/2028    | 4.25   | 5,000,000  | 4,972,100     | 4,983,010      | 5,087,000    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERHN4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/20/2024   | 10/20/2028    | 4.25   | 38,000,000 | 37,785,300    | 37,869,254     | 38,661,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETL70 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/26/2025  | 10/24/2028    | 3.38   | 5,000,000  | 4,977,650     | 4,979,647      | 4,986,750    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETL70 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/26/2025  | 10/24/2028    | 3.38   | 25,000,000 | 24,890,000    | 24,899,831     | 24,933,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETL70 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/26/2025  | 10/24/2028    | 3.38   | 30,000,000 | 29,865,900    | 29,877,884     | 29,920,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC45 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/13/2023  | 11/13/2028    | 4.63   | 12,000,000 | 11,984,040    | 11,991,369     | 12,327,600   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC45 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/13/2023  | 11/13/2028    | 4.63   | 20,000,000 | 19,971,600    | 19,984,642     | 20,546,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC45 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 11/13/2023  | 11/13/2028    | 4.63   | 55,000,000 | 54,922,285    | 54,957,973     | 56,501,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3GD9 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/28/2024  | 11/27/2028    | 4.00   | 47,025,000 | 46,940,355    | 46,968,116     | 47,563,436   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET2S5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 12/9/2025   | 11/28/2028    | 3.38   | 35,000,000 | 34,735,750    | 34,755,721     | 34,919,780   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EJ5J4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 1/8/2026    | 1/16/2029     | 3.19   | 10,000,000 | 9,891,400     | 9,896,515      | 9,916,910    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVBD3 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 4/9/2024    | 3/9/2029      | 4.50   | 25,000,000 | 25,018,750    | 25,011,532     | 25,736,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EP5U5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/8/2024    | 3/20/2029     | 4.13   | 51,660,000 | 51,008,309    | 51,257,878     | 52,569,733   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERDH1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 5/8/2024    | 4/30/2029     | 4.75   | 27,892,000 | 28,191,755    | 28,082,603     | 28,934,882   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERDH1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 5/8/2024    | 4/30/2029     | 4.75   | 30,000,000 | 30,317,400    | 30,201,823     | 31,121,700   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERDH1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 5/8/2024    | 4/30/2029     | 4.75   | 63,085,000 | 63,763,795    | 63,516,621     | 65,443,748   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B1BC0 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 7/31/2025   | 6/8/2029      | 4.63   | 9,705,000  | 9,943,355     | 9,907,297      | 10,044,597   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/26/2024   | 6/11/2029     | 4.25   | 10,000,000 | 9,967,600     | 9,978,567      | 10,227,590   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/26/2024   | 6/11/2029     | 4.25   | 10,000,000 | 9,967,600     | 9,978,567      | 10,227,590   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/26/2024   | 6/11/2029     | 4.25   | 20,000,000 | 19,935,200    | 19,957,134     | 20,455,180   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/26/2024   | 6/11/2029     | 4.25   | 29,000,000 | 28,923,730    | 28,949,546     | 29,660,011   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2XR1 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/2/2024   | 7/2/2029      | 4.01   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,933,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2XR1 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/2/2024   | 7/2/2029      | 4.01   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,933,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2XR1 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/2/2024   | 7/2/2029      | 4.01   | 65,000,000 | 65,000,000    | 65,000,000     | 64,826,125   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name              | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized Book | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERKX8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/12/2024   | 7/12/2029     | 4.25   | 20,000,000 | 19,989,200    | 19,992,731     | 20,474,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 9/27/2024   | 9/14/2029     | 4.13   | 15,000,000 | 15,392,700    | 15,280,067     | 15,307,095   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/29/2024  | 9/14/2029     | 4.13   | 15,000,000 | 15,048,300    | 15,035,066     | 15,307,095   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/29/2024  | 9/14/2029     | 4.13   | 15,000,000 | 15,043,200    | 15,031,363     | 15,307,095   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 8/11/2025   | 9/14/2029     | 4.13   | 17,000,000 | 17,204,170    | 17,176,583     | 17,348,041   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 10/29/2024  | 9/14/2029     | 4.13   | 25,590,000 | 25,663,699    | 25,643,505     | 26,113,904   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | Fannie Mae               | 10/1/2025   | 10/1/2029     | 4.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,986,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | Fannie Mae               | 10/1/2025   | 10/1/2029     | 4.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,986,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | Fannie Mae               | 10/1/2025   | 10/1/2029     | 4.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,986,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | Fannie Mae               | 10/1/2025   | 10/1/2029     | 4.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,986,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | Fannie Mae               | 10/1/2025   | 10/1/2029     | 4.08   | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000    | 50,000,000     | 49,973,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKN6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/9/2025    | 10/9/2029     | 4.00   | 10,000,000 | 9,987,500     | 9,989,593      | 10,147,240   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKN6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/9/2025    | 10/9/2029     | 4.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,981,250    | 14,984,389     | 15,220,860   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | Fannie Mae               | 10/15/2025  | 10/15/2029    | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,966,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | Fannie Mae               | 10/15/2025  | 10/15/2029    | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,966,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | Fannie Mae               | 10/15/2025  | 10/15/2029    | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,966,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | Fannie Mae               | 10/15/2025  | 10/15/2029    | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,966,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | Fannie Mae               | 10/15/2025  | 10/15/2029    | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000    | 50,000,000     | 49,932,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | Fannie Mae               | 11/7/2025   | 11/7/2029     | 4.05   | 25,000,000 | 24,998,750    | 24,998,848     | 24,986,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | Fannie Mae               | 11/7/2025   | 11/7/2029     | 4.05   | 25,000,000 | 24,998,750    | 24,998,848     | 24,986,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | Fannie Mae               | 11/7/2025   | 11/7/2029     | 4.05   | 25,000,000 | 24,998,750    | 24,998,848     | 24,986,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | Fannie Mae               | 11/7/2025   | 11/7/2029     | 4.05   | 25,000,000 | 24,998,750    | 24,998,848     | 24,986,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | Fannie Mae               | 11/7/2025   | 11/7/2029     | 4.05   | 50,000,000 | 49,997,500    | 49,997,695     | 49,972,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJV0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 5/30/2025   | 11/30/2029    | 4.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,945,400    | 14,954,528     | 15,209,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJV0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 5/30/2025   | 11/30/2029    | 4.00   | 23,000,000 | 22,922,030    | 22,935,064     | 23,321,080   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | Fannie Mae               | 1/16/2026   | 1/16/2030     | 4.06   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,930,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | Fannie Mae               | 1/16/2026   | 1/16/2030     | 4.06   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,930,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | Fannie Mae               | 1/16/2026   | 1/16/2030     | 4.06   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,930,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | Fannie Mae               | 1/16/2026   | 1/16/2030     | 4.06   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000     | 24,930,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | Fannie Mae               | 1/16/2026   | 1/16/2030     | 4.06   | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000    | 50,000,000     | 49,861,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4H1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 3/25/2025   | 1/18/2030     | 4.50   | 12,815,000 | 13,022,219    | 12,982,070     | 13,212,778   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4H1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 3/25/2025   | 1/18/2030     | 4.50   | 18,000,000 | 18,289,620    | 18,233,506     | 18,558,720   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETME4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/23/2025   | 1/23/2030     | 4.00   | 5,000,000  | 4,989,550     | 4,991,116      | 5,082,130    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETME4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/23/2025   | 1/23/2030     | 4.00   | 14,450,000 | 14,418,788    | 14,423,465     | 14,687,356   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETME4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/23/2025   | 1/23/2030     | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,946,000    | 24,954,092     | 25,410,650   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER7L9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/10/2025   | 3/18/2030     | 4.00   | 8,695,000  | 8,671,610     | 8,675,827      | 8,809,426    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/9/2025    | 4/1/2030      | 4.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,993,700    | 14,994,830     | 15,243,900   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/9/2025    | 4/1/2030      | 4.00   | 32,260,000 | 32,243,870    | 32,246,762     | 32,784,548   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/10/2025   | 4/1/2030      | 4.00   | 43,020,000 | 42,904,276    | 42,924,975     | 43,719,505   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/9/2025    | 4/1/2030      | 4.00   | 46,750,000 | 46,732,703    | 46,735,804     | 47,510,155   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 4/15/2025   | 4/1/2030      | 4.00   | 50,000,000 | 49,527,500    | 49,610,944     | 50,813,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/9/2025    | 6/10/2030     | 4.00   | 9,750,000  | 9,746,100     | 9,746,610      | 9,921,181    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/10/2025   | 6/10/2030     | 4.00   | 10,000,000 | 9,974,000     | 9,977,759      | 10,175,570   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/9/2025    | 6/10/2030     | 4.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,998,650    | 14,998,827     | 15,263,355   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/10/2025   | 6/10/2030     | 4.00   | 20,000,000 | 19,945,000    | 19,952,952     | 20,351,140   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 6/23/2025   | 6/10/2030     | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,965,000    | 24,969,846     | 25,438,925   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWGS3 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 7/9/2025    | 6/14/2030     | 4.13   | 12,515,000 | 12,579,452    | 12,571,042     | 12,757,278   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name              | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon      | Par Value            | Original Cost        | Amortized Book       | Market Value         |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWGS3 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 6/23/2025   | 6/14/2030     | 4.13        | 16,000,000           | 16,063,200           | 16,054,470           | 16,309,744           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank   | 11/20/2025  | 6/14/2030     | 4.38        | 31,000,000           | 31,899,000           | 31,844,531           | 32,012,770           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETLM7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/8/2025    | 6/17/2030     | 4.00        | 10,070,000           | 10,077,855           | 10,076,828           | 10,241,462           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETLM7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/8/2025    | 6/17/2030     | 4.00        | 15,000,000           | 15,012,900           | 15,011,213           | 15,255,405           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETLM7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/9/2025    | 6/17/2030     | 4.00        | 16,944,000           | 16,937,222           | 16,938,105           | 17,232,505           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETLM7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/8/2025    | 6/17/2030     | 4.00        | 41,000,000           | 41,035,260           | 41,030,650           | 41,698,107           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | Freddie Mac              | 12/24/2025  | 6/24/2030     | 4.04        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,980,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | Freddie Mac              | 12/24/2025  | 6/24/2030     | 4.04        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,980,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | Freddie Mac              | 12/24/2025  | 6/24/2030     | 4.04        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,980,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | Freddie Mac              | 12/24/2025  | 6/24/2030     | 4.04        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,980,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | Freddie Mac              | 12/24/2025  | 6/24/2030     | 4.04        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 49,960,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | Fannie Mae               | 1/12/2026   | 7/1/2030      | 4.11        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,999,250           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | Fannie Mae               | 1/12/2026   | 7/1/2030      | 4.11        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,999,250           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | Fannie Mae               | 1/12/2026   | 7/1/2030      | 4.11        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,999,250           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | Fannie Mae               | 1/12/2026   | 7/1/2030      | 4.11        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,999,250           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | Fannie Mae               | 1/12/2026   | 7/1/2030      | 4.11        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 49,998,500           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETPF8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank | 7/14/2025   | 7/8/2030      | 3.75        | 20,000,000           | 19,776,200           | 19,804,482           | 20,193,500           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | Fannie Mae               | 9/30/2025   | 9/30/2030     | 4.03        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,989,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | Fannie Mae               | 9/30/2025   | 9/30/2030     | 4.03        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,989,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | Fannie Mae               | 9/30/2025   | 9/30/2030     | 4.03        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,989,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | Fannie Mae               | 9/30/2025   | 9/30/2030     | 4.03        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 24,989,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | Fannie Mae               | 9/30/2025   | 9/30/2030     | 4.03        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 49,978,000           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | Freddie Mac              | 12/23/2025  | 12/23/2030    | 4.18        | 23,000,000           | 23,000,000           | 23,000,000           | 23,014,490           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | Freddie Mac              | 12/23/2025  | 12/23/2030    | 4.18        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,015,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | Freddie Mac              | 12/23/2025  | 12/23/2030    | 4.18        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,015,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | Freddie Mac              | 12/23/2025  | 12/23/2030    | 4.18        | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,000,000           | 25,015,750           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | Freddie Mac              | 12/23/2025  | 12/23/2030    | 4.18        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,031,500           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                          |             |               | <b>3.54</b> | <b>7,523,629,000</b> | <b>7,507,567,227</b> | <b>7,515,491,566</b> | <b>7,546,969,829</b> |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JGQ4 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY  | 5/29/2025   | 3/6/2026      | 4.38        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,006,500           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DEG7 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY | 5/29/2025   | 3/11/2026     | 4.41        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,009,500           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JJ81 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY  | 6/25/2025   | 3/16/2026     | 4.29        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,030,000          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DHC3 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY | 6/20/2025   | 3/16/2026     | 4.40        | 60,000,000           | 60,000,000           | 60,000,000           | 60,016,200           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130AA24 | Westpac Banking Corp/NY  | 5/20/2025   | 3/16/2026     | 4.35        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,025,000          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130AA65 | Westpac Banking Corp/NY  | 5/28/2025   | 3/23/2026     | 4.38        | 140,000,000          | 140,000,000          | 140,000,000          | 140,060,200          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DRH0 | Bank of Montreal/CHI     | 6/25/2025   | 3/24/2026     | 4.33        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,022,500           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DRJ6 | Bank of Montreal/CHI     | 6/25/2025   | 3/25/2026     | 4.33        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,023,500           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JJQ1 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY  | 7/9/2025    | 4/7/2026      | 4.33        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,028,000           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06418NJE3 | Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU  | 8/21/2025   | 4/20/2026     | 4.20        | 125,000,000          | 125,000,000          | 125,000,000          | 125,078,750          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06418NJK9 | Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU  | 9/3/2025    | 4/23/2026     | 4.11        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,037,000          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JMC8 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY  | 8/21/2025   | 4/23/2026     | 4.18        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,073,000          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130AZZ4 | Westpac Banking Corp/NY  | 5/15/2025   | 5/4/2026      | 4.35        | 125,000,000          | 125,000,000          | 125,000,000          | 125,126,250          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DRZ0 | Bank of Montreal/CHI     | 8/5/2025    | 6/1/2026      | 4.17        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,089,000          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DSQ9 | Bank of Montreal/CHI     | 9/9/2025    | 6/9/2026      | 4.00        | 46,000,000           | 46,000,000           | 46,000,000           | 46,037,720           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DS97 | Bank of Montreal/CHI     | 8/18/2025   | 6/15/2026     | 4.20        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,104,000          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DSR7 | Bank of Montreal/CHI     | 9/9/2025    | 6/15/2026     | 4.00        | 54,000,000           | 54,000,000           | 54,000,000           | 54,045,360           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DNV4 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY | 1/5/2026    | 6/15/2026     | 3.78        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 99,989,000           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130AC22 | Westpac Banking Corp/NY  | 6/20/2025   | 6/15/2026     | 4.32        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,127,000          |



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name              | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon      | Par Value            | Original Cost        | Amortized Book       | Market Value         |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DSV8 | Bank of Montreal/CHI     | 9/24/2025   | 6/17/2026     | 3.98        | 55,000,000           | 55,000,000           | 55,000,000           | 55,024,200           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DK96 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY | 12/11/2025  | 6/23/2026     | 3.85        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,003,000           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06418NHV7 | Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU  | 7/24/2025   | 7/1/2026      | 4.27        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,179,000          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JL88 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY  | 8/14/2025   | 7/1/2026      | 4.06        | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,000,000          | 100,098,000          |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DKD7 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY | 12/11/2025  | 7/1/2026      | 3.85        | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,000,000           | 50,003,500           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                          |             |               | <b>4.07</b> | <b>1,955,000,000</b> | <b>1,955,000,000</b> | <b>1,955,000,000</b> | <b>1,956,236,180</b> |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MC92 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 6/18/2025   | 3/9/2026      | 0.00        | 130,000,000          | 125,891,133          | 129,875,489          | 129,854,660          |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MCQ4 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 7/7/2025    | 3/24/2026     | 0.00        | 100,000,000          | 96,930,556           | 99,728,472           | 99,738,000           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MD67 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 7/28/2025   | 4/6/2026      | 0.00        | 110,000,000          | 106,712,100          | 109,530,300          | 109,564,840          |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MDN0 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 9/3/2025    | 4/22/2026     | 0.00        | 51,000,000           | 49,668,093           | 50,700,177           | 50,710,983           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HEL4 | Toyota Motor Credit      | 9/9/2025    | 5/20/2026     | 0.00        | 55,000,000           | 53,488,676           | 54,522,111           | 54,531,125           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HEN0 | Toyota Motor Credit      | 8/27/2025   | 5/22/2026     | 0.00        | 100,000,000          | 96,970,111           | 99,072,944           | 99,126,800           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MF16 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 12/11/2025  | 6/1/2026      | 0.00        | 30,000,000           | 29,451,033           | 29,706,367           | 29,707,020           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HF33 | Toyota Motor Credit      | 9/9/2025    | 6/3/2026      | 0.00        | 60,000,000           | 58,264,500           | 59,389,000           | 59,401,440           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MFF5 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 1/6/2026    | 6/15/2026     | 0.00        | 65,000,000           | 63,922,444           | 64,286,119           | 64,274,535           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MFJ7 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 12/11/2025  | 6/18/2026     | 0.00        | 15,000,000           | 14,699,175           | 14,826,508           | 14,828,115           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MFP3 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 12/11/2025  | 6/23/2026     | 0.00        | 50,000,000           | 48,970,722           | 49,395,167           | 49,402,300           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MFV0 | MUFG Bank Ltd/NY         | 12/11/2025  | 6/29/2026     | 0.00        | 25,000,000           | 24,469,444           | 24,681,667           | 24,685,200           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HG16 | Toyota Motor Credit      | 10/27/2025  | 7/1/2026      | 0.00        | 70,000,000           | 68,184,550           | 69,103,300           | 69,099,870           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HGE8 | Toyota Motor Credit      | 12/16/2025  | 7/14/2026     | 0.00        | 75,000,000           | 73,359,375           | 73,945,313           | 73,940,250           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HGQ1 | Toyota Motor Credit      | 12/16/2025  | 7/24/2026     | 0.00        | 75,000,000           | 73,285,833           | 73,870,208           | 73,867,575           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HGV0 | Toyota Motor Credit      | 12/16/2025  | 7/29/2026     | 0.00        | 50,000,000           | 48,834,375           | 49,222,917           | 49,219,300           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                          |             |               | <b>0.00</b> | <b>1,061,000,000</b> | <b>1,033,102,122</b> | <b>1,051,856,059</b> | <b>1,051,952,013</b> |
| Medium Term Notes  | 594918CN2 | Microsoft                | 7/9/2024    | 9/15/2026     | 3.40        | 6,452,000            | 6,270,957            | 6,407,080            | 6,441,928            |
| Medium Term Notes  | 594918CN2 | Microsoft                | 7/9/2024    | 9/15/2026     | 3.40        | 13,009,000           | 12,645,919           | 12,918,912           | 12,988,693           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 14913UAN0 | Caterpillar              | 9/18/2024   | 10/16/2026    | 4.45        | 18,385,000           | 18,600,288           | 18,450,041           | 18,470,858           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 89236TMY8 | Toyota Motors            | 1/9/2025    | 1/8/2027      | 4.60        | 40,000,000           | 39,978,000           | 39,990,554           | 40,312,800           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 037833CJ7 | Apple                    | 9/18/2024   | 2/9/2027      | 3.35        | 50,000,000           | 49,586,000           | 49,836,579           | 49,863,000           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 24422EXV6 | John Deere               | 9/6/2024    | 7/15/2027     | 4.20        | 10,000,000           | 9,998,600            | 9,999,327            | 10,069,800           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 24422EYD5 | John Deere               | 6/5/2025    | 6/5/2028      | 4.25        | 25,000,000           | 24,977,750           | 24,983,211           | 25,305,000           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                          |             |               | <b>3.98</b> | <b>162,846,000</b>   | <b>162,057,514</b>   | <b>162,585,704</b>   | <b>163,452,079</b>   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment   | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                                 | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Coupon      | Par Value             | Original Cost         | Amortized Book        | Market Value          |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Money Market Funds   | 09248U718 | BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund            | 2/28/2026   | 3/1/2026      | 3.56        | 14,694,137            | 14,694,137            | 14,694,137            | 14,694,137            |
| Money Market Funds   | 31607A703 | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 2/28/2026   | 3/1/2026      | 3.59        | 354,824,027           | 354,824,027           | 354,824,027           | 354,824,027           |
| Money Market Funds   | 608919718 | Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund      | 2/28/2026   | 3/1/2026      | 3.59        | 16,320,330            | 16,320,330            | 16,320,330            | 16,320,330            |
| Money Market Funds   | 262006208 | Dreyfus Government Cash Management          | 2/28/2026   | 3/1/2026      | 3.55        | 15,287,528            | 15,287,528            | 15,287,528            | 15,287,528            |
| Money Market Funds   | 85749T517 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 2/28/2026   | 3/1/2026      | 3.60        | 724,135,526           | 724,135,526           | 724,135,526           | 724,135,526           |
| Money Market Funds   | 61747C319 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 2/28/2026   | 3/1/2026      | 3.60        | 292,782,656           | 292,782,656           | 292,782,656           | 292,782,656           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                             |             |               | <b>3.60</b> | <b>1,418,044,205</b>  | <b>1,418,044,205</b>  | <b>1,418,044,205</b>  | <b>1,418,044,205</b>  |
| Supranational        | 459058KC6 | Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev                | 9/12/2025   | 11/16/2026    | 2.25        | 55,000,000            | 54,035,300            | 54,416,693            | 54,438,450            |
| Supranational        | 459058KJ1 | Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev                | 7/17/2024   | 6/15/2027     | 3.13        | 12,323,000            | 11,934,333            | 12,150,787            | 12,260,892            |
| Supranational        | 4581X0EN4 | Inter-American Development Bank             | 4/9/2024    | 2/15/2029     | 4.13        | 25,000,000            | 24,630,000            | 24,774,202            | 25,436,000            |
| Supranational        | 4581X0EN4 | Inter-American Development Bank             | 7/17/2024   | 2/15/2029     | 4.13        | 50,000,000            | 49,827,000            | 49,888,180            | 50,872,000            |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                             |             |               | <b>3.33</b> | <b>142,323,000</b>    | <b>140,426,633</b>    | <b>141,229,862</b>    | <b>143,007,342</b>    |
| Secured Bank Deposit | 0660P0999 | Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct        | 2/28/2026   | 3/1/2026      | 3.60        | 165,655,743           | 165,655,743           | 165,655,743           | 165,655,743           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                             |             |               | <b>3.60</b> | <b>165,655,743</b>    | <b>165,655,743</b>    | <b>165,655,743</b>    | <b>165,655,743</b>    |
| <b>Grand Totals</b>  |           |                                             |             |               | <b>3.29</b> | <b>17,822,497,947</b> | <b>17,764,449,086</b> | <b>17,800,633,156</b> | <b>17,868,230,794</b> |



# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description        | Par Value   | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797PM3 | B 0.000 02/19/2026 | -           | -       | 99,193            | -              | 99,193         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797QD2 | B 0.000 04/16/2026 | 25,000,000  | -       | 5,021             | -              | 5,021          |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797QN0 | B 0.000 05/14/2026 | 25,000,000  | -       | 4,988             | -              | 4,988          |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797SW8 | B 0.000 05/28/2026 | 30,000,000  | -       | 83,638            | -              | 83,638         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797TX5 | B 0.000 08/20/2026 | 100,000,000 | -       | 97,222            | -              | 97,222         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797TY3 | B 0.000 08/27/2026 | 25,000,000  | -       | 7,348             | -              | 7,348          |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797UA3 | B 0.000 06/16/2026 | 25,000,000  | -       | 4,976             | -              | 4,976          |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 9128284N7 | T 2.875 05/15/2028 | 65,000,000  | 144,544 | 73,278            | -              | 217,823        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 9128286B1 | T 2.625 02/15/2029 | 50,000,000  | 100,692 | 67,811            | -              | 168,503        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | T 1.625 05/15/2026 | 50,000,000  | 62,845  | (35,110)          | -              | 27,736         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | T 1.625 05/15/2026 | 50,000,000  | 62,845  | (30,742)          | -              | 32,103         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | T 0.750 04/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 29,006  | 5,354             | -              | 34,360         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | T 0.750 04/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 29,006  | 4,281             | -              | 33,286         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | 1,049             | -              | 34,889         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | (1,087)           | -              | 32,753         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | (5,366)           | -              | 28,474         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | (5,093)           | -              | 28,747         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | (6,358)           | -              | 27,481         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | (3,768)           | -              | 30,071         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | 1,006             | -              | 34,846         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | 6,613             | -              | 40,453         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,840  | 16,627            | -              | 50,466         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCW9 | T 0.750 08/31/2026 | 50,000,000  | 28,989  | 8,577             | -              | 37,566         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | T 0.875 09/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,654  | 4,783             | -              | 38,437         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | T 0.875 09/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,654  | 5,054             | -              | 38,707         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | T 0.875 09/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 33,654  | 10,562            | -              | 44,216         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | T 1.250 11/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 48,077  | (1,110)           | -              | 46,967         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | T 1.250 11/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 48,077  | (1,804)           | -              | 46,273         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | T 1.250 11/30/2026 | 50,000,000  | 48,077  | 47,928            | -              | 96,005         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDQ1 | T 1.250 12/31/2026 | 50,000,000  | 48,343  | 46,601            | -              | 94,943         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEF4 | T 2.500 03/31/2027 | 25,000,000  | 48,077  | 3,726             | -              | 51,803         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | T 3.250 06/30/2027 | 50,000,000  | 125,691 | 42,067            | -              | 167,758        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | T 3.250 06/30/2027 | 50,000,000  | 125,691 | 44,656            | -              | 170,347        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | T 3.250 06/30/2027 | 50,000,000  | 125,691 | 8,798             | -              | 134,488        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | T 3.250 06/30/2027 | 50,000,000  | 125,691 | 23,892            | -              | 149,582        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEW7 | T 3.250 06/30/2027 | 50,000,000  | 125,691 | 12,776            | -              | 138,466        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CFJ5 | T 3.125 08/31/2029 | 50,000,000  | 120,786 | 14,959            | -              | 135,745        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CFJ5 | T 3.125 08/31/2029 | 65,000,000  | 157,022 | 20,856            | -              | 177,878        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CFT3 | T 4.000 10/31/2029 | 60,000,000  | 185,635 | 203               | -              | 185,839        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CGQ8 | T 4.000 02/28/2030 | 50,000,000  | 154,606 | 1,134             | -              | 155,740        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CGQ8 | T 4.000 02/28/2030 | 75,000,000  | 231,909 | (14,266)          | -              | 217,643        |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description        | Par Value   | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHB0 | T 3.625 05/15/2026 | 25,000,000  | 70,097  | 2,203             | -              | 72,300         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHF1 | T 3.750 05/31/2030 | 65,000,000  | 187,500 | (3,305)           | -              | 184,195        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | T 4.000 06/30/2028 | 50,000,000  | 154,696 | 434               | -              | 155,130        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | T 4.000 06/30/2028 | 50,000,000  | 154,696 | 1,245             | -              | 155,941        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | T 4.000 06/30/2028 | 50,000,000  | 154,696 | 1,649             | -              | 156,345        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | T 4.000 06/30/2028 | 50,000,000  | 154,696 | 5,619             | -              | 160,315        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | T 4.000 06/30/2028 | 50,000,000  | 154,696 | 12,387            | -              | 167,083        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHK0 | T 4.000 06/30/2028 | 50,000,000  | 154,696 | 19,679            | -              | 174,375        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHX2 | T 4.375 08/31/2028 | 50,000,000  | 169,100 | (1,872)           | -              | 167,229        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CHX2 | T 4.375 08/31/2028 | 50,000,000  | 169,100 | (12,798)          | -              | 156,302        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CJW2 | T 4.000 01/31/2029 | 65,000,000  | 201,105 | (4,737)           | -              | 196,368        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CJW2 | T 4.000 01/31/2029 | 60,000,000  | 185,635 | 1,497             | -              | 187,132        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CJW2 | T 4.000 01/31/2029 | 55,000,000  | 170,166 | (13,344)          | -              | 156,822        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKD2 | T 4.250 02/28/2029 | 50,000,000  | 164,269 | 3,550             | -              | 167,819        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKD2 | T 4.250 02/28/2029 | 75,000,000  | 246,403 | (11,474)          | -              | 234,930        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKP5 | T 4.625 04/30/2029 | 50,000,000  | 178,867 | (19,898)          | -              | 158,969        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKP5 | T 4.625 04/30/2029 | 51,000,000  | 182,445 | (7,884)           | -              | 174,561        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKT7 | T 4.500 05/31/2029 | 50,000,000  | 173,077 | (17,307)          | -              | 155,770        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | T 4.625 06/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 177,885 | (5,146)           | -              | 172,739        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | T 4.625 06/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 177,885 | (7,659)           | -              | 170,225        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | T 4.625 06/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 177,885 | (25,893)          | -              | 151,992        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | T 4.625 06/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 177,885 | (22,206)          | -              | 155,679        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | T 4.625 06/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 177,885 | (26,454)          | -              | 151,430        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | T 4.625 06/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 177,885 | (25,949)          | -              | 151,935        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKV2 | T 4.625 06/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 177,885 | (25,679)          | -              | 152,205        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CKY6 | T 4.625 06/30/2026 | 100,000,000 | 357,735 | (78,125)          | -              | 279,610        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLC3 | T 4.000 07/31/2029 | 50,000,000  | 154,696 | (16,617)          | -              | 138,079        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLC3 | T 4.000 07/31/2029 | 65,000,000  | 201,105 | (8,978)           | -              | 192,127        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLC3 | T 4.000 07/31/2029 | 50,000,000  | 154,696 | 1,790             | -              | 156,487        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLL3 | T 3.375 09/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 130,525 | 5,575             | -              | 136,100        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLQ2 | T 3.875 10/15/2027 | 75,000,000  | 223,558 | (14,615)          | -              | 208,943        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLQ2 | T 3.875 10/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 149,038 | (11,032)          | -              | 138,006        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLR0 | T 4.125 10/31/2029 | 50,000,000  | 159,530 | 6,043             | -              | 165,573        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLX7 | T 4.125 11/15/2027 | 61,000,000  | 194,627 | 8,555             | -              | 203,182        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CLX7 | T 4.125 11/15/2027 | 70,000,000  | 223,343 | (28,202)          | -              | 195,141        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMB4 | T 4.000 12/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 153,846 | 7,198             | -              | 161,045        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMB4 | T 4.000 12/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 153,846 | 7,348             | -              | 161,194        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMB4 | T 4.000 12/15/2027 | 50,000,000  | 153,846 | (16,176)          | -              | 137,670        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMN8 | T 4.250 02/15/2028 | 50,000,000  | 163,025 | (24,320)          | -              | 138,704        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMN8 | T 4.250 02/15/2028 | 90,000,000  | 293,444 | (45,303)          | -              | 248,142        |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMZ1 | T 3.875 04/30/2030 | 50,000,000  | 149,862 | 8,246             | -              | 158,107        |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description           | Par Value            | Accrued           | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings    |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CMZ1 | T 3.875 04/30/2030    | 60,000,000           | 179,834           | (8,346)           | -              | 171,488           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CND9 | T 3.750 05/15/2028    | 70,000,000           | 203,039           | 13,133            | -              | 216,172           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNH0 | T 3.875 06/15/2028    | 50,000,000           | 149,038           | (12,081)          | -              | 136,957           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNH0 | T 3.875 06/15/2028    | 50,000,000           | 149,038           | (11,891)          | -              | 137,147           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030    | 50,000,000           | 149,862           | (4,420)           | -              | 145,442           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030    | 50,000,000           | 149,862           | (4,259)           | -              | 145,603           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030    | 50,000,000           | 149,862           | (4,165)           | -              | 145,697           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030    | 50,000,000           | 149,862           | (6,091)           | -              | 143,771           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030    | 50,000,000           | 149,862           | (5,702)           | -              | 144,160           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNV9 | T 3.625 08/31/2027    | 50,000,000           | 140,112           | (1,517)           | -              | 138,595           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNV9 | T 3.625 08/31/2027    | 75,000,000           | 210,168           | (2,532)           | -              | 207,636           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CNY3 | T 3.375 09/15/2028    | 55,000,000           | 143,577           | 5,108             | -              | 148,686           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPA3 | T 3.625 09/30/2030    | 50,000,000           | 139,423           | (2,486)           | -              | 136,937           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPA3 | T 3.625 09/30/2030    | 50,000,000           | 139,423           | (1,517)           | -              | 137,906           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPA3 | T 3.625 09/30/2030    | 50,000,000           | 139,423           | (850)             | -              | 138,573           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPD7 | T 3.625 10/31/2030    | 60,000,000           | 168,232           | 3,450             | -              | 171,682           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPE5 | T 3.500 10/31/2027    | 75,000,000           | 203,039           | 6,452             | -              | 209,491           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPK1 | T 3.500 11/15/2028    | 62,000,000           | 167,845           | 6,761             | -              | 174,607           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPR6 | T 3.625 12/31/2030    | 60,000,000           | 168,232           | 4,041             | -              | 172,273           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPR6 | T 3.625 12/31/2030    | 50,000,000           | 140,193           | 4,593             | -              | 144,786           |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CPR6 | T 3.625 12/31/2030    | 50,000,000           | 140,193           | 6,783             | -              | 146,976           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                       | <b>5,394,000,000</b> | <b>13,200,484</b> | <b>272,784</b>    | <b>-</b>       | <b>13,473,268</b> |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026 | 25,000,000           | 22,292            | -                 | -              | 22,292            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026 | 25,000,000           | 22,292            | -                 | -              | 22,292            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026 | 25,000,000           | 22,292            | -                 | -              | 22,292            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026 | 25,000,000           | 22,292            | -                 | -              | 22,292            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026 | 25,000,000           | 21,875            | -                 | -              | 21,875            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026 | 25,000,000           | 21,875            | -                 | -              | 21,875            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026 | 25,000,000           | 21,875            | -                 | -              | 21,875            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026 | 25,000,000           | 21,875            | -                 | -              | 21,875            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000           | 21,875            | -                 | -              | 21,875            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000           | 21,875            | -                 | -              | 21,875            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000           | 21,875            | -                 | -              | 21,875            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000           | 21,875            | -                 | -              | 21,875            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026 | 25,000,000           | 22,396            | -                 | -              | 22,396            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026 | 25,000,000           | 22,396            | -                 | -              | 22,396            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026 | 25,000,000           | 22,396            | -                 | -              | 22,396            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026 | 25,000,000           | 22,396            | -                 | -              | 22,396            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026 | 25,000,000           | 29,792            | -                 | -              | 29,792            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026 | 25,000,000           | 29,792            | -                 | -              | 29,792            |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description           | Par Value  | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026 | 25,000,000 | 29,792  | -                 | -              | 29,792         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026 | 25,000,000 | 29,792  | -                 | -              | 29,792         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026 | 25,000,000 | 33,438  | -                 | -              | 33,438         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026 | 25,000,000 | 33,438  | -                 | -              | 33,438         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026 | 25,000,000 | 33,438  | -                 | -              | 33,438         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026 | 25,000,000 | 33,438  | -                 | -              | 33,438         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026 | 25,000,000 | 34,271  | -                 | -              | 34,271         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026 | 25,000,000 | 34,271  | -                 | -              | 34,271         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026 | 25,000,000 | 34,271  | -                 | -              | 34,271         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026 | 25,000,000 | 34,271  | -                 | -              | 34,271         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 48,958  | -                 | -              | 48,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 48,958  | -                 | -              | 48,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 48,958  | -                 | -              | 48,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 48,958  | -                 | -              | 48,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027 | 12,375,000 | 36,094  | (2,785)           | -              | 33,309         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027 | 10,000,000 | 29,167  | (2,216)           | -              | 26,951         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027 | 21,725,000 | 63,365  | (4,568)           | -              | 58,796         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029 | 15,000,000 | 51,563  | (6,065)           | -              | 45,498         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029 | 15,000,000 | 51,563  | (759)             | -              | 50,803         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029 | 15,000,000 | 51,563  | (679)             | -              | 50,883         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029 | 25,590,000 | 87,966  | (1,159)           | -              | 86,807         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATHX8 | FHLB 4.125 09/14/2029 | 17,000,000 | 58,438  | (3,824)           | -              | 54,614         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AUTC8 | FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026 | -          | 11,752  | 524               | -              | 12,276         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVBD3 | FHLB 4.500 03/09/2029 | 25,000,000 | 93,750  | (292)             | -              | 93,458         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVWS7 | FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026 | 17,045,000 | 53,266  | 1,327             | -              | 54,593         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVWS7 | FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026 | 20,000,000 | 62,500  | 1,517             | -              | 64,017         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWAH3 | FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026 | 15,000,000 | 50,000  | 2,546             | -              | 52,546         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWAH3 | FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026 | 10,000,000 | 33,333  | 1,662             | -              | 34,995         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWC24 | FHLB 4.000 06/09/2028 | 10,000,000 | 33,333  | 85                | -              | 33,418         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWGS3 | FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030 | 16,000,000 | 55,000  | (974)             | -              | 54,026         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWGS3 | FHLB 4.125 06/14/2030 | 12,515,000 | 43,020  | (1,002)           | -              | 42,018         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWLZ1 | FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026 | 50,000,000 | 197,917 | 3,775             | -              | 201,692        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWMP2 | FHLB 4.375 06/14/2030 | 31,000,000 | 113,021 | (15,100)          | -              | 97,921         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AX4E5 | FHLB 4.500 06/11/2027 | 11,000,000 | 41,250  | 1,565             | -              | 42,815         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026 | 10,000,000 | 40,625  | 1,497             | -              | 42,122         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026 | 10,000,000 | 40,625  | 1,601             | -              | 42,226         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026 | 10,000,000 | 40,625  | 1,601             | -              | 42,226         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026 | 36,730,000 | 149,216 | (2,897)           | -              | 146,319        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXB31 | FHLB 4.875 03/13/2026 | 25,000,000 | 101,563 | (2,129)           | -              | 99,434         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXCP1 | FHLB 4.875 09/11/2026 | 11,895,000 | 48,323  | 1,931             | -              | 50,255         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AXU63 | FHLB 4.625 11/17/2026 | 50,000,000 | 192,708 | 2,261             | -              | 194,969        |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description           | Par Value  | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027 | 12,000,000 | 41,250  | 699               | -              | 41,949         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027 | 25,000,000 | 85,938  | 1,456             | -              | 87,393         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027 | 29,350,000 | 100,891 | 1,709             | -              | 102,600        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027 | 50,000,000 | 171,875 | 2,911             | -              | 174,786        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AYPN0 | FHLB 4.125 01/15/2027 | 20,000,000 | 68,750  | (7,091)           | -              | 61,659         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B0TY5 | FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027 | 20,000,000 | 79,167  | 1,353             | -              | 80,519         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B0TY5 | FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027 | 17,000,000 | 67,292  | 1,150             | -              | 68,441         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B0TY5 | FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027 | 48,000,000 | 190,000 | 3,246             | -              | 193,246        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B0TY5 | FHLB 4.750 04/09/2027 | 40,000,000 | 158,333 | 2,705             | -              | 161,039        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B1BC0 | FHLB 4.625 06/08/2029 | 9,705,000  | 37,405  | (4,740)           | -              | 32,665         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B1BT3 | FHLB 4.875 06/12/2026 | 13,485,000 | 54,783  | (777)             | -              | 54,006         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B1EF0 | FHLB 4.625 06/11/2027 | 20,700,000 | 79,781  | (2,512)           | -              | 77,269         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2PJ8 | FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026 | 25,000,000 | 75,521  | 1,291             | -              | 76,812         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2PJ8 | FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026 | 50,000,000 | 151,042 | 2,583             | -              | 153,624        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2PJ8 | FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026 | 19,000,000 | 57,396  | 981               | -              | 58,377         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2PJ8 | FHLB 3.625 09/04/2026 | 25,900,000 | 78,240  | 1,338             | -              | 79,577         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2XR1 | FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029 | 65,000,000 | 217,208 | -                 | -              | 217,208        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2XR1 | FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029 | 25,000,000 | 83,542  | -                 | -              | 83,542         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B2XR1 | FHLB 4.010 07/02/2029 | 25,000,000 | 83,542  | -                 | -              | 83,542         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3A29 | FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026 | 15,000,000 | 50,000  | 121               | -              | 50,121         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3A29 | FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026 | 25,000,000 | 83,333  | 202               | -              | 83,535         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3A29 | FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026 | 25,000,000 | 83,333  | 202               | -              | 83,535         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3A29 | FHLB 4.000 10/09/2026 | 50,000,000 | 166,667 | 404               | -              | 167,071        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B3GD9 | FHLB 4.000 11/27/2028 | 47,025,000 | 156,750 | 1,590             | -              | 158,340        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027 | 16,500,000 | 53,281  | 852               | -              | 54,133         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027 | 10,000,000 | 32,292  | 517               | -              | 32,808         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027 | 20,000,000 | 64,583  | 1,033             | -              | 65,616         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027 | 13,000,000 | 41,979  | 671               | -              | 42,651         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B6R24 | FHLB 3.875 06/04/2027 | 36,000,000 | 116,250 | 1,859             | -              | 118,109        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B82L5 | FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027 | 41,000,000 | 119,583 | 3,214             | -              | 122,798        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B82L5 | FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027 | 50,000,000 | 145,833 | 3,920             | -              | 149,753        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B82L5 | FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027 | 25,000,000 | 72,917  | 1,960             | -              | 74,877         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130B82L5 | FHLB 3.500 10/04/2027 | 20,000,000 | 58,333  | 1,568             | -              | 59,901         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385A97 | FHDN 0.000 08/07/2026 | 10,000,000 | -       | 27,067            | -              | 27,067         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385B47 | FHDN 0.000 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000 | -       | 67,569            | -              | 67,569         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385B62 | FHDN 0.000 08/12/2026 | 51,000,000 | -       | 137,842           | -              | 137,842        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385B88 | FHDN 0.000 08/14/2026 | 22,900,000 | -       | 26,908            | -              | 26,908         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026 | 25,000,000 | -       | 9,819             | -              | 9,819          |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026 | 25,000,000 | -       | 9,819             | -              | 9,819          |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026 | 15,000,000 | -       | 5,892             | -              | 5,892          |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385G91 | FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026 | 25,000,000 | -       | 12,170            | -              | 12,170         |

## Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description             | Par Value  | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 313385G91 | FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026   | 25,000,000 | -       | 12,170            | -              | 12,170         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385G91 | FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026   | 25,000,000 | -       | 12,170            | -              | 12,170         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385TF3 | FHDN 0.000 02/18/2026   | -          | -       | 14,833            | -              | 14,833         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385TM8 | FHLBDN 0.000 02/24/2026 | -          | -       | 115,000           | -              | 115,000        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385TM8 | FHLBDN 0.000 02/24/2026 | -          | -       | 115,000           | -              | 115,000        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385TM8 | FHLBDN 0.000 02/24/2026 | -          | -       | 69,000            | -              | 69,000         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385TM8 | FHLBDN 0.000 02/24/2026 | -          | -       | 69,000            | -              | 69,000         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385VE3 | FHDN 0.000 04/06/2026   | 24,500,000 | -       | 67,933            | -              | 67,933         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385VP8 | FHDN 0.000 04/15/2026   | 25,000,000 | -       | 74,278            | -              | 74,278         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385WN2 | FHDN 0.000 05/08/2026   | 25,000,000 | -       | 70,000            | -              | 70,000         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385ZG4 | FHDN 0.000 07/13/2026   | 15,000,000 | -       | 40,308            | -              | 40,308         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385ZS8 | FHDN 0.000 07/23/2026   | 15,000,000 | -       | 40,250            | -              | 40,250         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385ZT6 | FHDN 0.000 07/24/2026   | 50,000,000 | -       | 134,556           | -              | 134,556        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EJ5J4 | FFCB 3.190 01/16/2029   | 10,000,000 | 26,583  | 2,754             | -              | 29,338         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM4X7 | FFCB 0.800 09/10/2026   | 28,975,000 | 19,317  | 78,186            | -              | 97,502         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMZ21 | FFCB 0.690 04/06/2026   | 15,500,000 | 8,913   | 689               | -              | 9,601          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027   | 21,000,000 | 72,188  | 222               | -              | 72,409         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027   | 5,000,000  | 17,188  | 59                | -              | 17,246         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027   | 4,650,000  | 15,984  | 55                | -              | 16,039         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027   | 25,000,000 | 85,938  | 294               | -              | 86,232         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN5N6 | FFCB 4.000 01/06/2028   | 50,000,000 | 166,667 | (18,144)          | -              | 148,523        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ35 | FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026   | -          | 77,467  | 794               | -              | 78,261         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENRD4 | FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027   | 48,573,000 | 68,002  | 17,554            | -              | 85,556         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027   | 24,500,000 | 53,083  | 1,887             | -              | 54,970         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027   | 22,500,000 | 48,750  | 1,652             | -              | 50,402         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027   | 25,000,000 | 54,167  | 3,007             | -              | 57,174         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026   | 20,000,000 | 44,000  | 744               | -              | 44,744         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026   | 30,000,000 | 66,000  | 1,115             | -              | 67,115         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZK9 | FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027   | 27,865,000 | 75,236  | (3,607)           | -              | 71,629         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EP5K7 | FFCB 4.500 03/13/2026   | 50,000,000 | 187,500 | 9,544             | -              | 197,044        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EP5S0 | FFCB 4.250 03/20/2028   | 4,971,000  | 17,606  | 1,056             | -              | 18,661         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EP5U5 | FFCB 4.125 03/20/2029   | 51,660,000 | 177,581 | 10,098            | -              | 187,679        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EP6K6 | FFCB 4.500 03/26/2027   | 50,000,000 | 187,500 | 2,316             | -              | 189,816        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | -          | 133,681 | 1,646             | -              | 135,327        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | -          | 66,840  | 933               | -              | 67,774         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | -          | 74,861  | 922               | -              | 75,783         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBM6 | FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027   | 10,000,000 | 34,375  | 443               | -              | 34,818         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC45 | FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028   | 12,000,000 | 46,250  | 245               | -              | 46,495         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC45 | FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028   | 20,000,000 | 77,083  | 435               | -              | 77,519         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC45 | FFCB 4.625 11/13/2028   | 55,000,000 | 211,979 | 1,191             | -              | 213,170        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC60 | FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027   | 27,950,000 | 107,724 | 2,223             | -              | 109,947        |

## Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description           | Par Value  | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPC60 | FFCB 4.625 11/15/2027 | 33,300,000 | 128,344 | 2,655             | -              | 130,999        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPJX4 | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026 | -          | 48,333  | 1,501             | -              | 49,835         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPJX4 | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026 | -          | 40,278  | 1,136             | -              | 41,414         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026 | 30,000,000 | 106,250 | 1,242             | -              | 107,492        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026 | 20,000,000 | 70,833  | 787               | -              | 71,620         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026 | 24,700,000 | 87,479  | 1,527             | -              | 89,006         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMV4 | FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027 | 28,940,000 | 99,481  | 538               | -              | 100,019        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026 | 50,000,000 | 182,292 | 677               | -              | 182,969        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026 | 25,000,000 | 91,146  | 339               | -              | 91,484         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026 | 25,000,000 | 91,146  | 339               | -              | 91,484         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPP66 | FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027 | 31,000,000 | 103,333 | 2,116             | -              | 105,449        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPP66 | FFCB 4.000 05/20/2027 | 58,850,000 | 196,167 | 4,215             | -              | 200,382        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPSK2 | FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028 | 19,500,000 | 69,063  | 1,345             | -              | 70,407         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPSW6 | FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026 | 50,000,000 | 187,500 | 2,938             | -              | 190,438        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028 | 10,000,000 | 37,500  | 320               | -              | 37,820         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028 | 25,000,000 | 93,750  | 866               | -              | 94,616         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028 | 15,000,000 | 56,250  | 570               | -              | 56,820         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028 | 33,000,000 | 123,750 | 1,457             | -              | 125,207        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPVP7 | FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026 | 19,000,000 | 75,208  | 412               | -              | 75,620         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPVP7 | FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026 | 10,000,000 | 39,583  | 225               | -              | 39,808         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPVP7 | FFCB 4.750 07/08/2026 | 21,000,000 | 83,125  | 466               | -              | 83,591         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027 | 35,000,000 | 120,313 | 1,127             | -              | 121,439        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027 | 50,000,000 | 171,875 | 1,712             | -              | 173,587        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027 | 25,000,000 | 85,938  | 805               | -              | 86,742         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027 | 10,000,000 | 34,375  | 342               | -              | 34,717         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPX91 | FFCB 4.125 01/25/2027 | 5,000,000  | 17,188  | 183               | -              | 17,370         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZA6 | FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026 | 30,000,000 | 121,875 | 4,238             | -              | 126,113        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZA6 | FFCB 4.875 10/20/2026 | 14,000,000 | 56,875  | 2,429             | -              | 59,304         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZY4 | FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026 | 25,000,000 | 104,167 | 1,764             | -              | 105,931        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZY4 | FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026 | 3,000,000  | 12,500  | 225               | -              | 12,725         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZY4 | FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026 | 9,615,000  | 40,063  | 721               | -              | 40,784         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPZY4 | FFCB 5.000 07/30/2026 | 16,000,000 | 66,667  | 1,200             | -              | 67,867         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER2Z3 | FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027 | 41,880,000 | 148,325 | 63                | -              | 148,388        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER2Z3 | FFCB 4.250 11/03/2027 | 5,000,000  | 17,708  | 18                | -              | 17,726         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4A6 | FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027 | 30,000,000 | 106,250 | 1,243             | -              | 107,493        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4A6 | FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027 | 25,000,000 | 88,542  | 988               | -              | 89,529         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4A6 | FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027 | 2,000,000  | 7,083   | 82                | -              | 7,165          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4H1 | FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030 | 12,815,000 | 48,056  | (3,297)           | -              | 44,760         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER4H1 | FFCB 4.500 01/18/2030 | 18,000,000 | 67,500  | (4,608)           | -              | 62,892         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ER7L9 | FFCB 4.000 03/18/2030 | 8,695,000  | 28,983  | 363               | -              | 29,347         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERD24 | FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027 | 30,000,000 | 106,250 | 562               | -              | 106,812        |



## Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description           | Par Value  | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERDH1 | FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029 | 63,085,000 | 249,711 | (10,454)          | -              | 239,257        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERDH1 | FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029 | 27,892,000 | 110,406 | (4,617)           | -              | 105,789        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERDH1 | FFCB 4.750 04/30/2029 | 30,000,000 | 118,750 | (4,888)           | -              | 113,862        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERDS7 | FFCB 4.750 05/06/2027 | 12,727,000 | 50,378  | (341)             | -              | 50,037         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGL9 | FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028 | 15,000,000 | 56,250  | 103               | -              | 56,353         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGL9 | FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028 | 20,000,000 | 75,000  | (730)             | -              | 74,270         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGL9 | FFCB 4.500 06/07/2028 | 14,934,000 | 56,003  | (545)             | -              | 55,457         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029 | 10,000,000 | 35,417  | 501               | -              | 35,918         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029 | 10,000,000 | 35,417  | 501               | -              | 35,918         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029 | 20,000,000 | 70,833  | 1,002             | -              | 71,835         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029 | 10,000,000 | 35,417  | 501               | -              | 35,918         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERGS4 | FFCB 4.250 06/11/2029 | 29,000,000 | 102,708 | 1,179             | -              | 103,888        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERHD6 | FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026 | 32,000,000 | 130,000 | (1,980)           | -              | 128,020        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERHD6 | FFCB 4.875 06/12/2026 | 20,000,000 | 81,250  | (1,176)           | -              | 80,074         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERHN4 | FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028 | 38,000,000 | 134,583 | 3,798             | -              | 138,381        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERHN4 | FFCB 4.250 10/20/2028 | 5,000,000  | 17,708  | 493               | -              | 18,202         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJ51 | FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027 | 38,343,000 | 131,804 | 2,970             | -              | 134,774        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJ51 | FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027 | 25,505,000 | 87,673  | 1,969             | -              | 89,643         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJ51 | FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027 | 21,000,000 | 72,188  | 1,627             | -              | 73,814         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJ51 | FFCB 4.125 12/10/2027 | 33,000,000 | 113,438 | 2,752             | -              | 116,189        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERJZ5 | FFCB 4.500 06/28/2027 | 30,000,000 | 112,500 | 362               | -              | 112,862        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERKM2 | FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 93,750  | (851)             | -              | 92,899         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERKM2 | FFCB 4.500 07/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 93,750  | (653)             | -              | 93,097         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERKX8 | FFCB 4.250 07/12/2029 | 20,000,000 | 70,833  | 166               | -              | 70,999         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERMB4 | FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027 | 10,000,000 | 35,417  | 90                | -              | 35,506         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERMB4 | FFCB 4.250 07/23/2027 | 15,000,000 | 53,125  | 134               | -              | 53,259         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERT84 | FFCB 4.250 01/14/2028 | 29,750,000 | 105,365 | 4,450             | -              | 109,815        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERVR9 | FFCB 3.500 07/01/2027 | 55,000,000 | 160,417 | 2,086             | -              | 162,503        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERWR8 | FFCB 3.500 01/07/2027 | 12,500,000 | 36,458  | 4,306             | -              | 40,764         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERXJ5 | FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027 | 8,000,000  | 25,833  | 98                | -              | 25,932         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERXJ5 | FFCB 3.875 10/15/2027 | 5,000,000  | 16,146  | 70                | -              | 16,216         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERZ46 | FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028 | 50,000,000 | 177,083 | 654               | -              | 177,737        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ERZ46 | FFCB 4.250 01/28/2028 | 47,000,000 | 166,458 | 615               | -              | 167,073        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET2S5 | FFCB 3.375 11/28/2028 | 35,000,000 | 98,438  | 6,819             | -              | 105,257        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET2W6 | FFCB 3.500 01/20/2028 | 5,000,000  | 14,583  | 297               | -              | 14,880         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET4Y0 | FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028 | 10,000,000 | 29,167  | 67                | -              | 29,234         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET4Y0 | FFCB 3.500 09/22/2028 | 20,000,000 | 58,333  | 134               | -              | 58,467         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET5B9 | FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026 | 45,000,000 | 131,250 | 1,415             | -              | 132,665        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET5B9 | FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026 | 37,000,000 | 107,917 | 1,164             | -              | 109,080        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET5B9 | FFCB 3.500 12/22/2026 | 15,000,000 | 43,750  | 472               | -              | 44,222         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET6K8 | FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028 | 46,000,000 | 129,375 | 3,441             | -              | 132,816        |



# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description           | Par Value  | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET6K8 | FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028 | 30,000,000 | 84,375  | 2,244             | -              | 86,619         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET6K8 | FFCB 3.375 01/07/2028 | 23,480,000 | 66,038  | 2,955             | -              | 68,993         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ET6R3 | FFCB 3.375 10/08/2027 | 15,000,000 | 42,188  | 981               | -              | 43,168         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030 | 32,260,000 | 107,533 | 248               | -              | 107,782        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030 | 46,750,000 | 155,833 | 266               | -              | 156,100        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030 | 15,000,000 | 50,000  | 97                | -              | 50,097         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030 | 43,020,000 | 143,400 | 1,783             | -              | 145,183        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETBF3 | FFCB 4.000 04/01/2030 | 50,000,000 | 166,667 | 7,301             | -              | 173,968        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJF5 | FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027 | 45,000,000 | 150,000 | 1,219             | -              | 151,219        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJF5 | FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027 | 10,000,000 | 33,333  | 271               | -              | 33,604         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJS7 | FFCB 4.000 11/10/2026 | 12,600,000 | 42,000  | 985               | -              | 42,985         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJV0 | FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029 | 15,000,000 | 50,000  | 929               | -              | 50,929         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJV0 | FFCB 4.000 11/30/2029 | 23,000,000 | 76,667  | 1,327             | -              | 77,994         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJZ1 | FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028 | 25,000,000 | 80,729  | 1,092             | -              | 81,821         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETJZ1 | FFCB 3.875 06/05/2028 | 7,370,000  | 23,799  | 704               | -              | 24,503         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKN6 | FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029 | 15,000,000 | 50,000  | 332               | -              | 50,332         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKN6 | FFCB 4.000 10/09/2029 | 10,000,000 | 33,333  | 221               | -              | 33,554         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030 | 20,000,000 | 66,667  | 843               | -              | 67,510         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030 | 10,000,000 | 33,333  | 399               | -              | 33,732         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030 | 25,000,000 | 83,333  | 541               | -              | 83,874         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030 | 15,000,000 | 50,000  | 21                | -              | 50,021         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETKQ9 | FFCB 4.000 06/10/2030 | 9,750,000  | 32,500  | 61                | -              | 32,561         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETL70 | FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028 | 5,000,000  | 14,063  | 589               | -              | 14,651         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETL70 | FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028 | 25,000,000 | 70,313  | 2,897             | -              | 73,210         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETL70 | FFCB 3.375 10/24/2028 | 30,000,000 | 84,375  | 3,532             | -              | 87,907         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETLM7 | FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030 | 41,000,000 | 136,667 | (547)             | -              | 136,120        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETLM7 | FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030 | 15,000,000 | 50,000  | (200)             | -              | 49,800         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETLM7 | FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030 | 10,070,000 | 33,567  | (122)             | -              | 33,445         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETLM7 | FFCB 4.000 06/17/2030 | 16,944,000 | 56,480  | 105               | -              | 56,585         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETM95 | FFCB 3.375 10/27/2027 | 9,320,000  | 26,213  | 811               | -              | 27,024         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETM95 | FFCB 3.375 10/27/2027 | 60,000,000 | 168,750 | 5,224             | -              | 173,974        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETME4 | FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030 | 25,000,000 | 83,333  | 903               | -              | 84,236         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETME4 | FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030 | 14,450,000 | 48,167  | 522               | -              | 48,688         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETME4 | FFCB 4.000 01/23/2030 | 5,000,000  | 16,667  | 175               | -              | 16,841         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETNU7 | FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028 | 50,000,000 | 156,250 | 4,372             | -              | 160,622        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETNU7 | FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028 | 22,500,000 | 70,313  | 1,944             | -              | 72,257         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETNU7 | FFCB 3.750 07/03/2028 | 25,000,000 | 78,125  | 2,464             | -              | 80,589         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETPF8 | FFCB 3.750 07/08/2030 | 20,000,000 | 62,500  | 3,443             | -              | 65,943         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETSX6 | FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027 | 7,000,000  | 21,146  | 540               | -              | 21,686         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETSX6 | FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027 | 5,000,000  | 15,104  | 385               | -              | 15,490         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETSX6 | FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027 | 5,000,000  | 15,104  | 393               | -              | 15,497         |

## Monthly Investment Earnings

### Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description            | Par Value  | Accrued | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------|------------|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETUE5 | FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027  | 40,000,000 | 125,000 | 2,713             | -              | 127,713        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETUE5 | FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027  | 25,000,000 | 78,125  | 1,658             | -              | 79,783         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETUE5 | FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027  | 15,000,000 | 46,875  | 1,017             | -              | 47,892         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ETUE5 | FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027  | 35,000,000 | 109,375 | 2,517             | -              | 111,892        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EWAU4 | FFCB 3.500 01/21/2028  | 35,000,000 | 102,083 | 2,833             | -              | 104,916        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EWAU4 | FFCB 3.500 01/21/2028  | 35,000,000 | 102,083 | 2,833             | -              | 104,916        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030 | 50,000,000 | 173,958 | -                 | -              | 173,958        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030 | 25,000,000 | 86,979  | -                 | -              | 86,979         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030 | 25,000,000 | 86,979  | -                 | -              | 86,979         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030 | 25,000,000 | 86,979  | -                 | -              | 86,979         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCFX2 | FHLMC 4.175 12/23/2030 | 23,000,000 | 80,021  | -                 | -              | 80,021         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030 | 25,000,000 | 84,063  | -                 | -              | 84,063         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030 | 25,000,000 | 84,063  | -                 | -              | 84,063         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030 | 25,000,000 | 84,063  | -                 | -              | 84,063         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030 | 50,000,000 | 168,125 | -                 | -              | 168,125        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134HCKN8 | FHLMC 4.035 06/24/2030 | 25,000,000 | 84,063  | -                 | -              | 84,063         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030  | 25,000,000 | 83,958  | -                 | -              | 83,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030  | 25,000,000 | 83,958  | -                 | -              | 83,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030  | 25,000,000 | 83,958  | -                 | -              | 83,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030  | 25,000,000 | 83,958  | -                 | -              | 83,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GATQ2 | FNMA 4.030 09/30/2030  | 50,000,000 | 167,917 | -                 | -              | 167,917        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029  | 50,000,000 | 170,000 | -                 | -              | 170,000        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029  | 25,000,000 | 85,000  | -                 | -              | 85,000         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029  | 25,000,000 | 85,000  | -                 | -              | 85,000         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029  | 25,000,000 | 85,000  | -                 | -              | 85,000         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAVY2 | FNMA 4.080 10/01/2029  | 25,000,000 | 85,000  | -                 | -              | 85,000         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029  | 50,000,000 | 166,667 | -                 | -              | 166,667        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029  | 25,000,000 | 83,333  | -                 | -              | 83,333         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029  | 25,000,000 | 83,333  | -                 | -              | 83,333         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029  | 25,000,000 | 83,333  | -                 | -              | 83,333         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GAWY1 | FNMA 4.000 10/15/2029  | 25,000,000 | 83,333  | -                 | -              | 83,333         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029  | 25,000,000 | 84,375  | 24                | -              | 84,399         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029  | 25,000,000 | 84,375  | 24                | -              | 84,399         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029  | 50,000,000 | 168,750 | 48                | -              | 168,798        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029  | 25,000,000 | 84,375  | 24                | -              | 84,399         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GC2P9 | FNMA 4.050 11/07/2029  | 25,000,000 | 84,375  | 24                | -              | 84,399         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030  | 50,000,000 | 171,250 | -                 | -              | 171,250        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030  | 25,000,000 | 85,625  | -                 | -              | 85,625         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030  | 25,000,000 | 85,625  | -                 | -              | 85,625         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030  | 25,000,000 | 85,625  | -                 | -              | 85,625         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCEC5 | FNMA 4.110 07/01/2030  | 25,000,000 | 85,625  | -                 | -              | 85,625         |

## Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description             | Par Value            | Accrued           | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings    |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030   | 50,000,000           | 169,167           | -                 | -              | 169,167           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030   | 25,000,000           | 84,583            | -                 | -              | 84,583            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030   | 25,000,000           | 84,583            | -                 | -              | 84,583            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030   | 25,000,000           | 84,583            | -                 | -              | 84,583            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3136GCFD2 | FNMA 4.060 01/16/2030   | 25,000,000           | 84,583            | -                 | -              | 84,583            |
| Federal Agencies   | 912797SZ1 | B 0.000 03/17/2026      | 25,000,000           | -                 | 5,017             | -              | 5,017             |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                         | <b>7,523,629,000</b> | <b>22,559,844</b> | <b>1,376,569</b>  | <b>-</b>       | <b>23,936,413</b> |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DQ32 | BMOCHG 4.330 02/09/2026 | -                    | 72,167            | -                 | -              | 72,167            |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DQP3 | BMOCHG 4.430 02/11/2026 | -                    | 86,139            | -                 | -              | 86,139            |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DRH0 | BMOCHG 4.330 03/24/2026 | 50,000,000           | 168,389           | -                 | -              | 168,389           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DRJ6 | BMOCHG 4.330 03/25/2026 | 50,000,000           | 168,389           | -                 | -              | 168,389           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DRZ0 | BMOCHG 4.170 06/01/2026 | 100,000,000          | 324,333           | -                 | -              | 324,333           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DS97 | BMOCHG 4.200 06/15/2026 | 100,000,000          | 326,667           | -                 | -              | 326,667           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DSQ9 | BMOCHG 4.000 06/09/2026 | 46,000,000           | 143,111           | -                 | -              | 143,111           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DSR7 | BMOCHG 4.000 06/15/2026 | 54,000,000           | 168,000           | -                 | -              | 168,000           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DSV8 | BMOCHG 3.980 06/17/2026 | 55,000,000           | 170,256           | -                 | -              | 170,256           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06418NHV7 | BNSHOU 4.270 07/01/2026 | 100,000,000          | 332,111           | -                 | -              | 332,111           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06418NJE3 | BNSHOU 4.200 04/20/2026 | 125,000,000          | 408,333           | -                 | -              | 408,333           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06418NJK9 | BNSHOU 4.110 04/23/2026 | 100,000,000          | 319,667           | -                 | -              | 319,667           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 13606DHF2 | CIBCNY 4.330 02/09/2026 | -                    | 48,111            | -                 | -              | 48,111            |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JG84 | RY 4.330 02/23/2026     | -                    | 158,767           | -                 | -              | 158,767           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JGQ4 | RY 4.380 03/06/2026     | 50,000,000           | 170,333           | -                 | -              | 170,333           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JJ81 | RY 4.290 03/16/2026     | 100,000,000          | 333,667           | -                 | -              | 333,667           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JJQ1 | RY 4.330 04/07/2026     | 50,000,000           | 168,389           | -                 | -              | 168,389           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JL88 | RY 4.060 07/01/2026     | 100,000,000          | 315,778           | -                 | -              | 315,778           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JMC8 | RY 4.180 04/23/2026     | 100,000,000          | 325,111           | -                 | -              | 325,111           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DEG7 | TDNY 4.410 03/11/2026   | 50,000,000           | 171,500           | -                 | -              | 171,500           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DHC3 | TDNY 4.400 03/16/2026   | 60,000,000           | 205,333           | -                 | -              | 205,333           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DK96 | TDNY 3.850 06/23/2026   | 50,000,000           | 149,722           | -                 | -              | 149,722           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DKD7 | TDNY 3.850 07/01/2026   | 50,000,000           | 149,722           | -                 | -              | 149,722           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115DNV4 | TDNY 3.780 06/15/2026   | 100,000,000          | 294,000           | -                 | -              | 294,000           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130AA24 | WSTNY 4.350 03/16/2026  | 100,000,000          | 338,333           | -                 | -              | 338,333           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130AA65 | WSTNY 4.380 03/23/2026  | 140,000,000          | 476,933           | -                 | -              | 476,933           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130AC22 | WSTNY 4.320 06/15/2026  | 100,000,000          | 336,000           | -                 | -              | 336,000           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130AZZ4 | WSTNY 4.350 05/04/2026  | 125,000,000          | 422,917           | -                 | -              | 422,917           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                         | <b>1,955,000,000</b> | <b>6,752,178</b>  | <b>-</b>          | <b>-</b>       | <b>6,752,178</b>  |

## Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Description              | Par Value            | Accrued        | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings   |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MB69 | MUFG BK 0.000 02/06/2026 | -                    | -              | 14,896            | -              | 14,896           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MC92 | MUFG BK 0.000 03/09/2026 | 130,000,000          | -              | 435,789           | -              | 435,789          |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MCQ4 | MUFG BK 0.000 03/24/2026 | 100,000,000          | -              | 330,556           | -              | 330,556          |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MD67 | MUFG BK 0.000 04/06/2026 | 110,000,000          | -              | 365,322           | -              | 365,322          |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MDN0 | MUFG BK 0.000 04/22/2026 | 51,000,000           | -              | 161,443           | -              | 161,443          |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MF16 | MUFG BK 0.000 06/01/2026 | 30,000,000           | -              | 89,367            | -              | 89,367           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MFF5 | MUFG BK 0.000 06/15/2026 | 65,000,000           | -              | 188,572           | -              | 188,572          |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MFJ7 | MUFG BK 0.000 06/18/2026 | 15,000,000           | -              | 44,567            | -              | 44,567           |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MFP3 | MUFG BK 0.000 06/23/2026 | 50,000,000           | -              | 148,556           | -              | 148,556          |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MFV0 | MUFG BK 0.000 06/29/2026 | 25,000,000           | -              | 74,278            | -              | 74,278           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HEL4 | TOYCC 0.000 05/20/2026   | 55,000,000           | -              | 167,261           | -              | 167,261          |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HEN0 | TOYCC 0.000 05/22/2026   | 100,000,000          | -              | 316,556           | -              | 316,556          |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HF33 | TOYCC 0.000 06/03/2026   | 60,000,000           | -              | 182,000           | -              | 182,000          |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HG16 | TOYCC 0.000 07/01/2026   | 70,000,000           | -              | 205,800           | -              | 205,800          |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HGE8 | TOYCC 0.000 07/14/2026   | 75,000,000           | -              | 218,750           | -              | 218,750          |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HGQ1 | TOYCC 0.000 07/24/2026   | 75,000,000           | -              | 218,167           | -              | 218,167          |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HGV0 | TOYCC 0.000 07/29/2026   | 50,000,000           | -              | 145,056           | -              | 145,056          |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                          | <b>1,061,000,000</b> | <b>-</b>       | <b>3,306,934</b>  | <b>-</b>       | <b>3,306,934</b> |
| Medium Term Notes  | 037833CJ7 | AAPL 3.350 02/09/2027    | 50,000,000           | 139,583        | 13,263            | -              | 152,846          |
| Medium Term Notes  | 14913UAN0 | CAT 4.450 10/16/2026     | 18,385,000           | 68,178         | (7,953)           | -              | 60,225           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 24422EXV6 | DE 4.200 07/15/2027      | 10,000,000           | 35,000         | 38                | -              | 35,038           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 24422EYD5 | DE 4.250 06/05/2028      | 25,000,000           | 88,542         | 568               | -              | 89,110           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 594918CN2 | MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026    | 6,452,000            | 18,281         | 6,352             | -              | 24,633           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 594918CN2 | MSFT 3.400 09/15/2026    | 13,009,000           | 36,859         | 12,740            | -              | 49,599           |
| Medium Term Notes  | 89236TMY8 | TOYOTA 4.600 01/08/2027  | 40,000,000           | 153,333        | 845               | -              | 154,178          |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                          | <b>162,846,000</b>   | <b>539,776</b> | <b>25,854</b>     | <b>-</b>       | <b>565,629</b>   |

## Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment   | CUSIP     | Description                                 | Par Value             | Accrued           | (Amort.) / Accre. | Unrealized G/L | Total Earnings    |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Money Market Funds   | 09248U718 | BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund            | 14,694,137            | 40,067            | -                 | -              | 40,067            |
| Money Market Funds   | 31607A703 | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 354,824,027           | 381,624           | -                 | -              | 381,624           |
| Money Market Funds   | 608919718 | Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund      | 16,320,330            | 44,720            | -                 | -              | 44,720            |
| Money Market Funds   | 262006208 | Dreyfus Government Cash Management          | 15,287,528            | 41,624            | -                 | -              | 41,624            |
| Money Market Funds   | 85749T517 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 724,135,526           | 1,895,299         | -                 | -              | 1,895,299         |
| Money Market Funds   | 61747C319 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 292,782,656           | 784,362           | -                 | -              | 784,362           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                             | <b>1,418,044,205</b>  | <b>3,187,694</b>  | <b>-</b>          | <b>-</b>       | <b>3,187,694</b>  |
| Supranationals       | 45818WDG8 | IADB 0.820 02/27/2026                       | -                     | 11,548            | (898)             | -              | 10,650            |
| Supranationals       | 4581X0EN4 | IADB 4.125 02/15/2029                       | 25,000,000            | 85,938            | 5,843             | -              | 91,781            |
| Supranationals       | 4581X0EN4 | IADB 4.125 02/15/2029                       | 50,000,000            | 171,875           | 2,894             | -              | 174,769           |
| Supranationals       | 459058KC6 | IBRD 0.700 11/16/2026                       | 55,000,000            | 103,125           | 62,818            | -              | 165,943           |
| Supranationals       | 459058KJ1 | IBRD 3.125 06/15/2027                       | 12,323,000            | 32,091            | 10,238            | -              | 42,329            |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                             | <b>142,323,000</b>    | <b>404,577</b>    | <b>80,894</b>     | <b>-</b>       | <b>485,471</b>    |
| Secured Bank Deposit | 0660P0999 | Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct        | 165,655,743           | 456,222           | -                 | -              | 456,222           |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                             | <b>165,655,743</b>    | <b>456,222</b>    | <b>-</b>          | <b>-</b>       | <b>456,222</b>    |
| <b>Grand Totals</b>  |           |                                             | <b>17,822,497,947</b> | <b>47,100,775</b> | <b>5,063,034</b>  | <b>-</b>       | <b>52,163,808</b> |

# Investment Transactions

## Pooled Fund

| Accounting ID         | Transaction Type | Cusip     | Description           | Price    | Settlement Date | Posted Date | Par Value          | Principal          | Accrued Interest | Total              |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 58982                 | Buy              | 313385TF3 | FHDN 0.000 02/18/2026 | 99.95056 | 02/13/2026      | 02/13/2026  | 30,000,000         | 29,985,167         | -                | 29,985,167         |
| 58983                 | Buy              | 313385B88 | FHDN 0.000 08/14/2026 | 98.25708 | 02/17/2026      | 02/17/2026  | 22,900,000         | 22,500,872         | -                | 22,500,872         |
| 58984                 | Buy              | 912797TX5 | B 0.000 08/20/2026    | 98.23056 | 02/19/2026      | 02/19/2026  | 100,000,000        | 98,230,556         | -                | 98,230,556         |
| 58988                 | Buy              | 313385G91 | FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026 | 97.93594 | 02/24/2026      | 02/24/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,483,986         | -                | 24,483,986         |
| 58989                 | Buy              | 313385G91 | FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026 | 97.93594 | 02/24/2026      | 02/24/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,483,986         | -                | 24,483,986         |
| 58990                 | Buy              | 313385G91 | FHDN 0.000 09/24/2026 | 97.93594 | 02/24/2026      | 02/24/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,483,986         | -                | 24,483,986         |
| 58985                 | Buy              | 313385D29 | FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026 | 98.23250 | 02/25/2026      | 02/25/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,558,125         | -                | 24,558,125         |
| 58986                 | Buy              | 313385D29 | FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026 | 98.23250 | 02/25/2026      | 02/25/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,558,125         | -                | 24,558,125         |
| 58987                 | Buy              | 313385D29 | FHDN 0.000 08/24/2026 | 98.23250 | 02/25/2026      | 02/25/2026  | 15,000,000         | 14,734,875         | -                | 14,734,875         |
| 58991                 | Buy              | 912797TY3 | B 0.000 08/27/2026    | 98.21691 | 02/26/2026      | 02/26/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,554,226         | -                | 24,554,226         |
| 58992                 | Buy              | 912797QD2 | B 0.000 04/16/2026    | 99.51800 | 02/27/2026      | 02/27/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,879,500         | -                | 24,879,500         |
| 58993                 | Buy              | 912797SZ1 | B 0.000 03/17/2026    | 99.81938 | 02/27/2026      | 02/27/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,954,844         | -                | 24,954,844         |
| 58994                 | Buy              | 912797QN0 | B 0.000 05/14/2026    | 99.24175 | 02/27/2026      | 02/27/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,810,438         | -                | 24,810,438         |
| 58995                 | Buy              | 912797UA3 | B 0.000 06/16/2026    | 98.91515 | 02/27/2026      | 02/27/2026  | 25,000,000         | 24,728,787         | -                | 24,728,787         |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                  |           |                       |          |                 |             | <b>417,900,000</b> | <b>411,947,473</b> | <b>-</b>         | <b>411,947,473</b> |

# Investment Transactions

## Pooled Fund

| Accounting ID         | Transaction Type | Cusip     | Description              | Price     | Settlement Date | Posted Date | Par Value          | Principal          | Accrued Interest | Total              |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 57583                 | Maturity         | 3130AUTC8 | FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/06/2026      | 02/06/2026  | 21,100,000         | 21,100,000         | -                | 21,100,000         |
| 58673                 | Maturity         | 62479MB69 | MUFG BK 0.000 02/06/2026 | 100.00000 | 02/06/2026      | 02/06/2026  | 25,000,000         | 25,000,000         | -                | 25,000,000         |
| 58586                 | Maturity         | 06367DQ32 | BMOCHG 4.330 02/09/2026  | 100.00000 | 02/09/2026      | 02/09/2026  | 75,000,000         | 75,000,000         | -                | 75,000,000         |
| 58588                 | Maturity         | 13606DHF2 | CIBC NY 4.330 02/09/2026 | 100.00000 | 02/09/2026      | 02/09/2026  | 50,000,000         | 50,000,000         | -                | 50,000,000         |
| 58674                 | Maturity         | 06367DQP3 | BMOCHG 4.430 02/11/2026  | 100.00000 | 02/11/2026      | 02/11/2026  | 70,000,000         | 70,000,000         | -                | 70,000,000         |
| 57660                 | Maturity         | 3133EPJX4 | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/17/2026      | 02/17/2026  | 30,000,000         | 30,000,000         | -                | 30,000,000         |
| 57661                 | Maturity         | 3133EPJX4 | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/17/2026      | 02/17/2026  | 25,000,000         | 25,000,000         | -                | 25,000,000         |
| 58982                 | Maturity         | 313385TF3 | FHDN 0.000 02/18/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/18/2026      | 02/18/2026  | 30,000,000         | 30,000,000         | -                | 30,000,000         |
| 58975                 | Maturity         | 912797PM3 | B 0.000 02/19/2026       | 100.00000 | 02/19/2026      | 02/19/2026  | 55,000,000         | 55,000,000         | -                | 55,000,000         |
| 57594                 | Maturity         | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/23/2026      | 02/23/2026  | 50,000,000         | 50,000,000         | -                | 50,000,000         |
| 57595                 | Maturity         | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/23/2026      | 02/23/2026  | 25,000,000         | 25,000,000         | -                | 25,000,000         |
| 57596                 | Maturity         | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/23/2026      | 02/23/2026  | 28,000,000         | 28,000,000         | -                | 28,000,000         |
| 58678                 | Maturity         | 78015JG84 | RY 4.330 02/23/2026      | 100.00000 | 02/23/2026      | 02/23/2026  | 60,000,000         | 60,000,000         | -                | 60,000,000         |
| 58976                 | Maturity         | 313385TM8 | FHLBDN 0.000 02/24/2026  | 100.00000 | 02/24/2026      | 02/24/2026  | 50,000,000         | 50,000,000         | -                | 50,000,000         |
| 58977                 | Maturity         | 313385TM8 | FHLBDN 0.000 02/24/2026  | 100.00000 | 02/24/2026      | 02/24/2026  | 50,000,000         | 50,000,000         | -                | 50,000,000         |
| 58978                 | Maturity         | 313385TM8 | FHLBDN 0.000 02/24/2026  | 100.00000 | 02/24/2026      | 02/24/2026  | 30,000,000         | 30,000,000         | -                | 30,000,000         |
| 58979                 | Maturity         | 313385TM8 | FHLBDN 0.000 02/24/2026  | 100.00000 | 02/24/2026      | 02/24/2026  | 30,000,000         | 30,000,000         | -                | 30,000,000         |
| 47433                 | Maturity         | 3133ENJ35 | FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/25/2026      | 02/25/2026  | 35,000,000         | 35,000,000         | -                | 35,000,000         |
| 47144                 | Maturity         | 45818WDG8 | IADB 0.820 02/27/2026    | 100.00000 | 02/27/2026      | 02/27/2026  | 19,500,000         | 19,500,000         | -                | 19,500,000         |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                  |           |                          |           |                 |             | <b>758,600,000</b> | <b>758,600,000</b> | <b>-</b>         | <b>758,600,000</b> |

## Interest Received Pooled Fund

| Accounting ID         | Transaction Type | Cusip     | Description             | Date Posted | Interest Received | Purchased Interest Adjustment | Net Interest      |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 58669                 | Interest Income  | 91282CJW2 | T 4.000 01/31/2029      | 02/02/2026  | 1,200,000         | 0                             | 1,200,000         |
| 58905                 | Interest Income  | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030      | 02/02/2026  | 968,750           | 689,708                       | 279,042           |
| 58906                 | Interest Income  | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030      | 02/02/2026  | 968,750           | 689,708                       | 279,042           |
| 58912                 | Interest Income  | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030      | 02/02/2026  | 968,750           | 694,973                       | 273,777           |
| 58924                 | Interest Income  | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030      | 02/02/2026  | 968,750           | 726,563                       | 242,188           |
| 58927                 | Interest Income  | 91282CNN7 | T 3.875 07/31/2030      | 02/02/2026  | 968,750           | 726,563                       | 242,188           |
| 58980                 | Interest Income  | 91282CJW2 | T 4.000 01/31/2029      | 02/02/2026  | 1,100,000         | 1,076,087                     | 23,913            |
| 58400                 | Interest Income  | 91282CLC3 | T 4.000 07/31/2029      | 02/02/2026  | 1,000,000         | 0                             | 1,000,000         |
| 58406                 | Interest Income  | 91282CLC3 | T 4.000 07/31/2029      | 02/02/2026  | 1,300,000         | 0                             | 1,300,000         |
| 58413                 | Interest Income  | 91282CJW2 | T 4.000 01/31/2029      | 02/02/2026  | 1,300,000         | 0                             | 1,300,000         |
| 58431                 | Interest Income  | 91282CLC3 | T 4.000 07/31/2029      | 02/02/2026  | 1,000,000         | 0                             | 1,000,000         |
| 57583                 | Interest Income  | 3130AUTC8 | FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026   | 02/06/2026  | 423,055           | 0                             | 423,055           |
| 58586                 | Interest Income  | 06367DQ32 | BMOCHG 4.330 02/09/2026 | 02/09/2026  | 2,841,563         | 0                             | 2,841,563         |
| 58588                 | Interest Income  | 13606DHF2 | CIBCNY 4.330 02/09/2026 | 02/09/2026  | 1,894,375         | 0                             | 1,894,375         |
| 57712                 | Interest Income  | 3133EPSK2 | FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028   | 02/09/2026  | 414,375           | 0                             | 414,375           |
| 58379                 | Interest Income  | 037833CJ7 | AAPL 3.350 02/09/2027   | 02/09/2026  | 837,500           | 0                             | 837,500           |
| 58674                 | Interest Income  | 06367DQP3 | BMOCHG 4.430 02/11/2026 | 02/11/2026  | 2,351,592         | 0                             | 2,351,592         |
| 58763                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETX6  | FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027   | 02/11/2026  | 126,875           | 0                             | 126,875           |
| 58764                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETX6  | FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027   | 02/11/2026  | 90,625            | 0                             | 90,625            |
| 58765                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETX6  | FFCB 3.625 08/11/2027   | 02/11/2026  | 90,625            | 0                             | 90,625            |
| 58887                 | Interest Income  | 91282CMN8 | T 4.250 02/15/2028      | 02/17/2026  | 1,062,500         | 525,476                       | 537,024           |
| 58892                 | Interest Income  | 91282CMN8 | T 4.250 02/15/2028      | 02/17/2026  | 1,912,500         | 1,008,220                     | 904,280           |
| 57660                 | Interest Income  | 3133EPJX4 | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026   | 02/17/2026  | 543,750           | 0                             | 543,750           |
| 57661                 | Interest Income  | 3133EPJX4 | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026   | 02/17/2026  | 453,125           | 0                             | 453,125           |
| 57717                 | Interest Income  | 3133EPSW6 | FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026   | 02/17/2026  | 1,125,000         | 0                             | 1,125,000         |
| 57902                 | Interest Income  | 4581X0EN4 | IADB 4.125 02/15/2029   | 02/17/2026  | 515,625           | 0                             | 515,625           |
| 57911                 | Interest Income  | 9128286B1 | T 2.625 02/15/2029      | 02/17/2026  | 656,250           | 0                             | 656,250           |
| 58102                 | Interest Income  | 4581X0EN4 | IADB 4.125 02/15/2029   | 02/17/2026  | 1,031,250         | 0                             | 1,031,250         |
| 58444                 | Interest Income  | 3133ERD24 | FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027   | 02/18/2026  | 637,500           | 0                             | 637,500           |
| 58549                 | Interest Income  | 3133ER4A6 | FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027   | 02/18/2026  | 637,500           | 0                             | 637,500           |
| 58550                 | Interest Income  | 3133ER4A6 | FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027   | 02/18/2026  | 531,250           | 0                             | 531,250           |
| 58551                 | Interest Income  | 3133ER4A6 | FFCB 4.250 02/18/2027   | 02/18/2026  | 42,500            | 0                             | 42,500            |
| 58678                 | Interest Income  | 78015JG84 | RY 4.330 02/23/2026     | 02/23/2026  | 2,042,317         | 0                             | 2,042,317         |
| 58682                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETJF5 | FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027   | 02/23/2026  | 900,000           | 0                             | 900,000           |
| 58683                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETJF5 | FFCB 4.000 02/23/2027   | 02/23/2026  | 200,000           | 0                             | 200,000           |
| 58776                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETUE5 | FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027   | 02/23/2026  | 750,000           | 0                             | 750,000           |
| 58777                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETUE5 | FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027   | 02/23/2026  | 468,750           | 0                             | 468,750           |
| 58778                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETUE5 | FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027   | 02/23/2026  | 281,250           | 0                             | 281,250           |
| 58782                 | Interest Income  | 3133ETUE5 | FFCB 3.750 02/22/2027   | 02/23/2026  | 656,250           | 0                             | 656,250           |
| 57594                 | Interest Income  | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | 02/23/2026  | 1,093,750         | 0                             | 1,093,750         |
| 57595                 | Interest Income  | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | 02/23/2026  | 546,875           | 0                             | 546,875           |
| 57596                 | Interest Income  | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | 02/23/2026  | 612,500           | 0                             | 612,500           |
| 57597                 | Interest Income  | 3133EPBM6 | FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027   | 02/23/2026  | 206,250           | 0                             | 206,250           |
| 47433                 | Interest Income  | 3133ENJ35 | FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026   | 02/25/2026  | 581,000           | 0                             | 581,000           |
| 47144                 | Interest Income  | 45818WDG8 | IADB 0.820 02/27/2026   | 02/27/2026  | 79,950            | 0                             | 79,950            |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                  |           |                         |             | <b>38,381,976</b> | <b>6,137,296</b>              | <b>32,244,680</b> |



## Cash Activity Pooled Fund

| Accounting ID         | Description                                 | Activity Date | Transaction       | Amount             |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 85749T517             | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 02/02/2026    | Withdrawal        | -100,000,000       |
| 85749T517             | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 02/05/2026    | Withdrawal        | -35,000,000        |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/06/2026    | Deposit           | 60,000,000         |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/09/2026    | Deposit           | 40,000,000         |
| 85749T517             | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 02/10/2026    | Deposit           | 140,000,000        |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/12/2026    | Deposit           | 40,000,000         |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/13/2026    | Deposit           | 25,000,000         |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/17/2026    | Deposit           | 60,000,000         |
| 31607A703             | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 02/18/2026    | Deposit           | 35,000,000         |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/18/2026    | Withdrawal        | -65,000,000        |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/19/2026    | Withdrawal        | -75,000,000        |
| 31607A703             | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 02/20/2026    | Deposit           | 10,000,000         |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/23/2026    | Withdrawal        | -45,000,000        |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/24/2026    | Deposit           | 105,000,000        |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/25/2026    | Withdrawal        | -45,000,000        |
| 31607A703             | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 02/26/2026    | Deposit           | 65,000,000         |
| 31607A703             | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 02/27/2026    | Deposit           | 140,000,000        |
| 262006208             | Dreyfus Government Cash Management          | 02/27/2026    | Interest Received | 41,624             |
| 85749T517             | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 02/27/2026    | Interest Received | 1,895,299          |
| 61747C319             | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 02/27/2026    | Interest Received | 784,362            |
| 0660P0999             | Bank of America TTX INV Deposit Acct        | 02/27/2026    | Interest Received | 456,222            |
| 09248U718             | BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund            | 02/28/2026    | Interest Received | 40,067             |
| 31607A703             | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 02/28/2026    | Interest Received | 381,624            |
| 608919718             | Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund      | 02/28/2026    | Interest Received | 44,720             |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                                             |               |                   | <b>358,643,917</b> |

# Item 04

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SFMTA Response to Supervisor Sauter's LOI re: Bilingual Employees  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 2:24:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Signed SFMTA Response Letter of Inquiry Supervisor Sauter 03 20 26.pdf](#)  
[26.02.03 Sauter CTA\\_Clerk's Memo Signed.pdf](#)

---

Good afternoon,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Danny Sauter during the February 3, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Sakelaris, Kathleen <Kathleen.Sakelaris@sfmta.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2026 11:45 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <[Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org](mailto:Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org)>; SauterStaff <[SauterStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:SauterStaff@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Ramos, Joel (MTA) <[Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com](mailto:Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com)>; Martinsen, Janet (MTA) <[Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com](mailto:Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com)>; True, Judson (MTA) <[Judson.True@sfmta.com](mailto:Judson.True@sfmta.com)>  
**Subject:** SFMTA Response to Supervisor Sauter's LOI re: Bilingual Employees

Madame Clerk:

Please find attached the SFMTA's response to Supervisor Sauter's February 3, 2026, Letter of Inquiry requesting information on the recruitment, hiring and retention of bilingual public-facing employees.

Please note that this response was completed and understood to be sent late Friday afternoon but the email error wasn't discovered until now. We apologize for any inconvenience.

Please let us know if you need any additional information.

Best regards,

**Kathleen Sakelar**

Regulatory Affairs & Audits Manager  
Administration Division, Compliance



**Mobile 415.730-2561**

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
1 South Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94103



Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Janet Tarlov, Chair  
Stephanie Cajina, Vice Chair  
Mike Chen, Director  
Alfonso Felder, Director

Steve Heminger, Director  
Dominica Henderson, Director  
Fiona Hinze, Director

Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transportation

**March 20, 2026**

**The Honorable Supervisor Danny Sauter  
Board of Supervisors, District 3  
City and County of San Francisco  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
City Hall, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102**

***Subject: Letter of Inquiry Requesting Information on Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention of Bilingual Public-Facing City Employees***

**Dear Supervisor Sauter:**

Thank you for your Letter of Inquiry (LOI) to SFMTA requesting information on its recruitment, hiring and retention of bilingual public-facing employees. The SFMTA recognizes the importance of supporting language access to city services to better serve San Francisco's diverse communities.

Please find below our responses to Questions 1-3 and Question 7. Please note that the Department of Human Resources is responding to Questions 4, 5 and 6 on behalf of all agencies who were requested to respond and SFMTA forwarded information to them as requested.

**Q1. What are the public facing roles in your department that routinely involve Limited English Proficient interactions?**

SFMTA staff whose primary job function is interacting with the public and may involve interactions with individuals with limited-English proficiency include: Transit Fare Inspectors (TFIs), Public Relation and Public Information Officers, Outreach Managers, Muni Transit Assistance Program (MTAP), Station Agents, Customer Service Agents, Senior Permit and Citation Clerks, Fare Collection Receivers, Transit Information Clerks, Administrative Hearing Officers and Parking Enforcement Dispatchers.

**Q2. Which of those roles are designated language special condition positions?**

1314 Public Relations Officer, 1312 Public Information Officer, 9506 Senior Permit and Citation Clerk, 9132 Transit Fare Inspector

**Q3. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, what is your current bilingual employee recruitment, hiring, or retention plan or strategy?**

SFMTA strives to create a candidate pool that is reflective of the communities we serve. In general, the SFMTA posts and distributes job opportunities through an expansive outreach list ("SFMTA\_Jobnews@sfmta.com") that includes: 50+ Community-Based Organizations, who can share the job postings among their constituents and community members; surrounding city and county contacts;



unions; sister transit agencies; university and other educational bodies throughout the Bay Area and beyond. SFMTA also partners as needed with City Career Center to advertise and inform of upcoming events and workshops, such as getting the process started for applying to a city job, navigating the hiring process and job interview preparation. When language skills in a language other than English are required as a special condition for a particular position, the SFMTA can expand its efforts beyond eligibility lists if no initial candidates have met the language skills requirement. Expanded recruitment efforts can include posting more specific job ads and using paid advertising for hard to fill positions and to attract more candidates, as needed.

**Q7. What is the department's or division's strategy for recruiting, hiring, or retaining bilingual employees for the roles listed in response to Question 1? Please list specific information including goals, timelines and associated budgets.**

Please see the information listed in response to Question #3 regarding SFMTA's strategy for recruiting and hiring bilingual employees.

As a specific recruiting and hiring example for bilingual employees for specific conditions, SFMTA's Communications and Human Resources Divisions within the past two years have advertised positions that require language special conditions in job publications that expand beyond the normal recruitment reach through free and paid job ads such as through the Ad Club (Latinos in Transit, COMTO-Conference of Minority Transportation Officials, Indeed, LinkedIn, American Public Transportation Association (APTA), Public Relations Society of America, etc.). As a result of this effort, SFMTA's Communications Division tested and certified staff in Chinese (Cantonese and Mandarin) and Spanish to increase the number of bilingual staff that can provide these services.

With regard to retention, depending on the union contract, in addition to premium pay for certified bilingual employees, SFMTA offers various employee benefits, including transit passes. SFMTA also strives to make SFMTA a welcoming place and works to acknowledge and celebrate the diverse cultural backgrounds of our workforce and the communities we serve with the goal of a creating a more inclusive workplace culture and strengthening community relationships and connections.

Please do not hesitate to reach out if any further information is needed and thank you for the opportunity to participate in this important inquiry.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in purple ink, appearing to read 'Julie'.

Julie Kirschbaum  
Director of Transportation

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-District03 Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: DHR Response to Supervisor Sauter's Letter of Inquiry (February 3, 2026)  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:55:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Sauter LOI - Bilingual Pay - DHR Response 03.19.26.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the Department of Human Resources (DHR), submitting a response to a letter of inquiry issued by Supervisor Danny Sauter at the February 3, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Regards,

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

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

---

**From:** Young, Adam (HRD) <adam.r.young@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:51 PM  
**To:** Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Isen, Carol (HRD) <carol.isen@sfgov.org>; Howard, Kate (HRD) <kate.howard@sfgov.org>; Whitley, Gigi (HRD) <gigi.whitley@sfgov.org>; Chisti, Aliya (HRD) <aliya.chisti@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** DHR Response to Supervisor Sauter's Letter of Inquiry (February 3, 2026)

Dear Supervisor Sauter,

Please see attached response from the Department of Human Resources to your letter of inquiry dated February 3, 2026, *Requesting Information on the Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention of Bilingual Public-Facing City Employees*.

We appreciate the opportunity to contribute to this important review and remain committed to supporting cross-departmental efforts to strengthen language access for all San Franciscans.

If any additional information or clarification would be helpful, we would be glad to provide it.

Very best,  
Adam



**Adam Young**  
[He, Him, His]  
**Senior Policy Analyst, Policy and External Affairs**  
Department of Human Resources  
One South Van Ness Ave., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Phone: (628) 652-0631  
Website: [www.sf.gov/departments/human-resources](http://www.sf.gov/departments/human-resources)



**DATE:** March 19, 2026  
**TO:** Supervisor Danny Sauter  
**FROM:** Kate Howard, Managing Deputy Director, Department of Human Resources  
**CC:** Carol Isen, Human Resources Director, Department of Human Resources  
**SUBJECT:** **DHR Response to Letter of Inquiry: Requesting Information on Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention of Bilingual Public-Facing City Employees**

---

Dear Supervisor Sauter,

We write in response to your February 3, 2026, Letter of Inquiry, requesting information on recruitment, hiring, and retention of bilingual public-facing employees. The Department of Human Resources (DHR) recognizes the importance of supporting language access City services to better serve San Francisco's diverse communities. DHR supports City departments in this work through administration of examinations, review and approval of special condition designations, and participation in the collective bargaining process, which establishes compensation frameworks, including bilingual premium pay.

DHR administers the City's civil service examination and classification processes in accordance with the Civil Service Rules. Pursuant to Rule 111A<sup>1</sup>, the Human Resources Director may designate language proficiency as a special condition of employment when it is job-related and necessary to the duties of a position. Language special condition positions are established through a collaborative process between departments and DHR. Departments identify positions that require bilingual skills based on operational needs and service delivery to Limited English Proficient (LEP) populations. DHR then reviews and approves these designations to ensure they are job-related, consistently applied, and aligned with Civil Service Rules.

Bilingual premium pay provisions are established through the collective bargaining process and reflected in applicable memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between labor unions and the City. Depending on the applicable agreement, eligibility may be tied to designated positions with language requirements or to employees who are certified and assigned to perform bilingual services. DHR reviews and approves departmental requests for designated bilingual positions when applicable and ensures that eligible employees receive premium pay consistent with their applicable MOU.

DHR also administers language proficiency certification processes to assess employees' bilingual skills. Employees who are certified may be eligible to provide language services, such as interpretation or translation, as part of their job duties.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 111A applies to examinations designated to the Position-Based Testing Program and shall apply to employees in all classes except the Uniformed Ranks of the Police and Fire Departments, and MTA Service-Critical positions or classes.





While DHR provides oversight, policy guidance, and administrative support, departments remain responsible for identifying and addressing language access needs within their operations, including ensuring appropriate staffing and service delivery for LEP communities in accordance with applicable City policies, including the Language Access Ordinance.

In response to Part I of the Letter of Inquiry, the Department of Human Resources (DHR) coordinated with San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), Department of Emergency Management (DEM), Department of Public Health (DPH), City Administrator's Office (ADM), and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to provide answers to questions 4-6 in Part I as they relate DHR's oversight and administration. For Part II of the LOI, DHR has provided a response to questions 1-5.

**Part I.**

**1. What are the public facing roles in your department that routinely involve Limited English Proficient interactions?**

SFPD, SFFD, DEM, DPH, ADM, and SFMTA to respond.

**2. Which of those roles are designated language special condition positions?**

SFPD, SFFD, DEM, DPH, ADM, and SFMTA to respond.

**3. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, what is your current bilingual employee recruitment, hiring, or retention plan or strategy?**

SFPD, SFFD, DEM, DPH, ADM, and SFMTA to respond.

**4. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, do you offer pay bonuses for certified bilingual employees?**

Compensation for City employees, including bilingual assignment pay, is governed by the applicable MOU negotiated between the City and labor organizations representing employees in each bargaining unit. As a result, bilingual assignment pay varies across unions based on negotiated terms.

In 2019, through the collective bargaining process, the City implemented changes to streamline the administration of bilingual pay. These changes included standardizing certification requirements, introducing periodic recertification, and transitioning from performance-based premiums to status-based premiums tied to language proficiency.<sup>2</sup> Performance-based premium structures previously required employees to meet specified thresholds, such as a minimum number of hours performing bilingual work, or to be assigned to positions formally designated as bilingual. Through the collective bargaining process, the City implemented changes to standardize and simplify these provisions by moving away from hour-

---

<sup>2</sup> Collective bargaining agreements are negotiated on different cycles across bargaining units; accordingly, references to specific bargaining years may not apply uniformly to all units.



based thresholds and aligning eligibility more closely with certification and assignment to perform bilingual duties. While many bargaining units adopted this updated approach, some agreements continue to tie bilingual premium pay to designated positions with language special conditions. As a result, bilingual premium pay provisions vary across bargaining units, reflecting the terms negotiated in each MOU. There were no substantive changes to bilingual premium pay amounts for bargaining units in the 2024 collective bargaining process.

Collectively, these changes were intended to improve consistency, clarity, and accountability in how bilingual skills are recognized and compensated. These efforts reflect the City’s ongoing commitment to strengthening language access services while ensuring equitable and transparent compensation practices for bilingual employees.

In the table below, DHR coordinated with SFPD, SFFD, DEM, DPH, ADM, and SFMTA to identify the applicable bilingual assignment pay provisions in each MOU covering the public-facing positions and job classifications referenced by each department in their response.

| Union                                                                      | Department            | Prior <sup>3</sup><br>Bilingual<br>Assignment Pay<br>(per pay period)        | Current<br>Bilingual<br>Assignment Pay<br>(per pay period)             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Firefighters’ Association, Local 798 Unit 1                                | SFFD                  | \$36                                                                         | \$36                                                                   |
| Police Officers’ Association (POA)                                         | SFPD                  | \$35                                                                         | \$80                                                                   |
| Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21                             | DPH, DEM,<br>MTA      | \$ 40-\$60<br>(designated<br>position; <40hrs;<br>≥40 hrs per pay<br>period) | \$60                                                                   |
| Service Employees’ International Union (SEIU),<br>Local 1021 Miscellaneous | ADM, DPH,<br>DEM, MTA | \$ 40-\$60<br>(designated<br>position; <40hrs;<br>≥40 hrs per pay<br>period) | \$60; employees<br>shall be provided<br>with release time<br>to attend |

<sup>3</sup> Collective bargaining agreements are negotiated on varying cycles across bargaining units; therefore, references to “prior” agreements may not correspond to a uniform timeframe. In certain prior agreements, bilingual pay structures varied and could include position-based designations, minimum usage thresholds, or tiered compensation, rather than standardized certification-based premiums.



| Union                                                               | Department | Prior <sup>3</sup><br>Bilingual<br>Assignment Pay<br>(per pay period) | Current<br>Bilingual<br>Assignment Pay<br>(per pay period)                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                     |            |                                                                       | language<br>proficiency tests                                                                           |
| Service Employees' International Union (SEIU),<br>Local 1021 Nurses | DPH        | \$25/week<br>(designated<br>position;<br>assigned;<br>≥5hours/week)   | \$60; employees<br>shall be provided<br>with release time<br>to attend<br>language<br>proficiency tests |
| Teamsters Local 856, Multi-Unit                                     | ADM        | \$35 (designated<br>position; ≥ 10hrs)                                | \$40 (designated<br>position)                                                                           |
| Teamsters Local 856, Spv Registered Nurses                          | DPH        | \$35 (designated<br>position; ≥ 10hrs)                                | \$60                                                                                                    |
| TWU Local 250-A, Multi-unit                                         | DPH, MTA   | \$40-\$60 (≥ 10-<br>40+ hrs;<br>designated<br>position)               | \$60                                                                                                    |
| TWU, Local 200                                                      | MTA        | \$60 (designated<br>position)                                         | \$60 (designated<br>position)                                                                           |
| Union of American Physicians and Dentists,<br>Unit 18               | DPH        | \$50 (designated<br>position; ≥ 10hrs)                                | \$60 (designated<br>position)                                                                           |
| Municipal Executive Association, Misc.                              | MTA, DEM   | N/A                                                                   | N/A                                                                                                     |
| Municipal Executive Association, Fire                               | SFFD       | N/A                                                                   | N/A                                                                                                     |
| Municipal Executive Association, Police                             | SFPD       | N/A                                                                   | N/A                                                                                                     |

**5. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, how have these pay bonuses changed over time? When were they last increased?**

Please see table in question 4, which includes bilingual assignment pay from MOUs prior to 2019 for various unions.



**6. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, how do these pay bonuses compare to other municipalities that you often are in competition with?**

While bilingual pay structures vary across jurisdictions in terms of eligibility requirements, certification processes, and premium amounts, the City and County of San Francisco's bilingual assignment pay provisions are generally competitive with those offered by comparable public sector employers in the region. Jurisdictions included in the regional comparison are Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma counties, and cities within these Bay Area counties, such as San Jose, Vallejo, and Oakland.

**7. What is the department's or division's strategy for recruiting, hiring, or retaining bilingual employees for the roles listed in response to Question 1? Please list specific information including goals, timelines, and associated budgets**  
SFPD, SFFD, DEM, DPH, ADM, and SFMTA to respond.

**Part II.**

**1. What would be an appropriate premium pay rate for the City and County of San Francisco to remain competitive in recruiting, retaining, and lowering the vacancy rate for bilingual employees in language special condition positions? Please provide approximate information for each department and provide current bilingual pay incentives and ideal future incentive levels.**

Bilingual assignment pay is a negotiated term and condition of employment. The Department of Human Resources does not independently establish a single citywide premium rate or recommended amount. The appropriate premium level varies depending on negotiated compensation structures.

The City also supports language access through multiple strategies, including the administration of bilingual certification examinations, coordination of testing opportunities for employees seeking bilingual designation, and departmental recruitment efforts to identify candidates with relevant language skills.

Current bilingual assignment pay provisions applicable to the departments referenced in this inquiry are summarized in the table above. Any future adjustments to bilingual assignment pay would occur through negotiations with the relevant labor organizations during collective bargaining.

**2. What critical feedback has DHR received or noted regarding the certification examinations conducted by DHR and other authorized organizations, particularly from the six departments named above?**

The Department of Human Resources works closely with departments to coordinate the scheduling and administration of bilingual certification examinations. DHR has received feedback regarding the alignment of certain examination content with the operational duties of specific roles. For example, the bilingual examination administered for employees in law enforcement roles is designed to assess language proficiency in a policing context and therefore includes scenarios related to law enforcement interactions, such as incidents involving burglary, domestic violence, and other public safety situations. As a result,



departments must ensure that employees taking the bilingual certification examinations are in positions where language skills are job-related and consistent with operational needs. DHR will continue to work closely with departments to support the development and administration of bilingual certification examinations that align with operational needs and the duties of specific positions.

**3. What upcoming contract negotiations are you aware of that would impact bilingual pay incentives and rates?**

All five Police and Fire MOUs are open in 2026; the remaining thirty-five MOUs will be renegotiated in 2027.

**4. The city currently has 3,960 bilingual employees, sitting well below a recent high of 5,892 in 2016-2017. Acknowledging this, what is the city's goal for growing the number of bilingual city employees?**

DHR recognizes the importance of bilingual employees in delivering accessible and effective services to San Francisco's linguistically diverse communities. Bilingual employees play a critical role in supporting communication with residents who have limited English proficiency and in helping departments provide equitable access to City programs and services.

The number of employees certified for bilingual assignments may fluctuate over time due to several factors, including hiring levels, retirements, departmental staffing needs, and employee participation in bilingual certification testing. Departments determine the need for bilingual employees based on service delivery needs and the frequency with which positions interact with residents who have limited English proficiency. In addition to bilingual staffing, departments support language access through a range of strategies, including interpretation and translation services, multilingual outreach efforts, and the development of multilingual materials. These services represent an important component of the City's broader language access efforts.

The Department of Human Resources supports departments by administering bilingual certification examinations and coordinating testing opportunities for employees seeking bilingual designation to help ensure that positions requiring bilingual skills can be appropriately staffed.

**5. How can the Board of Supervisors support efforts to hire more bilingual city employees?**

The Department of Human Resources recognizes the importance of bilingual employees in ensuring that City services remain accessible to San Francisco's linguistically diverse communities. Supporting departments in recruiting and retaining employees with relevant language skills is an important part of the City's broader commitment to language access and equitable service delivery.

The Board of Supervisors can support these efforts through continued support of policies and resources that strengthen the City's language access work and help departments recruit and retain employees with the language skills needed to serve the public.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-District03 Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Sauter  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 8:31:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Sauter Bilingual LOI Response.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), submitting a response to a letter of inquiry issued by Supervisor Danny Sauter at the February 3, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Regards,

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

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

---

**From:** Nicita, Carl (POL) <carl.nicita@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 5:27 PM  
**To:** Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Bell, Tita (BOS) <tita.bell@sfgov.org>; Lew, Derrick (POL) <Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org>; Jones, Nicole (POL) <Nicole.H.Jones@sfgov.org>; Lopez, Steven (POL) <steven.lopez1@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Sauter

Supervisor Sauter –

On behalf of Chief Derrick Lew, please see the Police Department's response to your letter of inquiry requesting information on recruitment, hiring, and retention of bilingual public-facing employees. Please reach out with any further questions.

Thank you,  
Carl

**Carl Nicita** | Government Affairs Manager  
Government Affairs Unit – Office of the Chief of Staff  
San Francisco Police Department

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 5, 2026 2:54 PM  
**To:** Lew, Derrick (POL) <[Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org](mailto:Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org)>; Crispen, Dean (FIR) <[dean.crispen@sfgov.org](mailto:dean.crispen@sfgov.org)>; Carroll, Maryellen (DEM) <[maryellen.carroll@sfgov.org](mailto:maryellen.carroll@sfgov.org)>; Tsai, Daniel (DPH) <[daniel.tsai@sfdph.org](mailto:daniel.tsai@sfdph.org)>; Chu, Carmen (ADM) <[carmen.chu@sfgov.org](mailto:carmen.chu@sfgov.org)>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <[Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com](mailto:Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com)>; Isen, Carol (HRD) <[carol.isen@sfgov.org](mailto:carol.isen@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Lopez, Stephen (SHF) <[stephen.lopez@sfgov.org](mailto:stephen.lopez@sfgov.org)>; Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <[Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org](mailto:Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org)>; Nicita, Carl (POL) <[carl.nicita@sfgov.org](mailto:carl.nicita@sfgov.org)>; Miranda, Giannina (POL) <[giannina.miranda@sfgov.org](mailto:giannina.miranda@sfgov.org)>; Ludwig, Theresa (FIR) <[theresa.ludwig@sfgov.org](mailto:theresa.ludwig@sfgov.org)>; Scanlon, Olivia (DEM) <[olivia.scanlon@sfgov.org](mailto:olivia.scanlon@sfgov.org)>; Reardon, Claire (DEM) <[claire.reardon@sfgov.org](mailto:claire.reardon@sfgov.org)>; Bobba, Naveena (DPH) <[naveena.bobba@sfdph.org](mailto:naveena.bobba@sfdph.org)>; Patil, Sneha (DPH) <[sneha.patil@sfdph.org](mailto:sneha.patil@sfdph.org)>; Altman, Claire (DPH) <[claire.altman@sfdph.org](mailto:claire.altman@sfdph.org)>; Po, Vivian (ADM) <[vivian.po@sfgov.org](mailto:vivian.po@sfgov.org)>; Yip, Angela (ADM) <[angela.yip@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.yip@sfgov.org)>; Martinsen, Janet (MTA) <[Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com](mailto:Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com)>; Ramos, Joel (MTA) <[Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com](mailto:Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com)>; Olea, Ricardo (MTA) <[Ricardo.Olea@sfmta.com](mailto:Ricardo.Olea@sfmta.com)>; Wise, Viktoriya (MTA) <[Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com](mailto:Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com)>; Silva, Christine (MTA) <[Christine.Silva@sfmta.com](mailto:Christine.Silva@sfmta.com)>; Chisti, Aliya (HRD) <[aliya.chisti@sfgov.org](mailto:aliya.chisti@sfgov.org)>; Bell, Tita (BOS) <[tita.bell@sfgov.org](mailto:tita.bell@sfgov.org)>; BOS-Operations <[bos-operations@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-operations@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Sauter

Dear Chief Lew, Chief Crispen, Executive Director Carroll, Director Tsai, City Administrator Chu, Director Kirschbaum, and Director Isen,

Please see the attached memorandum from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors regarding a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Danny Sauter at the February 3, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

John Bullock  
Office of the Clerk of the Board  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

[BOS@sfgov.org](mailto:BOS@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

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



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Sauter - DPH Response  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 8:13:13 AM  
**Attachments:** [RE Letter of Inquiry - Information on the Recruitment Hiring and Retention of Bilingual Public-Facing City Employees.pdf](#)  
[26.02.03 Sauter CTA\\_Clerk's Memo Signed.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Department of Public Health, submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Danny Sauter at the February 3, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Altman, Claire (DPH) <claire.altman@sfdph.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 20, 2026 4:35 PM  
**To:** Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Bell, Tita (BOS) <tita.bell@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Tsai, Daniel (DPH) <daniel.tsai@sfdph.org>; Bobba, Naveena (DPH) <naveena.bobba@sfdph.org>; Kim, Luenna (DPH) <luenna.kim@sfdph.org>; Dhanju, Richa (DPH) <richa.dhanju@sfdph.org>; Pojman, Natalie (DPH) <natalie.pojman@sfdph.org>; Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>; Karajah, Raghda (DPH) <raghda.karajah@sfdph.org>  
**Subject:** Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Sauter - DPH Response

Dear Supervisor Sauter,

Attached is a response from the Department of Public Health to the February 3rd, 2026, Letter of Inquiry requesting information related to the recruitment, hiring, and retention of bilingual public-facing employees across the Department of Public Health.

I am also including [@BOS-Operations](#) to track completeness of this letter of inquiry.

Thank you,  
Claire

**Claire Altman, MPH**

Senior Health Program Planner | Office of Policy and Planning  
San Francisco Department of Public Health

[claire.altman@sfdph.org](mailto:claire.altman@sfdph.org)

desk: (628) 271-7502

**direct: ☎(415) 579-3336**

*Preferred Pronouns: she/her/hers*

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE. This email message and attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of the information included in this message and any other attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete or otherwise destroy the information.



City and County of San Francisco  
Daniel L. Lurie  
Mayor

## San Francisco Department of Public Health

Daniel Tsai  
Director of Health

March 20, 2026

VIA EMAIL

Supervisor Sauter  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Rm 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Requesting Information on the Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention of Bilingual Public-Facing City Employees

Thank you for your letter of inquiry regarding the recruitment, hiring, and retention of bilingual public-facing City employees, received on February 5, 2026.

Below we have provided the requested information raised in the letter of inquiry.

**1. What are the public facing roles in your department that routinely involve Limited English Proficient interactions?**

| Job Code | Job Title                             |
|----------|---------------------------------------|
| 1402     | Junior Clerk                          |
| 1404     | Clerk                                 |
| 1406     | Senior Clerk                          |
| 1408     | Principal Clerk                       |
| 1410     | Chief Clerk                           |
| 1428     | Unit Clerk                            |
| 1429     | Nurses Staffing Assistant             |
| 1635     | Health Care Billing Clerk 1           |
| 1636     | Health Care Billing Clerk 2           |
| 1637     | Patient Accounts Clerk                |
| 1662     | Patient Accounts Assistant Supervisor |
| 1708     | Senior Telephone Operator             |
| 2105     | Patient Services Finance Technician   |
| 2110     | Medical Records Clerk                 |
| 2112     | Medical Records Technician            |

|      |                                              |
|------|----------------------------------------------|
| 2114 | Medical Records Technician Supervisor        |
| 2202 | Dental Aide                                  |
| 2204 | Dental Hygienist                             |
| 2210 | Dentist                                      |
| 2218 | Physician Assistant                          |
| 2230 | Physician Specialist                         |
| 2232 | Senior Physician Specialist - Continuous     |
| 2233 | Supervising Physician Specialist             |
| 2242 | Senior Psychiatric Physician Specialist      |
| 2243 | Supervising Psychiatric Physician Specialist |
| 2302 | Nursing Assistant                            |
| 2303 | Certified Nursing Assistant                  |
| 2305 | Psychiatric Technician                       |
| 2312 | Licensed Vocational Nurse                    |
| 2314 | Behavioral Health Team Leader                |
| 2320 | Registered Nurse                             |
| 2322 | Nurse Manager                                |
| 2325 | Nurse Midwife                                |
| 2328 | Nurse Practitioner                           |
| 2409 | Pharmacy Technician                          |
| 2424 | Diagnostic Imaging Assistant                 |
| 2430 | Medical Evaluations Assistant                |
| 2436 | Electroencephalograph Technician 1           |
| 2450 | Pharmacist                                   |
| 2453 | Supervising Pharmacist                       |
| 2454 | Clinical Pharmacist                          |
| 2471 | Radiologist Technologist Level 1, 2, 3       |
| 2472 | Radiologist Technologist Lead                |
| 2473 | Diagnostic Medical Sonographer Level 1, 2, 3 |
| 2496 | Imaging Supervisor                           |
| 2514 | Orthopedic Technician I                      |
| 2542 | Speech Pathologist                           |
| 2548 | Occupational Therapist                       |
| 2551 | Mental Health Treatment Specialist           |
| 2554 | Therapy Aide                                 |
| 2555 | Physical Therapist Assistant                 |
| 2556 | Physical Therapist                           |
| 2565 | Acupuncturist                                |
| 2566 | Rehabilitation Counselor                     |
| 2574 | Clinical Psychologist                        |
| 2583 | Home Health Aide                             |
| 2585 | Health Worker 1                              |
| 2586 | Health Worker 2                              |

|      |                                          |
|------|------------------------------------------|
| 2587 | Health Worker 3                          |
| 2588 | Health Worker 4                          |
| 2589 | Health Program Coordinator 1             |
| 2591 | Health Program Coordinator 2             |
| 2593 | Health Program Coordinator 3             |
| 2606 | Senior Food Service Worker               |
| 2624 | Dietitian                                |
| 2736 | Porter                                   |
| 2740 | Porter Supervisor 1                      |
| 2802 | Epidemiologist 2                         |
| 2803 | Epidemiologist 3                         |
| 2806 | Disease Control Investigator             |
| 2819 | Assistant Health Educator                |
| 2820 | Senior Health Program Planner            |
| 2822 | Health Educator                          |
| 2830 | Public Health Nurse                      |
| 2846 | Nutritionist                             |
| 2903 | Hospital Eligibility Worker              |
| 2908 | Sen Hospital Eligibility Wrkr            |
| 2909 | Hospital Elig Wrk Supervisor             |
| 2910 | Social Worker                            |
| 2920 | Medical Social Worker                    |
| 2930 | Behavioral Health Clinician              |
| 2931 | Marriage, Family & Child Counselor       |
| 2932 | Sr Behavioral Health Clinician           |
| 3450 | Agricultural Inspector                   |
| 4320 | Cashier 1                                |
| 4321 | Cashier 2                                |
| 6108 | Environmental Health Technician 1        |
| 6120 | Environmental Health Inspector           |
| 6122 | Senior Environmental Health Inspector    |
| 6124 | Principal Environmental Health Inspector |
| 6220 | Inspector Of Weights And Measures        |
| 6222 | Deputy Sealer Of Weights And Measures    |
| 8106 | Legal Process Clerk                      |
| 9910 | Public Service Trainee                   |
| 9924 | Public Service Aide - Health Services    |
| P103 | Per Diem Nurse                           |

## 2. Which of those roles are designated language special condition positions?

| Language Special Condition | Job Code | Job Title                      | Number of Employees |
|----------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Chinese (Cantonese)        | 1406     | Senior Clerk                   | 3                   |
|                            | 1428     | Unit Clerk                     | 1                   |
|                            | 2202     | Dental Aide                    | 1                   |
|                            | 2230     | Physician Specialist           | 1                   |
|                            | 2303     | Certified Nursing Assistant    | 1                   |
|                            | 2312     | Licensed Vocational Nurse      | 1                   |
|                            | 2320     | Registered Nurse               | 14                  |
|                            | 2322     | Nurse Manager                  | 1                   |
|                            | 2328     | Nurse Practitioner             | 3                   |
|                            | 2430     | Medical Assistant              | 7                   |
|                            | 2548     | Occupational Therapist         | 1                   |
|                            | 2556     | Physical Therapist             | 1                   |
|                            | 2574     | Clinical Psychologist          | 1                   |
|                            | 2585     | Health Worker 1                | 2                   |
|                            | 2586     | Health Worker 2                | 13                  |
|                            | 2587     | Health Worker 3                | 9                   |
|                            | 2588     | Health Worker 4                | 2                   |
|                            | 2593     | Health Program Coordinator 3   | 2                   |
|                            | 2830     | Public Health Nurse            | 1                   |
|                            | 2903     | Hospital Eligibility Worker    | 15                  |
|                            | 2908     | Sen Hospital Eligibility Wrkr  | 3                   |
|                            | 2909     | Hospital Elig Wrk Supervisor   | 1                   |
|                            | 2910     | Social Worker                  | 1                   |
|                            | 2920     | Medical Social Worker          | 4                   |
|                            | 2930     | Behavioral Health Clinician    | 18                  |
|                            | 2931     | Marriage, Family & Child Cnslr | 1                   |
|                            | 2932     | Sr Behavioral Health Clinician | 4                   |
| Chinese (Mandarin)         | 1428     | Unit Clerk                     | 1                   |
|                            | 2312     | Licensed Vocational Nurse      | 1                   |
|                            | 2320     | Registered Nurse               | 5                   |
|                            | 2322     | Nurse Manager                  | 1                   |
|                            | 2586     | Health Worker 2                | 5                   |
|                            | 2587     | Health Worker 3                | 1                   |
|                            | 2920     | Medical Social Worker          | 1                   |
| Chinese (Other)            | 2930     | Behavioral Health Clinician    | 2                   |
|                            | 2320     | Registered Nurse               | 1                   |
|                            | 2430     | Medical Assistant              | 1                   |

|                   |      |                                |    |
|-------------------|------|--------------------------------|----|
| Filipino          | 2320 | Registered Nurse               | 1  |
|                   | 2587 | Health Worker 3                | 1  |
|                   | 2930 | Behavioral Health Clinician    | 1  |
|                   | 2932 | Sr Behavioral Health Clinician | 1  |
| Khmer (Cambodian) | 2930 | Behavioral Health Clinician    | 1  |
| Russian           | 2574 | Clinical Psychologist          | 1  |
|                   | 2586 | Health Worker 2                | 1  |
| Spanish           | 1232 | Training Officer               | 1  |
|                   | 1406 | Senior Clerk                   | 5  |
|                   | 1408 | Principal Clerk                | 1  |
|                   | 1428 | Unit Clerk                     | 2  |
|                   | 2202 | Dental Aide                    | 3  |
|                   | 2312 | Licensed Vocational Nurse      | 3  |
|                   | 2320 | Registered Nurse               | 16 |
|                   | 2322 | Nurse Manager                  | 1  |
|                   | 2328 | Nurse Practitioner             | 4  |
|                   | 2430 | Medical Assistant              | 14 |
|                   | 2554 | Therapy Aide                   | 1  |
|                   | 2566 | Rehabilitation Counselor       | 1  |
|                   | 2574 | Clinical Psychologist          | 1  |
|                   | 2585 | Health Worker 1                | 3  |
|                   | 2586 | Health Worker 2                | 24 |
|                   | 2587 | Health Worker 3                | 14 |
|                   | 2588 | Health Worker 4                | 3  |
|                   | 2591 | Health Program Coordinator 2   | 1  |
|                   | 2593 | Health Program Coordinator 3   | 2  |
|                   | 2806 | Disease Control Investigator   | 1  |
|                   | 2830 | Public Health Nurse            | 5  |
|                   | 2846 | Nutritionist                   | 1  |
|                   | 2903 | Hospital Eligibility Worker    | 24 |
|                   | 2908 | Sen Hospital Eligibility Wrkr  | 10 |
|                   | 2920 | Medical Social Worker          | 3  |
|                   | 2930 | Behavioral Health Clinician    | 38 |
|                   | 2931 | Marriage, Family & Child Cnslr | 3  |
|                   | 2932 | Sr Behavioral Health Clinician | 4  |
|                   | 6108 | Environmental Hlth Tech 1      | 1  |
| Vietnamese        | 1428 | Unit Clerk                     | 1  |
|                   | 2320 | Registered Nurse               | 1  |
|                   | 2586 | Health Worker 2                | 2  |
|                   | 2587 | Health Worker 3                | 1  |

**3. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, what is your current bilingual employee recruitment, hiring, or retention plan or strategy?**

Hiring managers and DPH HR work together to identify where bilingual staffing is most needed, using patient language needs to guide those decisions. Once a need is determined, DPH uses the following strategies and processes to hire bilingual staff and help ensure all San Franciscans can access healthcare.

**Establishing Bilingual Employees (Current staff and New Hires)**

Hiring managers can request bilingual certification of current staff with bilingual skills. DPH HR reviews these requests and if approved, the employee is scheduled for the bilingual assessment. Successful employees are designated bilingual and paid the bilingual premium. Employees often request on their own behalf and are provided with guidance to work with their manager to submit the bilingual designation request.

For positions with special conditions or desirable qualifications, DPH HR will often actively recruit and verify that enough applicants have self-reported bilingual skills, assess the finalist, and then move the candidate forward for hiring. When bilingual skills are a desirable qualification, instead of a special condition, the assessment outcome is not determinative of hire.

**External Recruitment**

DPH utilizes the following strategies to externally recruit bilingual employees:

- Advertise positions that require bilingual skills or those skills are desired and clearly list the language requirements.
- Post on specific job boards or with organizations that have a focus on a population with a potentially higher concentration of the desired language speakers who also have the skill set or certifications required.
- Partner with CBO's (community -based organizations) to host career fairs with diverse populations to attract bilingual applicants.

| Bilingual Recruiting Strategies by Job Groups |           |                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| Job Code                                      | Job Title | Specialized Recruiting Strategies |



|                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2585-<br>2588<br>and<br>2591-<br>2593                | Health Worker 1-4 and<br>Health Program<br>Coordinator II-III                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Recruiters conduct targeted outreach via the Certification Commission for Healthcare Interpreters (CCHI) and the National Board of Certification for Medical Interpreters (NBCMI). DPH leverages these organizations to increase visibility among credentialed bilingual professionals, as individuals in their databases are nationally certified and meet established medical interpretation standards, strengthening candidate quality and service readiness.<br>DPH Recruiting works closely with our local diverse student population and City College to make early connections with students in the Community Health Worker Program including making contact with professors and students to bring more people into public health that are bilingual.                                                                       |
| 2230<br>2574<br>2910<br>2920<br>2930<br>2931<br>2932 | Physicians and Behavioral<br>health and Social Worker<br>Recruiting: Physician<br>Specialist - Clinical<br>Psychologist - Social<br>Worker - Medical Social<br>Worker - Behavioral<br>Health Clinician - SR<br>Behavioral Health<br>Clinician - Marriage,<br>Family & Child Cnslr | In addition to highlighting the language in the title of the job posting, we perform specific sourcing for bilingual candidates on LinkedIn, Indeed and Practice Match. When recruiting for Mandarin or Cantonese speaking candidates, targeting those who worked at Chinese Hospital or North East Medical Services and other CBO's (that support the same target population) that likely have the same roles and language needs. We have also advertised in the Chinese Language "Wind Newspaper".                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 2320<br>2322<br>2328<br>2830                         | Nursing Careers:<br>Registered Nurse - Nurse<br>Manager - Nurse<br>Practitioner - Public<br>Health Nurse                                                                                                                                                                          | Recruiters post and source through professional affinity organizations that may have a higher concentration of the candidates with the skills or certifications and speak the desired language. For example, recruiting from the National Association of Hispanic Nurses by posting to the NAHN's job board or sending emails to their chapters and emailing individuals on their social media pages like LinkedIn and Facebook. When recruiting for Mandarin or Cantonese speaking candidates, DPH has found success by targeting those who worked at Chinese Hospital or North East Medical Services and other CBO's that support the same target population, such as, Self Help for the Elderly or On-Lok that likely have the same roles and language needs. DPH has also advertised in the Chinese Language "Wind Newspaper". |

**4. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, do you offer pay bonuses for certified bilingual employees?**

This question will be answered by the Department of Human Resources.

**5. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, how have these pay bonuses changed over time? When were they last increased?**

This question will be answered by the Department of Human Resources.

(Governed by MOU)

**6. For the roles listed in response to Question 1, how do these pay bonuses compare to other municipalities that you often are in competition with?**

This question will be answered by the Department of Human Resources.

**7. What is the department's or division's strategy for recruiting, hiring, or retaining bilingual employees for the roles listed in response to Question 1? Please list specific information including goals, timelines, and associated budgets.**

DPH's mission to protect and promote the health of all San Franciscans means we are constantly working to ensure all San Franciscans, regardless of the language they speak, can access care. Hiring and retaining our bilingual staff to reduce language barriers is a key part of that mission. By reducing language barriers, DPH strengthens public health protection, improves care outcomes, and promotes equity across diverse communities.

In addition to the specific strategies outlined above, DPH pursues long-term recruitment efforts by connecting with potential bilingual job seekers through partnerships with community organizations, job fairs, and local programs. In recent years, DPH recruiters have been present at community events like Cinco De Mayo and Carnival, as well as in City College classrooms engaging with future health workers. DPH regularly participates in job fairs at local colleges and universities – including City College, SFSU, and the University of San Francisco – as well as colleges and universities located in surrounding counties, including San Mateo, Alameda, and Contra Costa. DPH will continue to meet community members where they are and build pathways that encourage bilingual speakers to consider careers in public health. This collaboration helps us hire the staff to ensure everyone we serve can access and receive world-class healthcare and outcomes.

The typical timeline for recruiting for most of our jobs is 2-4 weeks, which can be extended for hard to fill positions. Examples of some of our hardest to fill bilingual positions include 2930 Behavioral Health Clinicians that are bilingual in Cantonese, Mandarin or Vietnamese, 2474 Clinical Psychologists that are bilingual in Cantonese or Spanish and 2242 Senior Psychiatrist that are bilingual in Spanish. The clinicians hired into these positions work across DPH, including staffing the Castro-Mission Health Center and the Chinatown Public Health Center with clinicians that can provide linguistically fluent care in communities where it is needed most.

Recruiting staff have a purchase card for advertising and event attendance with a monthly \$2500 limit. The purchase card is an addition beyond LinkedIn, ZipRecruiter, and other paid subscriptions. These tools allow recruiters to target bilingual job seekers and invest resources where they will have the greatest impact on language access and health equity. We remain committed to building a workforce that ensures every San Franciscan, regardless of language, can access world-class health care.

Please let us know if you have any questions about the information provided.

Sincerely,



Daniel Tsai  
Director of Health

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



**OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD**

Phone: (415) 554-5184  
Email: [Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org)

February 4, 2026

Derrick Lew, Chief  
San Francisco Police Department  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158  
Via Email: [Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org](mailto:Derrick.Lew@sfgov.org)

Dean Crispen, Chief  
San Francisco Fire Department  
698 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Via Email: [Dean.Crispen@sfgov.org](mailto:Dean.Crispen@sfgov.org)

Mary Ellen Carroll, Executive Director  
Department of Emergency Management  
1011 Turk Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Via Email: [Maryellen.Carroll@sfgov.org](mailto:Maryellen.Carroll@sfgov.org)

Daniel Tsai, Director  
Department of Public Health  
1145 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Via Email: [Daniel.Tsai@sfdph.org](mailto:Daniel.Tsai@sfdph.org)

Carmen Chu, City Administrator  
Office of the City Administrator  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 362  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Via Email: [Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org](mailto:Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org)

Julie Kirschbaum, Director  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
1 South Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Via Email: [Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com](mailto:Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com)

Carol Isen, Director  
Department of Human Resources  
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Via Email: [Carol.Isen@sfgov.org](mailto:Carol.Isen@sfgov.org)

Dear Chief Lew, Chief Crispen, Executive Director Carroll, Director Tsai, City Administrator Chu, Director Kirschbaum, and Director Isen,


At the February 3, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Danny Sauter issued the attached inquiry to the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), Department of Emergency Management (DEM), Department of Public Health (DPH), Office of the City Administrator (ADM), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and Department of Human Resources (DHR). Please review the attached letter of inquiry, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests information on the recruitment, hiring, and retention of bilingual public-facing employees for your respective agencies.

Please contact, Tita Bell, [Tita.Bell@sfgov.org](mailto:Tita.Bell@sfgov.org), Chief of Staff to Supervisor Sauter, for any questions related to this request, and copy [BOS@sfgov.org](mailto:BOS@sfgov.org) on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than March 20, 2026.

For questions pertaining to the administration of this inquiry, do not hesitate to contact me in the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (415) 554-5184.

Very Truly Yours,



Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

WN/JB

Attachments:

- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Steven Lopez, SFPD, [Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org](mailto:Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org)  
Sgt. Stacy Youngblood, SFPD, [Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org](mailto:Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org)  
Carl Nicita, SFPD, [Carl.Nicita@sfgov.org](mailto:Carl.Nicita@sfgov.org)  
Giannina Miranda, SFPD, [Giannina.Miranda@sfgov.org](mailto:Giannina.Miranda@sfgov.org)  
Theresa Ludwig, SFPD, [Theresa.Ludwig@sfgov.org](mailto:Theresa.Ludwig@sfgov.org)  
Olivia Scanlon, DEM, [Olivia.Scanlon@sfgov.org](mailto:Olivia.Scanlon@sfgov.org)  
Claire Reardon, DEM, [Claire.Reardon@sfgov.org](mailto:Claire.Reardon@sfgov.org)  
Dr. Naveena Bobba, DPH, [Naveena.Bobba@sfdph.org](mailto:Naveena.Bobba@sfdph.org)  
Sneha Patil, DPH, [Sneha.Patil@sfdph.org](mailto:Sneha.Patil@sfdph.org)  
Claire Altman, DPH, [Claire.Altman@sfdph.org](mailto:Claire.Altman@sfdph.org)  
Vivian Po, ADM, [Vivian.Po@sfgov.org](mailto:Vivian.Po@sfgov.org)  
Angela Yip, ADM, [Angela.Yip@sfgov.org](mailto:Angela.Yip@sfgov.org)  
Janet Martinsen, SFMTA, [Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com](mailto:Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com)  
Joel Ramos, SFMTA, [Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com](mailto:Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com)  
Ricardo Olea, SFMTA, [Ricardo.Olea@sfmta.com](mailto:Ricardo.Olea@sfmta.com)  
Viktoriya Wise, SFMTA, [Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com](mailto:Viktoriya.A.Wise@sfmta.com)  
Christine Silva, SFMTA, [Christine.Silva@sfmta.com](mailto:Christine.Silva@sfmta.com)  
Aliy Chisti, DHR, [Aliya.Chisti@sfgov.org](mailto:Aliya.Chisti@sfgov.org)

# Item 05

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CPC Memo for 3/23/26 Meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 8:10:06 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[032426 CAO - CPC Memorandum - SFPUC FY27 & FY 28 Capital Budgets.pdf](#)

---

Good morning Supervisors,

Please see attached and below from the Office of the City Administrator, submitting a Memorandum regarding the approval of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Enterprise and Wastewater Enterprise FY27 & FY28 Capital Budgets by the Capital Planning Committee.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Phan, Kay (ADM) <kay.phan@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 11:41 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Strong, Brian (ADM) <brian.strong@sfgov.org>; Vontsolos, Reid (ADM) <reid.vontsolos@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Re: CPC Memo for 3/23/26 Meeting

Hello Board of Supervisors Team,

Please see attached CPC meeting memo for 3/23. Please stamp the date and reply back to everyone on this email.

Thank you. Have a good day.

**Kay Phan** | Pronouns: She/Her  
Executive Assistant to City Administrator Carmen Chu  
City and County of San Francisco  
[kay.phan@sfgov.org](mailto:kay.phan@sfgov.org)  
628.652.1295

[Sign up here](#) to receive the City Administrator's newsletter

---

**From:** Vontsolos, Reid (ADM) <[reid.vontsolos@sfgov.org](mailto:reid.vontsolos@sfgov.org)>

**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2026 16:12

**To:** Phan, Kay (ADM) <[kay.phan@sfgov.org](mailto:kay.phan@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** Strong, Brian (ADM) <[brian.strong@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.strong@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** CPC Memo for 3/23/26 Meeting

Hi Kay,

Attached is the BOS Memo from today's CPC meeting for Carmen's review and signature, as well as filing with the Board. As always, we need a stamped / signed copy for our website.

Thank you!

Reid

**Reid Vontsolos**

Capital Planning Analyst

Office of Resilience and Capital Planning


Office of the City Administrator

Phone: +1-628-652-1267

Pronouns: they/her



**City & County of San Francisco**  
Daniel Lurie, Mayor



**Office of the City Administrator**  
Carmen Chu, City Administrator  
Brian Strong, Chief Resilience Officer  
Office of Resilience & Capital Planning

## MEMORANDUM

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2026 MAR 24 PM01:43  
JKA BOS-11

March 23, 2026

**To:** Members of the Board of Supervisors  
**From:** Carmen Chu, City Administrator & Capital Planning Committee Chair   
**Copy:** Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Capital Planning Committee  
**Regarding:** (1) The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Enterprise and  
Wastewater Enterprise FY27 & FY28 Capital Budgets

---

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on March 23, 2026, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) approved the following action item to be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The CPC's recommendation is set forth below.

**1. Board File Number:** **APPROVAL OF THE SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (SFPUC) WATER AND WASTEWATER FY27 & FY28 CAPITAL BUDGETS**

**CPC Recommendation:** The CPC recommends approval of the SFPUC Water Enterprise and Wastewater Enterprise FY27 & FY28 Capital Budgets.

**Comments:** The CPC approves this item by a vote of 9-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor:

Carmen Chu, City Administrator; Carla Short, Director, Public Works; Greg Wagner, Controller; Daniel Cawley, Mayor's Budget Office; Julie Kirschbaum, Director, SFMTA; Mike Martin, Acting Executive Director, Port of San Francisco; Ronald Flynn, Public Utilities Commission; Antonio Guerra, Recreation and Parks Department; Ronda Chu, San Francisco International Airport.



**From:** [Phan, Kay \(ADM\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Strong, Brian \(ADM\)](#); [Vontsolos, Reid \(ADM\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: CPC Memo for 3/23/26 Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 11:41:18 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[CPC BOS Memo 2026-03-23 with CC Signature.pdf](#)

---

Hello Board of Supervisors Team,

Please see attached CPC meeting memo for 3/23. Please stamp the date and reply back to everyone on this email.

Thank you. Have a good day.

**Kay Phan** | Pronouns: She/Her  
Executive Assistant to City Administrator Carmen Chu  
City and County of San Francisco  
[kay.phan@sfgov.org](mailto:kay.phan@sfgov.org)  
628.652.1295

[Sign up here](#) to receive the City Administrator's newsletter

---

**From:** Vontsolos, Reid (ADM) <reid.vontsolos@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2026 16:12  
**To:** Phan, Kay (ADM) <kay.phan@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Strong, Brian (ADM) <brian.strong@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** CPC Memo for 3/23/26 Meeting

Hi Kay,

Attached is the BOS Memo from today's CPC meeting for Carmen's review and signature, as well as filing with the Board. As always, we need a stamped / signed copy for our website.

Thank you!

Reid

**Reid Vontsolos**

Capital Planning Analyst  
Office of Resilience and Capital Planning  
Office of the City Administrator  
Phone: +1-628-652-1267  
Pronouns: they/her



# Item 06

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Document for File No. 250979 - Administrative Code - Police Surveillance Technology Policy for Electronic Location Tracking Devices  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 2:39:15 PM  
**Attachments:** [Pilot technology data.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the San Francisco Police Department, regarding:

File No. 250979 - Ordinance approving the Police Surveillance Technology Policy for electronic location tracking devices and making required findings.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Nicita, Carl (POL) <[carl.nicita@sfgov.org](mailto:carl.nicita@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 1:56 PM  
**To:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>; Young, Victor (BOS) <[victor.young@sfgov.org](mailto:victor.young@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Document for File No. 250979 - Administrative Code - Police Surveillance Technology Policy for Electronic Location Tracking Devices

Good afternoon –

Per a request from Supervisor Chan, I am submitting the attached document for File No. [250979](#).

Can you please include it in the legislative file?

Thank you!

Carl

**Carl Nicita** | Government Affairs Manager  
Government Affairs Unit – Office of the Chief of Staff  
San Francisco Police Department  
Cell: (415) 609-0497

| Date of Deployment | Station of Deployment | Primary Offense                      | Did Projectile Attach? | Arrest Made? | Vehicle Recovered? | Projectile Recovered? |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 8/5/25             | Tenderloin            | Stolen Vehicle                       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/5/25             | Tenderloin            | Felony Evasion                       | No                     | No           | No                 | Yes                   |
| 8/8/25             | Tenderloin            | Stolen Vehicle                       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/9/25             | Tenderloin            | Robbery                              | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/13/25            | Tenderloin            | Felony Evasion                       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/13/25            | Tenderloin            | Felony Evasion                       | No                     | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/14/25            | Tenderloin            | Stolen Vehicle; Burglary             | No                     | No           | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/15/25            | Taraval               | Burglary                             | No                     | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/19/25            | Central               | Stolen Vehicle                       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/19/25            | Central               | Stolen Vehicle                       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/19/25            | Central               | Burglary                             | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 8/23/25            | Tenderloin            | Stolen Vehicle                       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 9/5/25             | Bayview               | Firearm Related; Domestic Violence   | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 9/6/25             | Bayview               | Stolen Vehicle                       | No                     | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 9/9/25             | Bayview               | Stolen Vehicle                       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 9/12/25            | Central               | Robbery; Firearm Related; Kidnapping | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 9/12/25            | Bayview               | Stolen Vehicle; Felony Evasion       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 9/14/25            | Bayview               | Stolen Vehicle                       | Yes                    | No           | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 9/16/25            | Bayview               | Firearm Related                      | No                     | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 10/24/25           | Tenderloin            | Felony Evasion                       | Yes                    | Yes          | Yes                | Yes                   |
| 2/22/26            | Tenderloin            | Cold Plated Vehicle                  | Yes                    | No           | No                 | No                    |

# Item 07

**From:** [Alcantar, Justice \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Immigrant Rights Commission - Immigrant Community Priorities and Service Needs  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 2:17:35 PM  
**Attachments:** [Immigrant Rights Commission Priorities and Service Needs\\_Final Letter.pdf](#)  
[Outlook-d3h2zaz4.png](#)

---

Good afternoon Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Rivas, Jorge (ADM) <Jorge.Rivas@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 2:09 PM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; Mayor Daniel Lurie (MYR) <MDL@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Commissioner Souza <commissionersouza@gmail.com>; Kudrat Dutta Chaudhary <kudratduttachaudhary@gmail.com>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative\_aides@sfgov.org>; Zou, Han (MYR) <han.zou@sfgov.org>; Garcia, Moises (MYR) <moises.garcia@sfgov.org>; Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <sophie.hayward@sfgov.org>; Johnston, Jennifer (ADM) <jennifer.johnston@sfgov.org>; Shore, Elena (ADM) <elena.shore@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Chu, Carmen (ADM) <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Immigrant Rights Commission - Immigrant Community Priorities and Service Needs

Dear Mayor Lurie, President Mandelman, and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to share the San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission's (IRC) recently issued letter outlining the urgent priorities and service needs of immigrant communities across our city.

In light of federal immigration enforcement and shifting federal policies, the Commission has convened a series of public hearings and engaged directly with impacted community members and subject matter experts. Through this work, the IRC has identified several critical

areas that require attention.

The attached letter provides additional context and specific recommendations grounded in community testimony and ongoing engagement. These priorities reflect both the urgency of the current moment and the City's longstanding commitment to immigrant inclusion and protection.

Please do not hesitate to reach out if you would like to discuss any of these priorities further.

Sincerely,

Sarah Souza  
Chair, Immigrant Rights Commission

Kudrat Dutta Chaudhary  
Vice Chair, Immigrant Rights Commission

**Jorge Rivas | Executive Director | He, Him, él**

Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs | City & County of San Francisco

(415) 554 -0600 | 1145 Market Street, Suite #100, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: (415) 554-0615

[OCEIA](#) | [Immigrant Rights Commission](#) | [Follow OCEIA on Instagram](#)

**OCEIA** SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF  
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT  
& IMMIGRANT AFFAIRS



## CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IMMIGRANT RIGHTS COMMISSION

### **Commissioners:**

Sarah Souza, Chair  
Kudrat Chaudhary, Vice Chair  
Soha Abdou Agina  
Hessah Aljiran  
Aseel Fara  
Hans How  
Celine Kennelly  
Yu Pok (Jose) Ng  
Lucia Obregon Matzer  
Laura Padilla  
Mario Paz  
Monthanus Ratanapakdee  
Jessy Ruiz  
Adoubou Traore  
Alicia Wang

### **Executive Director:**

Jorge Rivas, Jr.  
Office of Civic Engagement  
& Immigrant Affairs

March 25, 2026

Honorable Daniel Lurie  
Mayor, San Francisco City and County  
City Hall, Room 200  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

### **Re: Priorities and Service Needs of Immigrant Communities in San Francisco**

Dear Mayor Lurie, President Mandelman, and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of the San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC), we write to outline the urgent priorities and service needs of immigrant communities in San Francisco amid escalating federal immigration enforcement and renewed threats of discriminatory federal immigration policies.

San Francisco is home to a diverse immigrant population, with immigrants accounting for over one-third of the City's population. Our immigrant community contributes profoundly to the city's economic vitality, workforce stability, cultural richness, and civic life. Immigrant families are small business owners, frontline workers, students, caregivers, and community leaders. Ensuring their safety, stability, and full participation in civic life is essential not only to their well-being, but to the well-being of the city as a whole.

In light of the rapidly changing federal landscape and its impacts on the immigrant community, the IRC has hosted a series of hearings to understand these immigration policy changes from subject matter experts as well as directly impacted community members, particularly in the areas of newly imposed travel bans, efforts to terminate the lawful status of many immigrants living in the U.S., immigration enforcement actions, our City's sanctuary policies, impacts on the LGBTQIA+ immigrant community, and local City-funded resources available to immigrant communities.

Based on these public hearings, community testimony and ongoing community engagement, the IRC has issued statements and resolutions which the Commission has shared with your offices. With that, we call your attention to the following areas of focus:



## **Urgent Priorities and Service Needs**

### **Protection from Federal Immigration Enforcement:**

- Recent reports of increased federal immigration enforcement — including arrests in the community, at immigration court proceedings and during check-ins — have created widespread fear across immigrant communities. This chilling effect discourages residents from attending school, accessing health care, reporting crimes, and utilizing City services. Strong sanctuary implementation is fundamental to public safety, public health, and trust in local government. We call on the City to use strong messaging affirming San Francisco’s Sanctuary City policies and to provide clear, consistent, and transparent protocols for City departments when interacting with federal immigration agents, in full compliance with state and local law, and ensuring City-owned property and resources are not used for federal immigration enforcement.

### **Housing, Food Security, Health Access, and Mental Health Support:**

- Immigrant families, particularly mixed-status households and low-income immigrants and seniors, tend to face disproportionate barriers to stable housing, health care, mental health support, and food access. We urge the City to continue investing in tenants’ legal representation to prevent further displacement of immigrant families living on a fixed income. We also call on the City to identify strategies focused on solutions to uplift the housing needs of San Francisco’s low-income immigrant families and seniors, particularly given the increasing number of unhoused families. These emerging needs require urgent attention from the City. The City’s leadership and prompt response were evident in the Mayor’s deployment of the GiveCards program during the SNAP emergency in November 2025. This lifesaving support prevents further crises and reduces long-term public costs.

### **Access to Immigration Legal Services and Representation:**

- Escalating federal immigration enforcement, the expansion of discriminatory travel bans, and the termination of many immigrants’ lawful status heighten the risk of family separation and destabilization. We call on the City to increase funding for immigration legal services, rapid response efforts, immigration “know-your-rights” community education and outreach, access to City-funded naturalization and immigration filing fee assistance, dedicated immigration legal resources to LGBTQIA+ immigrant residents, and prompt and effective coordination with the City’s Rapid Response Network for immigration raid verification. Access to legal counsel is one of the most effective tools for protecting due process and family unity.

### **Language Access and Equal Access to City Services:**

- Nearly one in five San Francisco residents identifies as Limited English Proficient (LEP). In moments of heightened enforcement and policy shifts, language access becomes even more critical. We stress the need to prioritize language access, ensuring LEP residents have equal access to vital information and public services. With the passage of the 2024 amendments to the Language Access Ordinance, we urge the City to provide sufficient funding and staffing support to City departments and community partners required for successful implementation of our local language access law. Without language access, residents cannot fully access services or understand their rights.

**Economic Stability and Workforce Support:**

- Immigrant workers are disproportionately represented in frontline industries. Fear of enforcement and travel restrictions destabilizes employment and local businesses. We cannot emphasize enough the need to support and maintain programs that offer workforce development tailored to immigrant workers and business support for small business owners, regardless of immigration status. These programs strengthen families, support neighborhood vitality, and contribute to our city's sustained recovery.

San Francisco has long been a national leader in immigrant inclusion and protection. At this moment of uncertainty, strong leadership from local government is critical, ensuring that immigrant residents can live, work and thrive in our city without fear. Addressing the above-mentioned urgent priorities and needs will not only strengthen our City's sanctuary protections, but also create a more welcoming and inclusive San Francisco for all residents.

The IRC stands ready to partner with the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to advance policies and investments that reflect the dignity, resilience, and contributions of our immigrant communities.

Sincerely,



Sarah Souza  
Commission Chair



Kudrat D. Chaudhary  
Commission Vice Chair

San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission

**From:** [Alcantar, Justice \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: February 2026 Resolution of the SF Bicycle Advisory Committee  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 3:42:27 PM  
**Attachments:** [Resolution for Improvements to Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Infrastructure In San Francisco Parks and Open Spaces \(1\).pdf](#)

---

Good afternoon Supervisors,

Please see attached Bicycle Advisory Committee Resolution Number 020325-01 Calling for Improvements to Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Infrastructure in San Francisco Parks and Open Spaces (Also known as “Jessie’s Resolution”).

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Brandon Powell <[brandonpowell@mac.com](mailto:brandonpowell@mac.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 2:10 PM  
**To:** Young, Victor (BOS) <[victor.young@sfgov.org](mailto:victor.young@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** February 2026 Resolution of the SF Bicycle Advisory Committee

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

Victor,

Please find attached the committee’s resolution of February 23, 2026 regarding safety improvements to traffic and pedestrian safety infrastructure in Golden Gate Park for distribution to the Board of Supervisors.

Warm regards,  
Brandon Powell  
Chairperson, San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee

Contact for information: [sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com](mailto:sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com)



San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee

City Hall, Room 408

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

**JOINT PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PROSAC) AND BICYCLE ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE (BAC)**

**City and County of San Francisco**

**Resolution Number 020325-01**

**CALLING FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN  
SAFETY INFRASTRUCTURE IN SAN FRANCISCO PARKS AND OPEN  
SPACES (ALSO KNOWN AS “JESSIE’S RESOLUTION”)**

**WHEREAS**, the SFRPD’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, and

**WHEREAS**, “well-being” should be assumed to include upholding safety protocols within shared spaces for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorized vehicles throughout the city, and

**WHEREAS**, in 2014, the City and County of San Francisco adopted Vision Zero SF, a 10-year data-driven approach to safety, which sunsetted in 2025, following the models of the San Francisco Pedestrian Strategy and the WalkFirst program, and

**WHEREAS**, the City and County of San Francisco also adopted a Transit-First Policy as stated in Section 8A.115 of the San Francisco Charter, which includes the principles that decisions regarding the use of limited public street and sidewalk space “shall strive to reduce traffic and improve public health and safety” and

**WHEREAS**, research shows that grieving the death of a pet could be as chronic as that for a human family member, and that people grieving a pet can suffer prolonged grief disorder (according to recent study published by academic journal PLOS One), and

**WHEREAS**, human error is inevitable and unpredictable; we should design the transportation system to anticipate error so the consequence is not severe injury or death. Transportation and land use development policies, standards, programs, and design decisions should prioritize preserving lives, and



San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee

City Hall, Room 408

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

**WHEREAS**, the San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department (SFRPD) is wholly responsible for maintaining traffic and shared road infrastructure with the SFRPD system under the guidance of the San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and

**WHEREAS**, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors declared a state of emergency regarding pedestrian and cyclist fatalities on November 5, 2019, and

**WHEREAS**, on Saturday, November 15th, 2025 a collision between a person on a rented Bay Wheels electric bicycle and pedestrians occurred at the boathouse intersection of Blue Heron Lake in Golden Gate Park, resulting in the death of a family dog named Jessie, and

**WHEREAS**, the culpability of this fatality is cyclist error; however the infrastructure conditions at Blue Heron Lake Road very likely contributed to the cyclist's ability to reach an accelerated speed, and

**WHEREAS**, traffic fatalities have been proven to be alleviated by traffic calming measures such as clearing vegetation that obstructs traffic signage, daylighting, speed bollards, repainting of crosswalks and road signage, a dedicated bike lane, flashing beacons, wayfinding, and additional traffic signage such as pedestrian yield signs ahead of all crosswalks and trailheads and speed limit signs, and

**WHEREAS**, SFRPD has committed towards resolving several of the infrastructure deficiencies on Blue Heron Lake Road, now therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, the San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC) collectively urge that SFRPD work with SFMTA and Department of Public Works to reaffirm its commitment to traffic and pedestrian safety in order to minimize the potential for future collisions and fatalities, and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that BAC and PROSAC strongly urge that in 2026, SFRPD proactively work with SFMTA to review shared spaces throughout our citywide parks and identify further infrastructure deficiencies within our parks system, and be it finally

**RESOLVED**, that BAC and PROSAC strongly urge that by the end of 2026, SFRPD works with SFMTA to prioritize and complete improvements, including but not limited to clearing vegetation that obstructs traffic signage, daylighting, speed bollards, repainting of crosswalks



San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee

City Hall, Room 408

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

and road signage, a dedicated bike lane, flashing beacons, wayfinding, and additional traffic signage such as pedestrian yield signs ahead of all crosswalks and trailheads and speed limit signs and any other improvements identified by RPD, with necessary upgrades to implement traffic and pedestrian safety for all visitors throughout our San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department parks system.

---

*Submitted for joint review and adoption by the San Francisco Bicycle Advisory and San Francisco Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committees by Kristin Tièche (SFBAC, D1) and Wendy Aragón (SFPROSAC, D1)*

The above resolution was approved at the PROSAC meeting held on February 3, 2026 with 12 members in support and 0 in opposition.

District 1: Kristin Tièche—Absent  
District 2: Whitney Ericson—Aye  
District 3: Vanessa Day—Absent  
District 4: Tim Marcus—Aye  
District 5: Melyssa Mendoza—Aye  
District 6: Jay Hansen—Aye  
District 7: Bert Hill—Absent  
District 8: Diane Serafini—Absent  
District 9: Brandon Powell—Aye  
District 10: Paul Wells—Aye  
District 11: Jeffrey Taliaferro—Absent

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brandon Powell".

Brandon Powell, Chair

Date: February 23, 2026

**From:** Ng, Wilson (BOS)  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides  
**Cc:** BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); McHugh, Eileen (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)  
**Subject:** FW: Commission Memo  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 4:12:58 PM  
**Attachments:** DAS Commission Budget Reductions Memo Final.pdf  
image001.png  
image002.png  
image005.png  
image003.png  
image004.png  
image006.png

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the communication below from Disability and Aging Services (DAS), providing the attached summary of DAS funded grant reductions as of March 2026.

Sincerely,

Wilson L. Ng

Deputy Director of Operations

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-5184  
Web: [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



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

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

[...]

**From:** Durbeej, Ravi (HSA) <[ravi.durbeej@sfgov.org](mailto:ravi.durbeej@sfgov.org)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 6:30 PM

**To:** Young, Victor (BOS) <[victor.young@sfgov.org](mailto:victor.young@sfgov.org)>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>



**Subject:** Commission Memo

Good afternoon Victor and Angela,

This is Ravi, the DAS Commission Secretary, and we have received a number of requests from members of the BOS for a break-down of our DAS budget reductions. Could you please forward the attached DAS Budget Reductions Memo to the Supervisors?

Thanks in advance and greatly appreciated,

**Ravi Durbeej**

**He/Him**

Executive Assistant to Kelly Dearman  
Disability and Aging Services Commission Secretary  
DAS Advisory Council Secretary

**C:** (415) 307-0609

**O:** (415) 934-4402

**Office Address:**

2 Gough 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA. 94103

[www.SFHSA.org](http://www.SFHSA.org)



SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

**Department of Disability  
and Aging Services**



## MEMORANDUM

To: DISABILITY AND AGING SERVICES COMMISSION  
Through: KELLY DEARMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
From: CINDY KAUFFMAN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
MIKE ZAUGG, PROGRAM DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS  
Date: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2026  
Subject: SUMMARY OF DAS FUNDED GRANT REDUCTIONS AS OF MARCH 2026

In response to a increased public comment and attention about reductions to DAS funded grants, this memorandum is submitted for your review.

### Overview

Following the February 18<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting, DAS began notifying individual grantees of budget reductions. For each grantee, we scheduled an in-person meeting to discuss their budget change and how DAS came to make these difficult decisions. Leadership for several grantees have asked that specifics for their organization not be widely published. As a result, DAS does not release a grantee level detailed list of reductions.

As of the time of this memo, there are 21 reductions in total. 10 are grants ending June 30, 2026. 6 are grants ending June 30, 2027. The 5 remaining actions are budget reductions to ongoing grants which will take effect July 1, 2026. 16 distinct community-based organizations are impacted by these reductions.

The reductions listed below add up to closer to \$3.1m, which is higher than the \$2.9m in reductions presented at DAS Commission. This is due to revenue generation in some of the grants, minimum compensation ordinance funding, and one-time-only funding which are not counted when calculating numbers through a budget reduction lens.

Public comment at recent DAS Commission meetings has also touched on topics beyond this memo, such as non-DAS grant reductions, citywide trends, and reductions from previous fiscal years. Those topics are not covered in this memo as they may include details outside the DAS scope of knowledge and/or would not be relevant to current budget discussions.

### Review of Current Reductions

The following subsections provide a more detailed look at current reductions, impacts, and discussion based on service area.



## Access and Empowerment

---

### **- Westside Legal Services – 1 CBO grant - \$435,182 in annual funding. Grant to sunset June 30, 2026.**

Ends pilot program started in 2023. Created a dedicated legal services brick and mortar location on westside of City, on Irving St near 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Program was launched and funded in part by new-at-the-time State of California funding titled “Older Adults Recovery and Resilience” (OARR). These funds ran from 7/1/22 to 9/30/24. The state did not renew the funding, statewide, after 9/30/24. DAS would need to utilize local funding to keep this program in place. The current term of this grant ends June 30, 2026.

District impacts: program services are located in District 7 and are focused on Districts 1, 4, and 7. Serves clients citywide.

### **- Homecare Advocacy – 1 CBO grant - \$140,054 in annual funding. Grant to end June 30, 2026.**

Program facilitates the hosting of two client-provider-government workgroups: Healthcare Action Team (HAT) and In-Home Care Stakeholder workgroup. Purpose of both groups is to increase communication and response to needs across the stakeholders. Originated approx. 2010-2012. Program is not seen as a ‘core’ DAS service, reduction taken to help maintain support for other DAS programs.

District impacts: program administration located in District 6, provides services citywide.

### **- Aging and Disability Resource Center Coordinator – 1 CBO provider - \$155,263 in annual funding. Grant to sunset June 30, 2027.**

CBO staff person providing coordination and support to network of 14 ADRC sites. DAS intends to bring these work responsibilities in-house to DAS Office of Community Partnerships’ staff. No projected impact on client service capacity at the ADRC sites.

District impacts: program administration located in District 1, does not serve the public.

## Caregiver Support

---

No budget reductions in this service area.

## Case Management and Care Navigation

---

### **- Veterans Justice Court Case Management – 1 CBO grant - \$256,250 in annual funding. Grant to end June 30, 2026.**

This program offers case management support services to veterans participating in the Veterans Justice Court. Approximately 20 program participants will be impacted by this program ending. Prioritizes funding for DAS Case Management program, which is provided through multiple grants, and has capacity for 1,300 clients per year.

District impacts: program administration located in District 6, serves Veterans citywide.

**- IHSS-tied Case Management – 1 CBO grant - \$137,358 in annual funding. Grant to end June 30, 2026.**

All clients served by this provider are IHSS recipients and eligible for CalAim/Medi-cal funded Enhanced Case Management (ECM). This grantee offers ECM. All clients to be referred to ECM services. Any remaining clients to be absorbed elsewhere in the DAS Case Management service network. Approximately 20 clients impacted by this change.

District impacts: program administration located in District 6, services provided citywide.

## Community Connection and Engagement

---

**- Community Center Extensions – 2 CBO grants - \$122,000 annual funding reduction effective July 1, 2026.**

DAS identifies Community Service Center programs as 'core' to the Department's mission. These two programs, distinct from Community Service Center funding, represent successful program models reaching out into communities to engage clients not otherwise participating in community center services. For both of these reductions, a provider has a corresponding community center grant which is not impacted.

District impacts: services provided in and focused on District 1 and 7. Reductions will reduce capacity for services but not end them completely.

**- Neighborhood Based Programs – 4 CBO grants - \$599,050 total annual funding. All grants to end June 30, 2026.**

DAS identifies Community Service Center programs as 'core' to the Department's mission. These four programs represent successful strategies to reach out into their communities to engage clients in underserved districts. For each of these reductions, a provider has a corresponding community center grant which is not impacted.

District impacts: services provided in and focused on Districts 2, 5, and 11.

**- LGBTQ+ Community Services in Adult Day Health Center Pilot – 1 CBO grant - \$203,767 in annual funding. Grant to end June 30, 2026.**

Adult Day Health Centers are licensed-community based day health programs funded through Medi-cal, primarily via Community-Based Adult Services. This program model is not typically funded by DAS. Ends a pilot program started July 2022 offering enhanced programming to Adult Day Health Center participants, designed to foster a more welcoming and inclusive space.

District impacts: services provided in District 6, attended by clients citywide.

**- Digital Navigators Pilot – 5 CBO grants - \$334,172 in annual funding. Grants to sunset June 30, 2027, at end of current grant.**

Ends a pilot program started in July 2023. which places a dedicated staff position in select community centers for tech support to clients. Clients needing services to be referred to 'core' DAS digital literacy program SF Connected which will have no program reductions. For comparison, SF Connected and Technology at Home programs have annual budget of approx \$2.5m and support over 40 computer labs citywide.

District impacts: services provided in and focused on Districts 5, 9, 11.

**- LGBTQ+ Telehealth Pilot – 1 CBO grant - \$100,000 in annual funding reduction effective July 1, 2026.**

DAS identifies SF Connected and Technology at Home programs as 'core' digital support programs in our program offerings. With the above reductions, those core program budgets will remain intact. Clients impacted by the above program changes will be referred to existing DAS digital programs for support.

District impacts: services provided in District 5, serves clients citywide.

**- ReServe – 1 CBO grant - \$500,000 annual funding reduction effective July 1, 2026.**

Reduces grant budget by one-half. ReServe is a workforce program placing already skilled workers in temporary subsidized jobs. Goal is to encourage employers to then hire the older workers at the end of subsidy period. With reduction in program capacity, clients unable to participate in this program will be referred to other workforce programs available via multiple City departments.

District impacts: program administration located in District 6, services located at jobsites citywide.

## Housing Support

---

No budget reductions in this service area.

## Nutrition and Wellness

---

No budget reductions in this service area.

## Self-Care and Safety

---

**- Video Doorbells – 1 CBO grant - \$35,908 in annual funding. Grant to end June 30, 2026.**

Ends program as not 'core' to DAS Self-Care and Safety programs. Interest in program has waned over past year.

**- Senior Escort – 1 CBO provider - \$100,000 in annual funding reduction effective July 1, 2026.**

A 12.5% grant reduction which will reduce capacity for program services next FY. DAS to monitor program performance with a goal to understand if other Citywide investments in street safety have improved the safety and sense of safety for DAS populations to travel more freely in public.

District impacts: program administration for both located in District 3, but serve clients citywide.

# Item 10

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: April 6, 2026, Full Arts Commission agenda posted  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 4:05:29 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see below communication from the San Francisco Arts Commission, submitting an agenda for the April 6, 2026, Full Arts Commission meeting.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART) <manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 2:18 PM  
**Subject:** April 6, 2026, Full Arts Commission agenda posted

Hello,

The agenda for the April 6, 2026, Full Commission meeting has been posted:

[Full Arts Commission Meeting | San Francisco \(sf.gov\)](#)

Kindly,  
Manraj



**Manraj Dhaliwal**  
Commission Secretary  
Pronouns: [he/him](#)  
Email: [manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org](mailto:manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org)  
Phone: 415-252-2247  
Mobile: 415-940-1803

**San Francisco Arts Commission**  
401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 325  
San Francisco, CA 94102

[www.sfartscommission.org](http://www.sfartscommission.org)

[Newsletter](#) | [Flickr](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [TikTok](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

The San Francisco Arts Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the [Ramaytush Ohlone](#). We affirm the sovereign rights of their community as First Peoples and are committed to supporting the traditional and contemporary evolution of the American Indian community and uplifting contemporary indigenous voices and culture.

Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the San Francisco Arts Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the [Sunshine Ordinance](#) and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as personal emails, Social Security numbers and phone numbers will be redacted.



# Item 11

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Notice of Entertainment Commission Meeting - April 7, 2026  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 4:17:20 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[EC Agenda Apr 7 2026\\_Final.pdf](#)

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Entertainment Commission, submitting an agenda for the April 7, 2026 Entertainment Commission meeting.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Liang, May (ADM) <may.k.liang@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 3:56 PM  
**To:** Liang, May (ADM) <may.k.liang@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Commission, Entertainment (ADM) <entertainment.commission@sfgov.org>; Weiland, Maggie (ADM) <maggie.weiland@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Notice of Entertainment Commission Meeting - April 7, 2026

Hello all:

Please note that our next regular Entertainment Commission meeting will be held **in-person and can be viewed remotely on Tuesday, April 7, 2026**. The meeting agenda is attached.

**Notice of Entertainment Commission Meeting:**

**Date:** Tuesday, April 7, 2026

**Time:** 5:30PM

**Location:**

- **In-person at City Hall Room 416**, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102
- **Viewed remotely via Microsoft Teams:** <https://shorturl.at/ErbqD>

Refer to the “Remote Access to Information and Participation” section at the end of the

agenda document for detailed instructions on how to participate remotely due to an accommodation for a disability.

Thank you,  
May

---

**May Liang 梁阔** (she/her)

Commission Secretary | Permit Administrator

San Francisco Entertainment Commission

49 South Van Ness, Suite 1482

San Francisco, CA 94103

628-652-6035 (direct line) | 628-652-6030 (EC main line)

[Facebook](#) | [Website](#) | [Instagram](#)

[\*Sign up for the Entertainment Commission e-mail list\*](#)



Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the Entertainment Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the [Sunshine Ordinance](#) and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as Social Security numbers and phone numbers, will be redacted.



# **Entertainment Commission**

## ***City and County of San Francisco***



### **Notice and Agenda for Regular Meeting**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026, 5:30 P.M.**

*Meeting will be held both in-person and can be viewed online on Microsoft Teams.*

#### **IN-PERSON MEETING:**

**San Francisco City Hall, Room 416**

**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.**

**San Francisco, CA 94102**

#### **TO VIEW ONLINE:**

**Watch live on Microsoft Teams: <https://shorturl.at/ErbqD>**

The above link should take you directly to the meeting but if needed:

Meeting ID: 211 323 355 358 7

Passcode: iz2st9hA

**Refer to the “Remote Access to Information and Participation” section at the end of this agenda document for detailed instructions on how to participate remotely due to an accommodation for a disability.**

#### **Commissioners:**

**Ben Bleiman, *President - Industry Representative***

**Cyn Wang, *Vice President - Urban Planning Representative***

**Maria Davis, *Commissioner - Industry Representative***

**Lt. Leonard Poggio, *Commissioner - Law Enforcement Representative***

**Anthony Schlender, *Commissioner - Neighborhood Representative***

**Laura Thomas, *Commissioner - Public Health Representative***

**Jordan Wilson, *Commissioner - Neighborhood Representative***

## 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

**2. General Public Comment:** Members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. With respect to agenda items, members of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes at the time such item is called.

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes:** Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2026 Commission meeting. [Discussion and Possible Action Item]

Explanatory Document: <https://www.sf.gov/sf-entertainment-commission-minutes-for-march-3-2026>

**4. Report from Executive Director:** Legislative/Policy Update: none; Staff and Office Update: Reminder about 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Nightlife and Entertainment Summit on May 6, 2026; Update on Board of Appeals Actions: Update on Appeal No. 26-006 – EC-1906 Place of Entertainment permit for Golden Eye Social; Corrective Actions: none. [Discussion and Possible Action Item]

**5. Report from Senior Inspector:** Senior Inspector Andrew Zverina reports on recent enforcement activities. [Discussion and Possible Action Item]

**6. Hearing and Possible Action regarding applications for permits under the jurisdiction of the Entertainment Commission.** [Discussion and Possible Action Item]

Commissioners will discuss and may vote to approve the permits listed below.

### **Consent Calendar:**

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine by the Entertainment Commission, and will be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this or a future hearing.

**Consent Agenda:** None

### **Regular Agenda:**

- a. ECOTE26-072 Goldenvoice, LLC ***dba Portola Music Festival***, Pier 80, 401 Cesar Chavez Street – One Time Outdoor Event Permit to host outdoor entertainment and amplified sound on Saturday 9/26/26 from 1:00pm - 11:00pm and Sunday 09/27/26 from 1:00pm - 10:45pm.

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

- b. ECOTE26-065 Into The Streets ***dba Downtown First Thursdays*** – One Time Outdoor Event Permit to host outdoor entertainment and amplified sound on 05/07/26, 06/04/26, 07/02/26, 08/06/26, 09/03/2026, 10/01/26, 11/05/26, 12/03/26, 01/07/27, 02/04/27, 03/04/27, 04/01/27 from 5:00pm - 10:00pm, located at 2nd Street between Natoma Street and Howard Street, 2nd Street between Market and Howard Streets, Jessie Street between 2nd Street and New Montgomery Street, Minna Street between 2nd Street and New Montgomery Street, Natoma Street between 90 Natoma/Salesforce Transit Center and 2nd Street.
- c. EC-1923 - Yuko Takahashi, Joina Liao, and Pramod Shantharam of THE HALL LLC, ***dba The Hall***, 2565 Mission St, Place of Entertainment that includes outdoor amplified sound
- d. EC-1927 - YERBA BUENA CBD, ***dba Yerba Buena Partnership***, Yerba Buena Lane, Fixed Place Amplified Sound
- e. EC-1928 - Wissam Habr of SF LAUNDROMAT LLC, ***dba Hideaway Café***, 850 Jones St, Limited Live Performance that includes outdoor amplified sound

**7. Commissioner Comments & Questions; New Business Request for Future Agenda Items:** This item is to allow Commissioners to introduce agenda items for future consideration, and to make announcements. [Action item and Discussion]

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

### **Remote Access to Information and Participation**

The public can view the meeting via computer with a Microsoft Teams link, or listen to via telephone.

In addition to in-person public comment, the Entertainment Commission will hear remote public comment **only for those who have received a prior accommodation due to disability.**

### **How to Request Accommodation for a Disability:**

Effective March 17, 2026, remote public comment is available only to those requiring accommodation due to a disability who cannot attend in-person. To request accommodation, contact the Commission Secretary **by 12 PM (Noon) the day of the Commission meeting** by email at [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org) or via calling (628) 652-6030.

Meeting materials may be viewed at the Entertainment Commission webpages:

<https://www.sf.gov/departments--city-administrator--entertainment-commission/events/upcoming>

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

**To access the Meeting by Computer/Smartphone/Tablet or by Telephone:**

To access by computer/smartphone/tablet, please click the following link (or paste it into your browser): **Join the meeting now:** <https://shorturl.at/ErbqD>

The above link should take you directly to the meeting but if needed:

Meeting ID: 211 323 355 358 7

Passcode: iz2st9hA

To access by telephone, call +1-415-906-4659 and enter the Meeting ID **909 878 45#** (please read the notes, below, prior to calling in).

**How to make a remote public comment during meetings for those who have requested an accommodation for a disability:**

Please read below to help facilitate this process for remote public comment:

**Follow these best practices to improve your call:**

1. Call from a quiet location
2. Speak slowly and clearly
3. Turn down radios or televisions.

**Raising Your Hand in a Remote Meeting:**

If you would like to speak during public comment, please listen for your agenda item to be called, then wait until the public comment section is announced. When it is your turn, staff will enter you into the meeting to speak.

*By computer, smartphone, or tablet:*

Step 1: Select the hand icon with the word “Raise”  at the top-right of the Microsoft Teams window/screen.

Step 2: When you are prompted to unmute, click on the microphone icon with the word “Mic”  at the top-right of the Microsoft Teams window/screen to speak.

*By telephone:*

Step 1: Dial \*5 to raise your hand.

Step 2: When it is your turn, Commission staff will tell you to unmute. Dial \*6 to unmute/mute.

*Dial \*1 to hear the command menu which provides descriptions of dial-pad commands that are available.*

**Things to Remember:**

The Commission’s staff will indicate how much time you will have to provide your verbal comment. You will be alerted when you have 30 seconds remaining.

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

Once your public comment time has ended, you will be moved out of the live speaker line and back listening to the meeting (unless you disconnect).

### **DISABILITY ACCESS**

City Hall Room 416 is wheelchair accessible. **Wheelchair-accessible entrances are located on Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street.** There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor.

Remote public participation is available upon request for individuals who cannot attend in person due to disability. Making a request to participate remotely no later than 12pm of the meeting date.

Sign Language Interpretation is also available upon request. If requesting remote Sign Language Interpretation, please submit an accommodation request a minimum of 4 business hours prior to the start of the meeting. Allowing a minimum of 48 business hours for all other accommodation requests (for example, for other auxiliary aids and services) helps ensure availability. To request accommodation, please contact us at [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org).

### **To view previous meetings on-line**

Watch an archived Entertainment Commission meeting: [https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=99](https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=99)  
Watch meetings on demand for other City Commissions, Councils and Boards: [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)

### **CELLPHONE AND/OR SOUND PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICE USAGE AT HEARINGS**

The ringing and use of cell phones and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices (Sunshine Ordinance 67A.1).

### **SENSITIVITY TO CHEMICAL BASED PRODUCTS**

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity, or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals

### **KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE**

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force ([sfgov.org/sunshine](http://sfgov.org/sunshine)) the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's website at [sfgov.org](http://sfgov.org). For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact:

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
City Hall, Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683  
Office: (415) 554-7724  
(Fax): (415) 554-5163  
(E-mail): [SOTF@sfgov.org](mailto:SOTF@sfgov.org)  
(Web): [sfgov.org/sunshine](http://sfgov.org/sunshine)

### **ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION**

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

### **WRITTEN COMMENTS**

Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Commission. Written comments should be submitted to the Entertainment Commission via email to [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org) by 12pm on the day of the meeting.

### **EXPLANATORY DOCUMENTS**

Copies of explanatory documents listed in this agenda, and other related materials received by the Entertainment Commission after the posting of this agenda, can be obtained by emailing [Entertainment.Commission@sfgov.org](mailto:Entertainment.Commission@sfgov.org) during normal business hours, and also, to the extent possible, will be available on the Commission's website at: <https://www.sf.gov/departments--city-administrator--entertainment-commission/events/upcomings>.

### **LANGUAGE ACCESS**

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Commission. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact us at [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org) at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. Late requests will be honored if possible.

### **LOBBYIST ORDINANCE**

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local policy or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone 415/252-3100, fax 415/252-3112 and website: [www.sfgov.org/ethics](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).

--

如對會議有任何疑問，請致電 628-652-6035 查詢。當會議進行時，嚴禁使用手機及任何發聲電子裝置。會議主席可以命令任何使用手機或其他發出聲音裝置的人等離開會議場所。

### **了解你在陽光政策下的權益**

政府的職責是為公眾服務，並在具透明度的情況下作出決策。市及縣政府的委員會，市參事會，議會和其他機構的存在是為處理民眾的事務。本政策保證一切政務討論都在民眾面前進行，而市政府的運作也公開讓民眾審查。如果你需要知道你在陽光政策 (San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 67) 下擁有的權利，或是需要舉報違反本條例的情況，請聯絡：

陽光政策 專責小組行政官 地址：

City Hall – Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102-4683

電話號碼: 415-554-7724 ; 傳真號碼 415-554-5163

電子郵箱: [SOTF@sfgov.org](mailto:SOTF@sfgov.org)

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main



陽光政策的文件可以通過陽光政策專責小組秘書、三藩市公共圖書館、以及市政府網頁 [www.sfgov.org](http://www.sfgov.org) 等途徑索取。民眾也可以到網頁 <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine> 閱覽有關的解釋文件，或根據以上提供的地址和電話向委員會秘書索取。

### **語言服務**

根據語言服務條例(三藩市行政法典第 91 章)，中文、西班牙語和/或菲律賓語（泰加洛語）傳譯人員在收到要求後將會提供傳譯服務。翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後透過要求而提供。其他語言協助在可能的情況下也將可提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少 48 小時致電 628-652-6035 或電郵至 [may.k.liang@sfgov.org](mailto:may.k.liang@sfgov.org) 向委員會秘書 May Liang 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。

### **遊說者法令**

依據「三藩市遊說者法令」（SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code 2.100）能影響或欲影響本地立法或行政的人士或團體可能需要註冊，並報告其遊說行為。如需更多有關遊說者法令的資訊，請聯絡位於 Van Ness 街 25 號 220 室的三藩市道德委員會，電話號碼：415- 252-3100，傳真號碼 415-252-3112，網址：[sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics)。

--

Para preguntas acerca de la reunión, por favor contactar el 628-652-6035. El timbrado de y el uso de teléfonos celulares, localizadores de personas, y artículos electrónicos que producen sonidos similares, están prohibidos en esta reunión. Por favor tome en cuenta que el Presidente podría ordenar el retiro de la sala de la reunión a cualquier persona(s) responsable del timbrado o el uso de un teléfono celular, localizador de personas, u otros artículos electrónicos que producen sonidos similares.

### **CONOZCA SUS DERECHOS BAJO LA ORDENANZA SUNSHINE**

El deber del Gobierno es servir al público, alcanzando sus decisiones a completa vista del público. Comisiones, juntas, concilios, y otras agencias de la Ciudad y Condado, existen para conducir negocios de la gente. Esta ordenanza asegura que las deliberaciones se lleven a cabo ante la gente y que las operaciones de la ciudad estén abiertas para revisión de la gente. Para obtener información sobre sus derechos bajo la Ordenanza Sunshine (capítulo 67 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco) o para reportar una violación de la ordenanza, por favor póngase en contacto con:

Administrador del Grupo de Trabajo de la Ordenanza Sunshine (Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator)  
City Hall – Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683  
415-554-7724 (Oficina); 415-554-5163 (Fax);  
Correo electrónico: [SOTF@sfgov.org](mailto:SOTF@sfgov.org)

Copias de la Ordenanza Sunshine pueden ser obtenidas del Secretario del grupo de Trabajo de la Ordenanza Sunshine, la Biblioteca Pública de San Francisco y en la página web del internet de la ciudad en [www.sfgov.org](http://www.sfgov.org). Copias de documentos explicativos están disponibles al público por Internet en <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine>; o, pidiéndolas al Secretario de la Comisión en la dirección o número telefónico mencionados arriba.

### **ACCESO A IDIOMAS**

De acuerdo con la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas “Language Access Ordinance” (Capítulo 91 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco “Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code”) intérpretes de chino, español y/o filipino (tagalo) estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas, de ser requeridas, luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. La asistencia en idiomas adicionales se tomará en cuenta siempre que sea posible. Para solicitar asistencia con estos servicios favor comunicarse con

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

Entertainment.commission@sfgov.org por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible.

#### **ORDENANZA DE CABILDEO**

Individuos y entidades que influncian o intentan influenciar legislación local o acciones administrativas podrán ser requeridos por la Ordenanza de Cabildeo de San Francisco (SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code 2.100) a registrarse y a reportar actividades de cabildeo. Para más información acerca de la Ordenanza de Cabildeo, por favor contactar la Comisión de Ética: 25 de la avenida Van Ness , Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, 415-252-3100, FAX 415-252-3112, sitio web: [sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics).

--

Kung mayroon kayong mga tanong tungkol sa miting, mangyaring tumawag lang sa 628-652-66035. Ang pagtunog at paggammit ng mga cell phone, mga pager at kagamitang may tunog ay ipinagbabawal sa pulong. Paalala po na maaring palabasin ng Tagapangulo ang sinumang may-ari o responsable sa ingay o tunog na mula sa cell-phone, pager o iba pang gamit na lumilikha ng tunog o ingay.

#### **ALAMIN ANG INYONG MGA KARAPATAN SA ILALIM NG SUNSHINE ORDINANCE**

Tungkulin ng Pamahalaan na paglinkuran ang publiko, maabot ito sa patas at medaling maunawaan na paraan. Ang mga komisyon, board, kapulungan at iba pang mga ahensya ng Lungsod at County ay mananatili upang maglingkod sa pamayanan. Tinitiyak ng ordinansa na ang desisyon o pagpapasya ay ginagawa kasama ng mamamayan at ang mga gawaing panglungsod na napagkaisahan ay bukas sa pagsusuri ng publiko. Para sa impormasyon ukol sa inyong karapatan sa ilalim ng Sunshine Ordinance ( Kapitulo 67 sa San Francisco Administrative Code) o para mag report sa paglabag sa ordinansa, mangyaring tumawag sa Administrador ng Sunshine Ordinance Task Force .

City Hall – Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683  
415-554-7724 (Opisina); 415-554-7854 (Fax)  
E-mail: [SOTF@sfgov.org](mailto:SOTF@sfgov.org)

Ang mga kopya ng Sunshine Ordinance ay makukuha sa Clerk ng Sunshine Task Force, sa pampublikong aklatan ng San Francisco at sa website ng Lungsod sa [www.sfgov.org](http://www.sfgov.org). Mga kopya at mga dokumentong na nagpapaliwanag sa Ordinance ay makukuha online sa <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine> o sa kahilingan sa Commission Secretary, sa address sa itaas o sa numero ng telepono.

#### **PAG-ACCESS SA WIKA**

Ayon sa Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 ng San Francisco Administrative Code), maaaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin sa wikang Tsino, Espanyol, at/o Filipino (Tagalog). Kapag hiniling, ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon. Maari din magkaroon ng tulong sa ibang wika. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyaring tumawag sa [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org) sa hindi bababa sa 48 oras bago mag miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng pagbibigyan.

#### **LOBBYIST ORDINANCE**

Ayon sa San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code 2.100], ang mga indibidwal o mga entity na nag iimpluensiya o sumusubok na mag impluensiya sa mga lokal na pambatasan o administrative na aksyon ay maaring kailangan mag register o mag report ng aktibidad ng lobbying. Para sa karagdagan na impormasyon tungkol sa Lobbyist Ordinance, mangyaring tumawag sa San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, (415) 252-3100, FAX (415) 252-3112, website: [sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics)

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Notice of Entertainment Commission Special Meetings - May 6, 2026  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 11:16:02 AM  
**Attachments:** [EC Summit Agenda May 6 2026.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the Office of the City Administrator, submitting an agenda for the May 6, 2026, Entertainment Commission special meeting.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Liang, May (ADM) <may.k.liang@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2026 6:06 PM  
**To:** Liang, May (ADM) <may.k.liang@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Commission, Entertainment (ADM) <entertainment.commission@sfgov.org>; Weiland, Maggie (ADM) <maggie.weiland@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Notice of Entertainment Commission Special Meetings - May 6, 2026

Hello all:

Please note that we have an Entertainment Commission special meeting that will be held **in-person on Wednesday, May 6, 2026**. The meeting agenda is attached.

**Notice of Entertainment Commission Special Meeting:**

**Date:** Monday, May 6, 2026

**Time:** 12:30PM

**Location:**

- **In-person at 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Rooms, 49 South Van Ness Ave., San Francisco, CA 94103**

Following the special meeting, the Entertainment Commission will host the [16 Annual SF Nightlife and Entertainment Summit](#) at the same location.

Thank you,  
May

---

**May Liang** 梁潤 (she/her)

Commission Secretary | Permit Administrator

San Francisco Entertainment Commission

49 South Van Ness, Suite 1482

San Francisco, CA 94103

628-652-6035 (direct line) | 628-652-6030 (EC main line)

[Facebook](#) | [Website](#) | [Instagram](#)

[Sign up for the Entertainment Commission e-mail list](#)



Please be mindful that all correspondence and documents submitted to the Entertainment Commission are public records and, as such, are subject to the [Sunshine Ordinance](#) and can be requested by the public. If this happens, personal information such as Social Security numbers and phone numbers, will be redacted.



# **Entertainment Commission**

## ***City and County of San Francisco***



### **Notice and Agenda for Special Meeting**

### **San Francisco Nightlife and Entertainment Summit**

**Wednesday, May 6, 2026, 12:30 P.M.**

#### **Location:**

**49 South Van Ness Ave.**

**Ground Floor, Conference Center Rooms**

**San Francisco, CA 94103**

**An informal networking Happy Hour will follow the summit. There is no agenda or program for the happy hour.**

***This special meeting will be held in-person for the public.***

#### **Commissioners:**

**Ben Bleiman, *President - Industry Representative***

**Cyn Wang, *Vice President - Urban Planning Representative***

**Maria Davis, *Commissioner - Industry Representative***

**Lt. Leonard Poggio, *Commissioner - Law Enforcement Representative***

**Anthony Schlender, *Commissioner - Neighborhood Representative***

**Laura Thomas, *Commissioner - Public Health Representative***

**Jordan Wilson, *Commissioner - Neighborhood Representative***

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

## **1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

## **2. General Public Comment**

Members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. With respect to agenda items, members of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes at the time such item is called.

## **3. Commissioner Comments & Questions. [Announcements]**

**4. Adjournment.** Note: Following the adjournment, the Entertainment Commission will host its 16th Annual Nightlife and Entertainment Summit at 49 South Van Ness Ave., Ground Floor, Conference Center Rooms.

## **5. Happy Hour to follow at The Gambit – 581 Hayes St, San Francisco, CA 94102**

### **DISABILITY ACCESS**

49 South Van Ness Ave. is wheelchair accessible. **Wheelchair-accessible entrances are located on Van Ness Avenue and on 11<sup>th</sup> Street.** There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor.

Sign Language Interpretation is also available upon request. If requesting remote Sign Language Interpretation, please submit an accommodation request a minimum of 4 business hours prior to the start of the meeting. Allowing a minimum of 48 business hours for all other accommodation requests (for example, for other auxiliary aids and services) helps ensure availability. To request accommodation, please contact us at [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org).

### **To view previous meetings on-line**

Watch an archived Entertainment Commission meeting: [https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=99](https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=99)  
Watch meetings on demand for other City Commissions, Councils and Boards: [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)

### **CELLPHONE AND/OR SOUND PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICE USAGE AT HEARINGS**

The ringing and use of cell phones and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices (Sunshine Ordinance 67A.1).

### **SENSITIVITY TO CHEMICAL BASED PRODUCTS**

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity, or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals

### **KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE**

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force ([sfgov.org/sunshine](http://sfgov.org/sunshine)) the San Francisco Public Library. and on the City's website at [sfgov.org](http://sfgov.org). For more

### **ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION**

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact:

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
City Hall, Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683  
Office: (415) 554-7724  
(Fax): (415) 554-5163  
(E-mail): [SOTF@sfgov.org](mailto:SOTF@sfgov.org)  
(Web): [sfgov.org/sunshine](http://sfgov.org/sunshine)

#### **WRITTEN COMMENTS**

Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Commission. Written comments should be submitted to the Entertainment Commission via email to [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org) by 12pm on the day of the meeting.

#### **EXPLANATORY DOCUMENTS**

Copies of explanatory documents listed in this agenda, and other related materials received by the Entertainment Commission after the posting of this agenda, can be obtained by emailing [Entertainment.Commission@sfgov.org](mailto:Entertainment.Commission@sfgov.org) during normal business hours, and also, to the extent possible, will be available on the Commission's website at: <https://www.sf.gov/departments-city-administrator-entertainment-commission/events/upcomings>.

#### **LANGUAGE ACCESS**

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Commission. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact us at [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org) at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. Late requests will be honored if possible.

#### **LOBBYIST ORDINANCE**

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local policy or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone 415/252- 3100, fax 415/252-3112 and website: [www.sfgov.org/ethics](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).

--

如對會議有任何疑問，請致電 628-652-6035 查詢。當會議進行時，嚴禁使用手機及任何發聲電子裝置。會議主席可以命令任何使用手機或其他發出聲音裝置的人等離開會議場所。

#### **了解你在陽光政策下的權益**

政府的職責是為公眾服務，並在具透明度的情況下作出決策。市及縣政府的委員會，市參事會，議會和其他機構的存在是為處理民眾的事務。本政策保證一切政務討論都在民眾面前進行，而市政府的運作也公開讓民眾審查。如果你需要知道你在陽光政策 (San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 67) 下擁有的權利，或是需要舉報違反本條例的情況，請聯絡：

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main



陽光政策 專責小組行政官 地址:

City Hall – Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102-4683

電話號碼: 415-554-7724 ; 傳真號碼 415-554-5163

電子郵件: [SOTF@sfgov.org](mailto:SOTF@sfgov.org)

陽光政策的文件可以通過陽光政策專責小組秘書、三藩市公共圖書館、以及市政府網頁 [www.sfgov.org](http://www.sfgov.org) 等途徑索取。民眾也可以到網頁 <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine> 閱覽有關的解釋文件，或根據以上提供的地址和電話向委員會秘書索取。

### **語言服務**

根據語言服務條例(三藩市行政法典第 91 章)，中文、西班牙語和/或菲律賓語（泰加洛語）傳譯人員在收到要求後將會提供傳譯服務。翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後透過要求而提供。其他語言協助在可能的情況下也將可提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少 48 小時致電 628-652-6035 或電郵至 [may.k.liang@sfgov.org](mailto:may.k.liang@sfgov.org) 向委員會秘書 May Liang 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。

### **遊說者法令**

依據「三藩市遊說者法令」（SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code 2.100）能影響或欲影響本地立法或行政的人士或團體可能需要註冊，並報告其遊說行為。如需更多有關遊說者法令的資訊，請聯絡位於 Van Ness 街 25 號 220 室的三藩市道德委員會，電話號碼:415- 252-3100，傳真號碼 415-252-3112，網址：[sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics)。

--

Para preguntas acerca de la reunión, por favor contactar el 628-652-6035. El timbrado de y el uso de teléfonos celulares, localizadores de personas, y artículos electrónicos que producen sonidos similares, están prohibidos en esta reunión. Por favor tome en cuenta que el Presidente podría ordenar el retiro de la sala de la reunión a cualquier persona(s) responsable del timbrado o el uso de un teléfono celular, localizador de personas, u otros artículos electrónicos que producen sonidos similares.

### **CONOZCA SUS DERECHOS BAJO LA ORDENANZA SUNSHINE**

El deber del Gobierno es servir al público, alcanzando sus decisiones a completa vista del público. Comisiones, juntas, concilios, y otras agencias de la Ciudad y Condado, existen para conducir negocios de la gente. Esta ordenanza asegura que las deliberaciones se lleven a cabo ante la gente y que las operaciones de la ciudad estén abiertas para revisión de la gente. Para obtener información sobre sus derechos bajo la Ordenanza Sunshine (capítulo 67 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco) o para reportar una violación de la ordenanza, por favor póngase en contacto con:

Administrador del Grupo de Trabajo de la Ordenanza Sunshine (Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator)

City Hall – Room 244

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102-4683

415-554-7724 (Oficina); 415-554-5163 (Fax);

Correo electrónico: [SOTF@sfgov.org](mailto:SOTF@sfgov.org)

Copias de la Ordenanza Sunshine pueden ser obtenidas del Secretario del grupo de Trabajo de la Ordenanza Sunshine, la Biblioteca Pública de San Francisco y en la página web del internet de la ciudad en [www.sfgov.org](http://www.sfgov.org).

ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main



Copias de documentos explicativos están disponibles al público por Internet en <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine>; o, pidiéndolas al Secretario de la Comisión en la dirección o número telefónico mencionados arriba.

### **ACCESO A IDIOMAS**

De acuerdo con la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas “Language Access Ordinance” (Capítulo 91 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco “Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code”) intérpretes de chino, español y/o filipino (tagalo) estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas, de ser requeridas, luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. La asistencia en idiomas adicionales se tomará en cuenta siempre que sea posible. Para solicitar asistencia con estos servicios favor comunicarse con [Entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:Entertainment.commission@sfgov.org) por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible.

### **ORDENANZA DE CABILDEO**

Individuos y entidades que influyen o intentan influenciar legislación local o acciones administrativas podrán ser requeridos por la Ordenanza de Cabildeo de San Francisco (SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code 2.100) a registrarse y a reportar actividades de cabildeo. Para más información acerca de la Ordenanza de Cabildeo, por favor contactar la Comisión de Ética: 25 de la avenida Van Ness, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, 415-252-3100, FAX 415-252-3112, sitio web: [sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics).

--

Kung mayroon kayong mga tanong tungkol sa miting, mangyaring tumawag lang sa 628-652-66035. Ang pagtunog at paggamit ng mga cell phone, mga pager at kagamitang may tunog ay ipinagbabawal sa pulong. Paalala po na maaring palabasin ng Tagapangulo ang sinumang may-ari o responsable sa ingay o tunog na mula sa cell-phone, pager o iba pang gamit na lumilikha ng tunog o ingay.

### **ALAMIN ANG INYONG MGA KARAPATAN SA ILALIM NG SUNSHINE ORDINANCE**

Tungkulin ng Pamahalaan na paglinkuran ang publiko, maabot ito sa patas at medaling maunawaan na paraan. Ang mga komisyón, board, kapulungan at iba pang mga ahensya ng Lungsod at County ay mananatili upang maglingkod sa pamayanan. Tinitiyak ng ordinansa na ang desisyon o pagpapasya ay ginagawa kasama ng mamamayan at ang mga gawaing panglungsod na napagkaisahan ay bukas sa pagsusuri ng publiko. Para sa impormasyon ukol sa inyong karapatan sa ilalim ng Sunshine Ordinance (Kapitulo 67 sa San Francisco Administrative Code) o para mag report sa paglabag sa ordinansa, mangyaring tumawag sa Administrador ng Sunshine Ordinance Task Force .

City Hall – Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683  
415-554-7724 (Opisina); 415-554-7854 (Fax)  
E-mail: [SOTF@sfgov.org](mailto:SOTF@sfgov.org)

Ang mga kopya ng Sunshine Ordinance ay makukuha sa Clerk ng Sunshine Task Force, sa pampublikong aklatan ng San Francisco at sa website ng Lungsod sa [www.sfgov.org](http://www.sfgov.org). Mga kopya at mga dokumentong na nagpapaliwanag sa Ordinance ay makukuha online sa <http://www.sfbos.org/sunshine> o sa kahilingan sa Commission Secretary, sa address sa itaas o sa numero ng telepono.

### **PAG-ACCESS SA WIKA**

Ayon sa Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 ng San Francisco Administrative Code), maaaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin sa wikang Tsino, Espanyol, at/o Filipino (Tagalog). Kapag hiniling, ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyón. Maari din magkaroon ng tulong sa ibang wika. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyaring tumawag sa [entertainment.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:entertainment.commission@sfgov.org) sa hindi bababa sa 48 oras bago mag miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng pagbibigyan.

### **LOBBYIST ORDINANCE**

#### **ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION**

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103

(628) 652-6030 Main

Ayon sa San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code 2.100], ang mga indibidwal o mga entity na nag iimpluensiya o sumusubok na mag impluensiya sa mga lokal na pambatasan o administrative na aksyon ay maaring kailangan mag register o mag report ng aktibidad ng lobbying. Para sa karagdagan na impormasyon tungkol sa Lobbyist Ordinance, mangyaring tumawag sa San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, (415) 252-3100, FAX (415) 252-3112, website: [sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics)

**ENTERTAINMENT COMMISSION**

**49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1482, San Francisco, CA 94103**

**(628) 652-6030 Main**

# Item 12

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2025 Surplus Public Lands Ordinance- No Properties to Report  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 10:55:07 AM  
**Attachments:** [Surplus Property List 2025.pdf](#)  
[2026.3 Annual Surplus Property Report.pdf](#)

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the Office of the City Administrator (ADM), submitting the 2025 Surplus Public Lands Ordinance.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Po, Vivian (ADM) <[vivian.po@sfgov.org](mailto:vivian.po@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:00 AM  
**To:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <[sophie.hayward@sfgov.org](mailto:sophie.hayward@sfgov.org)>; Oerth, Sally (ADM) <[sally.oerth@sfgov.org](mailto:sally.oerth@sfgov.org)>; Giovannelli, Lesley (ADM) <[lesley.giovannelli@sfgov.org](mailto:lesley.giovannelli@sfgov.org)>; Cukierman, Rachel (ADM) <[rachel.cukierman@sfgov.org](mailto:rachel.cukierman@sfgov.org)>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org)>; Petrucione, Katharine (ADM) <[katharine.petrucione@sfgov.org](mailto:katharine.petrucione@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** 2025 Surplus Public Lands Ordinance- No Properties to Report

Madam Clerk,

Please see attached for Real Estate Division's 2025 annual update of the City's surplus property list. Please do not hesitate to contact Sally Oerth, Director of Real Estate, at [sally.oerth@sfgov.org](mailto:sally.oerth@sfgov.org), if you have any questions. Thank you very much.

Vivian Po (she/her)

Director of Central Office and Engagement

Office of the City Administrator

City & County of San Francisco

City Hall, Room 362

[Sign up here](#) to receive the City Administrator's newsletter.

City & County of San Francisco  
Daniel Lurie, Mayor



Office of the City Administrator  
Carmen Chu, City Administrator

March 27, 2026

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

**RE: Surplus Public Lands Ordinance – No Properties to Report for 2025**

Madam Clerk,

Pursuant to Section 23 A6(b) of the Administrative Code, the City's surplus property list is transmitted along with this memorandum to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. At my direction, the Real Estate Division surveyed departments with real estate holdings to provide an update to any new surplus properties that could be made available for affordable housing. The Real Estate Division determined that there are no changes to the previously transmitted Surplus Property Report and currently there are no Surplus Properties or Underutilized Properties (not under the jurisdiction of Enterprise Departments or the Educational Districts) available for the development of Affordable Housing.

As a result, per Section 23 A6(c), there is no new information to recommend a hearing of the Board of Supervisors.

Please do not hesitate to contact Sally Oerth, Director of Real Estate, at [sally.oerth@sfgov.org](mailto:sally.oerth@sfgov.org), if we can assist with answering any questions.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Carmen Chu".

Carmen Chu  
City Administrator

Attachment: Surplus Property Report 2025

| 2025 SURPLUS PROPERTY REPORT:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                               |                     |             |               |           |        |          |        |           |                                    |                                           |                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|--------|----------|--------|-----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| THERE ARE NO NEW SURPLUS PROPERTIES SUBJECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 23A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                               |                     |             |               |           |        |          |        |           |                                    |                                           |                        |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                               |                     |             |               |           |        |          |        |           |                                    |                                           |                        |
| BELOW ARE PREVIOUSLY REPORTED PARCELS; NONE QUALIFY AS SUPRLUS PROPERTY UNDER ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 23A:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                               |                     |             |               |           |        |          |        |           |                                    |                                           |                        |
| Property Name                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Address                       | Jurisdiction (Land) | No. of Lots | Land Area(sf) | Bldg Area | Zoning | District | Vacant | Block-Lot | Meets Surplus Property Definition* | Comments/Status                           | Adjacent City Parcels? |
| EXCESS PROPERTY                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 455 BUSH                      | Public Works        | 2           | 949           | 0         | C-3-R  | 3        | YES    | 0287-015  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| BROADWAY TUNNEL REMAINDER                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | BROADWAY & LARKIN             | Public Works        | 1           | 400           | 0         | RH-3   | 3        | YES    | 0154-028  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| UNDEDICATED ST                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | SE CARL & ARGUELLO            | Public Works        | 1           | 1646          | 0         | P      | 5        | YES    | 1275A-029 | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| GENEVA AT OCEAN                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                               | MOHCD               | 1           | 8575          | 0         | RH-2   | 7        | YES    | 6946-061  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| STATE RELINQUISHMENT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 149 Milton St                 | Public Works        | 1           | 80            | 0         | P      | 8        | YES    | 6750-054  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| OBSERVATION AREA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 191 PORTOLA                   | Public Works        | 1           | 50141         | 0         | P-OS   | 8        | YES    | 2848-001  | NO                                 | MOHCD reviewed & rejected                 | 840 Clipper            |
| UNDEDICATED STREET                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 59 Ord Ct                     | Public Works        | 1           | 125           | 0         | RH-2   | 8        | YES    | 2619-086  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| PLAZA - CLIPPER & 26TH STS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 840 CLIPPER                   | Public Works        | 1           | 15868         | 0         | P-OS   | 8        | YES    | 2850-023  | NO                                 | MOHCD reviewed & rejected                 | 191 Portola            |
| CESAR CHAVEZ ST (REMAINDER)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | CESAR CHAVEZ & GUERRERO ST    | Public Works        | 1           | 701           | 0         | RH-3   | 8        | YES    | 6567-009A | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| UNDEDICATED STREET                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | E OF ROOSEVELT & PARK HILL    | Public Works        | 1           | 196           | 0         | RH-2   | 8        | YES    | 2608-032  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| OLD BURNETT AVE (VACATED)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | PALO ALTO & GLENBROOK         | Public Works        | 1           | 7270          | 0         | RH-2   | 8        | YES    | 2719B-046 | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre /MOHCD reviewed & rejected | SFPUC lot adj          |
| FRANCONIA ST ALIGNMENT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 401 FRANCONIA                 | Public Works        | 1           | 2282          | 0         | RH-1   | 9        | YES    | 5635-023  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| MISSION ST PARCEL                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 4011 MISSION                  | Public Works        | 2           | 1161          | 0         | RH-2   | 9        | YES    | 5835-011A | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| PUBLIC WORKS LANDS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 691 ALEMANY                   | Public Works        | 3           | 9425          | 0         | RH-1   | 9        | YES    | 5886-058  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| DWIGHT ST PARCEL                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 859 DWIGHT                    | Public Works        | 1           | 997           | 0         | RH-1   | 9        | YES    | 6130-031  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| JUSTIN DRIVE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 395 JUSTIN DRIVE              | MOHCD               | 1           | 962           | 0         | RH-1   | 9        | YES    | 5842-048  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| SOUTHERN FWY (REMAINDER) AT THOMAS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | NO ADDRESS                    | Public Works        | 1           | 1546          | 0         | PDR-2  | 10       | YES    | 5350-050  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| SOUTHERN FWY (REMAINDER) AT THOMAS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 2198 THOMAS AVE               | Public Works        | 1           | 2047          | 0         | PDR-2  | 10       | YES    | 5350-048  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| CESAR CHAVEZ ST CIRCLE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 2627 CESAR CHAVEZ             | Public Works        | 1           | 7278          | 0         | PDR-2  | 10       | YES    | 4339-002A | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | DPW yard parking       |
| CESAR CHAVEZ ST RIGHT-OF-WAY                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 900 CESAR CHAVEZ ST           | Public Works        | 1           | 2896          | 0         | P      | 10       | YES    | 4314-001  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| UNDEDICATED STREET                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | AUGUSTA & CHARTER OAK         | Public Works        | 1           | 1685          | 0         | P      | 10       | YES    | 5376-066  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| CITY-OWNED PARCEL (BAY SHORE BLVD & SILVER)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | BAY SHORE BLVD & SILVER AVE   | Public Works        | 1           | 897           | 0         | NC-1   | 10       | YES    | 5402-060  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1051 PALOU                    | MOHCD               | 1           | 4530          | 0         | M-1    | 10       | YES    | 4756-046  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 114 ELMIRA STREET             | MOHCD               | 1           | 2040          | 0         | P      | 10       | YES    | 5377-068  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| GENEVA AVE (REMAINDER AT CAYUGA)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | CAYUGA & GENEVA AVENUE        | Public Works        | ---         | 265           | 0         | RH-1   | 11       | YES    | 7029-028  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| UNDEDICATED ST (LA GRANDE & MANSFIELD)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | LA GRANDE & MANSFIELD         | Public Works        | 1           | 374           | 0         | RH-1   | 11       | YES    | 5963A-001 | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | surrounded by park     |
| REMAINDER PARCEL                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | BTWN BART & I-280             | Public Works        | 1           | 848           | 0         |        | 11       | YES    | 7176-032  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| REMAINDER PARCEL                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | UNDER SOUTHBOUND I-280        | Public Works        | 1           | 4996          | 0         |        | 11       | YES    | 7126A-007 | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| REMAINDER PARCEL                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | UNDER NORTHBOUND I-280        | Public Works        | 1           | 287           | 0         |        | 11       | YES    | 7153-051  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| JUNIPERO SERRA AT SHIELDS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                               | MOHCD               | 1           | 2439          | 0         | RH-1   | 11       | YES    | 7000-025  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| UNDEDICATED ST (DE LONG STREET & SAN DIEGO STREET)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | DE LONG STREET & SAN DIEGO ST | Public Works        | 4           | 900           | 0         | P      |          | YES    | 7174-051  | NO                                 | Under 1/4 acre                            | r/w only               |
| *DEFINITIONS UNDER ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 23A.4:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                               |                     |             |               |           |        |          |        |           |                                    |                                           |                        |
| <b>Property:</b> "Property" shall mean any real property located within and owned by the City and County of San Francisco of one-quarter acre or more, excluding land and buildings reserved or intended to be reserved for open space or parks purposes, any land dedicated for public right-of-way purposes, any land used or reserved for transit lines, or public utility rights-of-way, or any publicly dedicated streets or rights-of-way. "Property" shall not include any real property owned by or on behalf of the Education Districts.                                                                                     |                               |                     |             |               |           |        |          |        |           |                                    |                                           |                        |
| <b>Surplus Property:</b> "Surplus Property" shall mean any Property that is not required to fulfill the mission of the City department, commission or agency with jurisdiction or control of such Property and that is not required to fulfill the mission of another governmental agency pursuant to an inter-governmental transfer, and shall not include any land to be exchanged for other land to be used by a City department in accordance with an existing letter of intent or agreement;                                                                                                                                     |                               |                     |             |               |           |        |          |        |           |                                    |                                           |                        |
| <b>Underutilized Property:</b> "Underutilized Property" shall mean an entire Property or portion thereof (including air rights), with or without improvements, that is used by the City only at irregular periods of time or intermittently, or that is used by the City for current purposes that can be satisfied with only a portion of such Property, or that is not currently occupied or used by the City and for which there are no plans by the City to occupy or use such Property, and that has a potential for development as Affordable Housing while maintaining the existing and anticipated City uses of the Property. |                               |                     |             |               |           |        |          |        |           |                                    |                                           |                        |

# Item 13

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2025 General Plan Annual Progress Report  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 4:23:36 PM  
**Attachments:** [2025 GP APR - BOS Transmittal cover.pdf](#)  
[San Francisco\\_CityCounty\\_2025\\_GP APR .pdf](#)

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the Planning Department (CPC), pursuant to California State Government Code Section 65400 and 65700, submitting a General Plan Annual Progress Report for 2025.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Hamilton, Dylan (CPC) <[dylan.hamilton@sfgov.org](mailto:dylan.hamilton@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2026 12:59 PM  
**To:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Switzky, Joshua (CPC) <[joshua.switzky@sfgov.org](mailto:joshua.switzky@sfgov.org)>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <[rachael.tanner@sfgov.org](mailto:rachael.tanner@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** 2025 General Plan Annual Progress Report

Hello Angela,

Attached, please find the General Plan Annual Progress Report for the 2025 reporting period, as well as the accompanying cover letter. Each jurisdiction, as per Government Code Sections 65400 and 65700, is required to submit the annual progress report to the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation outlining the status of the general plan and its implementation over the previous 12-month period. The Housing Element APR will be submitted separately. Please add the report and the cover letter to the file.

Thanks for your help, and please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Dylan

**Dylan Hamilton, Planner**  
**Citywide Division**

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 628.652.7478 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)

[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Note: I am currently working Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and am out of office Tuesdays and Thursdays





3/27/2026

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

Re: San Francisco General Plan Annual Progress Report 2025

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65400 and 65700, a General Plan Annual Progress Report (APR) has been completed for calendar year 2025 and is attached.

Government Code Section 65400 and 65700 mandates that all cities and counties submit an annual report on the status of the General Plan and progress in its implementation to their legislative bodies, the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) and Housing and Community Development (HCD) by April 1 of each year. State law further requires that all cities and counties submit an annual report on the community's progress toward implementing their Housing Element. The attached General Plan APR does not include the required information on progress toward implementing the Housing Element. This information can be found in the 2025 Housing Element APR, which will be transmitted separately.

Please feel free to reach out to Dylan Hamilton, Planner, at [dylan.hamilton@sfgov.org](mailto:dylan.hamilton@sfgov.org) or 628.652.7478 if you have any questions about this document.

Attachments:

San Francisco General Plan Annual Progress Report 2025



**San Francisco**  
**Planning**

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
628.652.7600  
[www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)

San Francisco Planning Department

General Plan Annual Progress Report

2025 Reporting Period

March 27, 2026

## Table of Contents

|                                                                                                    |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction .....                                                                                 | 3  |
| General Plan Amendments and Updates .....                                                          | 4  |
| General Plan Updates Underway .....                                                                | 6  |
| General Plan Implementation .....                                                                  | 7  |
| Compliance with Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation General Plan Guidelines ..... | 8  |
| Interagency and Intergovernmental Coordination .....                                               | 11 |
| Appendix A: Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan Compliance with SB-1425 .....    | 12 |

# Introduction

## About the General Plan

California Government Code Section 65300 mandates that each planning agency prepare, and the legislative body shall adopt, a General Plan for guiding physical change in the City. Chartered cities must include specific elements in the General Plan, as listed in Government Code Section 65302<sup>1</sup>. San Francisco's first General Plan was adopted by the Planning Commission in 1945 as the embodiment of San Francisco's vision for the future. The General Plan is intended to serve as a living document in "the first step in the continuous process of planning,"<sup>2</sup> and provides a comprehensive set of objectives and policies that influence how we live, work, and move about, as well as the quality and character of the City.

The San Francisco General Plan includes objectives and policies in a series of Elements and Area Plans. Each Element addresses a particular topic and applies citywide, while Area Plans make policies found in the Elements more precise as they relate to specific parts of the city. The San Francisco City Charter<sup>3</sup> requires the Planning Commission to update the General Plan from time to time through the process of amendments and referrals.

## About the Annual Progress Report

Government Code Section 65400 and 65700 mandates that all cities and counties submit an annual report on the status of the General Plan and progress in its implementation to their legislative bodies, the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation and Housing and Community Development (HCD) by April 1 of each year. The General Plan Annual Progress Report (APR) provides local legislative bodies and the public with information regarding the implementation of the General Plan for the City.

This 2025 General Plan APR covers the period from January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025, and was submitted to the Board of Supervisors on March 27, 2026.

This General Plan APR does not describe San Francisco's progress toward implementing the Housing Element. This information can be found in the 2025 Housing Element APR.

---

<sup>1</sup> [California Government Code section 65302.](#)

<sup>2</sup> [San Francisco General Plan](#), adopted December 1945.

<sup>3</sup> [San Francisco Charter, section 4.105](#)

# General Plan Amendments and Updates

## Family Zoning Plan

San Francisco's Family Zoning Plan (FZP) was a citywide rezoning initiative, signed into law by Mayor Lurie on December 12, 2025, designed to meet California's state RHNA mandate, as reflected in the updated Housing Element adopted in January 2023, requiring the city to plan for an additional 82,000 new homes by 2031. The plan provided zoning capacity for more than 36,200 new housing units (the shortfall of sites in the HE Sites Inventory), largely concentrated in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods in San Francisco's northern and western neighborhoods along existing public transit corridors.

The Family Zoning Plan's centerpiece is the Housing Choice-SF Program, a development pathway that offers projects flexibility in how housing, including affordable housing, is delivered, without sacrificing the essential design standards that matter to our communities. The plan also modernized parts of the Planning Code dating back more than 50 years, while strengthening protections for existing tenants, supporting small businesses, and welcoming new neighbors through small and mid-size housing development.

The General Plan amendments adopted as part of the Family Zoning Plan updated a range of citywide General Plan elements and neighborhood area plans to align the city's long-range policy guidance with the rezoning's core goals – primarily by revising outdated height, bulk, density, and design policies and maps to support more housing and increased density in well-resourced neighborhoods. The Family Zoning Plan included amendments to the Urban Design Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Transportation Element, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Glen Park Community Plan, Market and Octavia Area Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, Western SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan, Western Shoreline Area Plan, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index, removing or modifying provisions that would conflict with the increased heights and form-based density the FZP introduces.

Taken together, they brought overall General Plan policy into conformance with the accompanying Planning Code and Zoning Map changes necessary to implement the Housing Element. For more information about Housing Element Implementation, see San Francisco's 2025 Housing Element APR.

## Central SoMa and Transit Center District Commercial Development Requirements

This legislation, signed into law by Mayor Lurie on April 3, 2025, reduced mandatory commercial development requirements in two downtown planning areas. Specifically, it amended policies in the Central SoMa Area Plan to remove the existing policy requiring that new development on large parcels in the plan area include at least half commercial or non-residential space, and amended a Transit Center District Sub-Area Plan policy to eliminate the Plan's directive to reserve the bulk of remaining space for job growth by limiting non-commercial uses — replacing that directive with language that simply encourages and permits non-residential uses on major opportunity sites. The change was motivated by the dramatic shift in San Francisco's office market since the COVID-19 pandemic, with downtown SoMa facing a nearly 45% vacancy rate. Furthermore mandatory commercial allocations served as a barrier to housing development. By removing these requirements, the ordinance aimed to unlock feasibility for large residential projects in transit-rich areas while still allowing office development if market conditions recover.

## 530 Sansome Street

The 530 Sansome Development Agreement in Downtown San Francisco approved a new state-of-the-art fire station, a 41-story mixed-use tower with office, hotel, retail, and restaurant uses, and a reimagined public plaza between Sansome Street and Battery Street. The accompanying General Plan Amendments updated maps in the Urban Design Element, Downtown Area Plan, and Land Use Index to facilitate the development, including by accommodating the roughly 544-foot tower's height and creating a new Mixed-Use Fire Station Special Use District. In exchange for the entitlements, the developer would provide substantial community benefits including nearly \$15 million in affordable housing payments (with funds prioritized for senior housing in Chinatown), approximately \$1 million to the Downtown Park Fund, prevailing wages and local hiring commitments, and ongoing public open space improvements along Merchant Street. The legislation was signed by Mayor Lurie on October 27, 2025.

## Recreation and Open Space Element

California Senate Bill 1425, signed by Governor Newsom on September 30, 2022, requires every city and county to review and update its local open space plan by January 1, 2026. The update must include plans and an action program that address the following requirements: (i) access to open space for all residents in a manner that considers social, economic, and racial equity; (ii) climate resilience and other co-benefits of open space; (iii) re-wilding opportunities, including the preservation and restoration of natural habitats.

Planning Department staff reviewed relevant General Plan elements, including the Recreation and Open Space Element, Safety and Resilience Element, Environmental Justice Framework, and Western Shoreline Area Plan to determine if San Francisco meets the open space legislative requirements of SB-1425. Additionally, Planning Department staff coordinated with Recreation and Parks Department staff to identify and review action plans that employ policies for each requirement.

Overall, the Planning Department found that the current Recreation and Open Space Element sufficiently meets the three requirements of SB-1425 and has determined that no updates to San Francisco's Recreation and Open Space Element are needed to comply with SB-1425. The action programs that meet these requirements are numerous, so those mentioned in this document are examples including the Natural Resource Management Plan, RPD Strategic Plan, RPD Acquisition Policy, India Basin Waterfront Park Plan, SF Climate Action Plan, India Basin Equitable Development Plan, and Yosemite Creek Daylighting Project. For more information on the analysis determining the Recreation and Open Space Element's fulfillment of SB-1425's requirements, please see Appendix A: Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan Compliance with SB-1425.

## Other General Plan Elements

The date of adoption or latest major comprehensive update of each General Plan Element is given in table 1 below.

Table 1: General Plan Components, year of adoption or latest major update

| General Plan Component            | Year Adopted or Comprehensively Updated |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Introduction                      | 2023                                    |
| Housing Element                   | 2023                                    |
| Environmental Justice Framework   | 2023                                    |
| Safety and Resilience Element     | 2022                                    |
| Recreation and Open Space Element | 2014                                    |
| Air Quality Element               | 1997                                    |
| Transportation Element            | 1995                                    |
| Arts Element                      | 1991                                    |
| Environmental Protection Element  | 1988                                    |
| Community Facilities Element      | 1988                                    |
| Commerce and Industry Element     | 1987                                    |
| Urban Design Element              | 1972                                    |

## General Plan Updates Underway

### Transportation Element

The Planning Department, in collaboration with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), initiated a process in 2018 to update the Transportation Element. This work was postponed because a comprehensive Transportation Element update would have required more staffing, public engagement, and attention from agency leadership than what was available to carry out the effort. Currently, the SFMTA is prioritizing the delivery of planned transportation projects in the pipeline, responding to neighborhood concerns, and focusing on strategies to address the fiscal challenges associated with San Francisco's budget shortfall and facing transit agencies generally. Work to implement AB 98/SB 415, which requires cities to update trucking routes in the Transportation Element by January 1, 2028 or through an ordinance, is scheduled for initiation in FY2026-2027.

## General Plan Implementation

General Plan policies and objectives are implemented via the San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map, Development Agreements, Design Guidelines, other implementation documents associated with General Plan

elements and area plans, and through review and approval of private and public projects by the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and other City bodies.

### Private Projects

The objectives and policies reflected in the Planning Code and Zoning Map translate the General Plan's vision into specific rules for private development. Review and approval of private projects must also incorporate assessment of the proposed project against General Plan policies and objectives. This comes in the form of "Findings" that affirm a project's compliance with specific objectives and policies of the General Plan, and Consistency with eight priority-planning policies in Planning Code Section 101.1(b).

### Public Projects

San Francisco's Administrative Code requires that certain actions be referred to the San Francisco Planning Department for evaluation of consistency with the General Plan prior to their consideration by the Board of Supervisors. Actions requiring finding of consistency with the General Plan include real estate transactions by San Francisco, subdivision mapping, improvements to public structure, affordable housing projects that benefit from assistance by San Francisco, Redevelopment plans or amendments thereto, changes to public right-of-way, and capital expenditure plans (San Francisco Charter Section 4.105 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 2A.53). In most cases, an agency with jurisdiction over a particular action to be considered by the Board of Supervisors will submit a General Plan Referral (GPR) application to the Planning Department, requesting findings of consistency with the General Plan.

In 2025, the San Francisco Planning Department received 22 GPR applications. This marks a decline in volume from 2024 (50 GPRs), which may be partially due to the Department's new Planning Approval Letter (PAL) process and templates, which include General Plan findings of consistency for the entire project. For projects receiving this new PAL, the Board of Supervisors can rely on the PAL General Plan findings therein for actions that previously required a separate GPR application.

### Master Plans

#### Ongoing Master Planning Efforts

Site-specific master planning efforts for several large sites are currently ongoing. These are typically conducted collaboratively with a private development sponsor or property owner and typically include mixed-use developments with mixed-income and affordable housing, open space, and community benefits such as improved mobility, sustainability, and resilience.

Notable on-going planning for such sites include, but are not limited to:

1. **Freedom West**, a 4-block cooperative housing development in the Western Addition neighborhood, built as part of the former Redevelopment project area in the early 1970s. The project aims to rebuild and replace the existing co-op community and add substantial new housing (including additional affordable units), neighborhood-serving retail and community services, and new public open space. Approvals expected late 2026.
2. **Flower Mart** is a vacant, roughly 7- acre site within the adopted Central SoMa Area Plan. The site formerly housed the city's wholesale flower market, and was entitled in 2019 to replace or relocate the market and construct approximately 2 million square feet of office space with ancillary retail. The City



is working with the project sponsors to amend the Development Agreement, zoning and site design to add flexibility to respond to changing economic conditions. The proposed concept includes a range of land uses, from all housing to mixed use (housing/institutional/office/lab) to all office/lab, with a urban block network with publicly accessible streets and open spaces. Approval expected summer 2026.

3. **Presidio Yard** is a modernization project for an SFMTA-owned bus yard and maintenance facility. The project will improve transit service by upgrading maintenance operations and working conditions, allowing buses to return to service more quickly and improving street safety, while also enabling joint development and mixed-use opportunities at the site. As part of the Family Zoning Plan, the City created the *SFMTA Non-Contiguous Special Use District*, which establishes development controls enabling joint development at most SFMTA sites within the rezoned areas and includes specific provisions for the Presidio Yard site.
4. **SF Railyards**, envisions the Caltrain railyards at 4th and King as a regional transit center where Caltrain, future CA High Speed Rail, SFMTA light rail and buses come together at a major node. There will be a new rail station, added Caltrain service, and phased high rise high-density development with housing, office, and public spaces. The project will identify potential track layouts and development concepts for the site.

#### Master Planning Efforts Completed in 2025

1. **SF Gateway (749 Toland)**, consists of two million square feet of space for Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR), potentially including last mile delivery, fleet parking, warehousing, and maker spaces. Public benefits may include streetscape improvements, EV charging, workforce support, and air quality mitigation measures. The Development Agreement and accompanying legislation were signed by Mayor Lurie on December 12, 2025.

## Compliance with Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation General Plan Guidelines

Several ongoing planning efforts will increase the General Plan's compliance with Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation Guidelines:

### Tribal Cultural Resource Consultation

The Planning Department conducts outreach, notification, and consultation with local Native American representatives for General Plan Updates, for affordable housing projects as required under Assembly Bill 168, and for tribal cultural resources per CEQA requirements. Additionally, the department notifies Native American tribal representatives of public interpretation projects. The Planning Department contacts representatives on the Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC) list for San Francisco as well as parties on the interested local Native American representative list maintained by the department.

In 2025, the Planning Department issued 7 notifications to Native American tribal representatives on AB52 projects and plans, of which, 100% resulted in consultation with Native American tribal representatives. The Planning Department also conducted presentations and discussions about the implementation of new state

laws that require tribal cultural resource notice, such as SB 423, with Native American tribal representatives. The Planning Department issued 22 notifications to Native American tribal representatives on SB423 projects in 2025, of which, 100% resulted in consultation with Native American tribal representatives.

### American Indian Liaison / Community Development Initiatives

The Planning Department also engaged with the American Indian Cultural District (AICD), located in the Mission neighborhood and founded in 2020, to recognize, honor, and celebrate the American Indian legacy, culture, people, and contributions. Key elements of the Planning Department's work in the AICD in 2025 include:

- **American Indian Cultural District**
  - o **Draft Strategies for the CHHESS Report:** In 2025, the American Indian Cultural District (AICD) synthesized feedback gathered during the 2023–2024 workshops to develop draft Cultural Heritage Housing and Economic Sustainability Strategies (CHHESS). These draft strategies were presented to the community at AICD's 5th Annual Town Hall in March 2025. The Planning Department supported the synthesis of community feedback and assisted in developing the draft strategies.

The Planning Department partnered with Friendship House Association of American Indians, the oldest Urban Indian Organization (UIO) in the country, providing culturally grounded recovery services and community programming for the urban American Indian community. This work supported the development of the Village SF Wellness Center at 80 Julian Avenue and related community-led initiatives.

Key elements include:

- **Friendship House and the Village SF Wellness Center:**
  - o **Served as a strategic thought partner for an \$80 million capital campaign to develop the Village SF Indigenous Wellness Center at 80 Julian Avenue,** providing research, data analysis, campaign strategy advising, and development of funder-facing materials to support fundraising for a holistic project including supportive housing, behavioral health and substance use recovery services, and cultural community space for Native residents. The shovel-ready project previously received Conditional Use approval from the Planning Department.
  - o **Provided grant writing and strategic advisory support through the Community Engagement Fellowship,** assisting in the submission of over \$50 million in grant funding to support housing, health, and community development initiatives. This included advising on grant strategy and supporting proposal development that contributed to the successful acquisition of \$31.5 million in State funding through California's Behavioral Health Continuum Infrastructure Program (BHCIP) and \$14.5 million from the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development through the Proposition A Affordable Housing Bond, supporting the Village SF Wellness project.
  - o **Supported interdepartmental coordination and project management for community-led initiatives** including: the Green Cultural Zone (GCZ) pilot on Julian Avenue in front of the

Village SF Wellness Center, including program development the GCZ's green workforce development program, and the Golden Gate Indigenous Gardening Project led by Friendship House in partnership with Recreation and Park Department

- o **Ongoing support with research on applying Tribal Housing Preference** in San Francisco, exploring policy mechanisms to prioritize housing access for Native residents and working with MOHCD on this body of work.
- o **Develop a DAHLIA affordable housing application** guide aimed at improving access to San Francisco's affordable housing system for underserved communities. The project included conducting focus groups to identify barriers to using the DAHLIA system, including a session specifically with Native residents, and developing a publicly accessible, graphically designed community guide to support applicants. The guide was finalized and launched alongside targeted workshops with Native service providers to walk through the DAHLIA application process and strengthen providers' ability to support community members applying for affordable housing.

### American Indian Historical Context Statement

Through ongoing grant support from California's Office of Historic Preservation, the Planning Department is collaborating with the AICD and local Native American representatives on the development and realization of the San Francisco American Indian National Register Multiple Property Document/Historic Context Statement (SFAIMPD/HCS), which will help inform both CEQA review and General Plan updates. Phase one of the project was completed in 2024 and included the creation of a Community Advisory Group (CAG), the commencement of oral history collection, research, the identification of potential resources, and the development of an outline for the completion of the SFAIMPD/HCS.

The second phase of the project will involve the completion of oral history interviews, community outreach, ongoing identification of significant tangible and intangible resources, and finalizing the SFAIMPD/HCS. Phase two of the project commenced in 2025 and included additional oral history interviews, research and identification of resources and the development of a draft narrative history.

### Budget Request for Future General Plan Updates

The Planning Department's work plan includes staffing for the development of a new Land Use & Economy Element. There is no staffing allocated to the new Element in 2026, but, in the second year of the two-year work program, as staffing and resources become available, the division will seek to initiate development of a new Land Use Element of the General Plan, replacing the Land Use Index (which is a compilation of maps from other Elements and Area Plans) and implementing best practice in state guidelines. This effort will seek to consolidate and update content from the Commerce & Industry Element (last updated in 1987) and Community Facilities Element (last updated in 1990) along with content from the 2022 Housing Element.

## Interagency and Intergovernmental Coordination

The Planning Department is heavily engaged in the regional Plan Bay Area process, the Bay Area's regional long-range plan focusing on the economy, environment, housing, and transportation. This plan, which is

updated every four years under the auspices of the region's Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), is coordinated with agencies across nine Bay Area counties that represent 101 cities and towns of the region. The Plan Bay Area process also produces the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy as required by Senate Bill 375, and the Regional Transportation Plan. The most recent plan, Plan Bay Area 2050, was adopted in Fall 2021.

The next iteration, Plan Bay Area 2050+, is currently undergoing final review and adoption by MTC/ABAG as of March 2026. The Planning Department continues to be an active participant in Plan Bay Area implementation activities, including commenting on guidelines for MTC/ABAG's implementation of the Transit Oriented Communities Policy, the Priority Sites program, and grant programs for the Priority Development Areas, Priority Conservation Areas, and Priority Production Areas.

### Strategy for Monitoring Long-term Growth

Plan Bay Area is the primary source of long-term population and growth projections for the City and Region. The Planning Department has and is working on a variety of projects to address the public service and infrastructure needs of this growth, specifically through the various General Plan updates, site-specific master plans and citywide or district-scale policy studies mentioned earlier in this report. Participating in and implementing strategies in Plan Bay Area is the Department and City's primary strategy for monitoring long-term growth.

The Planning Department provides and refines the regional projections for use by our local infrastructure and public services agencies, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco Unified School District, transit agencies (e.g., SFMTA, BART, Caltrain), Recreation & Parks Department, and public safety agencies. Through the policies and implementation actions from the recently adopted Housing Element, the Planning Department is engaged with these various infrastructure and service-delivery agencies to ensure each agency's plan is aligned with the General Plan's vision of housing and population growth.

## Appendix A: Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan Compliance with SB-1425

### Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan Compliance with SB-1425

Link to Legislation: [Bill Text - SB-1425 Open-space element: updates. \(ca.gov\)](#)

## Introduction and Background

California Senate Bill 1425 was approved by Governor Gavin Newsom on September 30, 2022. It requires every city and county to review and update its local open space plan by January 1, 2026. The update must include plans and an action program that address the following requirements:

- Access to open space for all residents in a manner that considers social, economic, and racial equity, correlated with the environmental justice element or environmental justice policies in the general plan, as applicable.
- Climate resilience and other co-benefits of open space, correlated with the safety element.
- Rewilding opportunities, correlated with the land use element. “Rewilding opportunity” examples include: a) Opportunities to preserve, enhance, and expand an integrated network of open space to support beneficial uses, such as habitat, recreation, natural resources, historic and tribal resources, water management, and aesthetics; and b) Establishing a natural communities conservation plan to provide for coordinated mitigation of the impacts of new development.

In San Francisco, the titles and structure of General Plan components differ as follows:

- Open Space Plan = Recreation and Open Space Element
- Environmental Justice Element = Environmental Justice Framework
- Safety Element = Safety and Resilience Element
- Land Use Element = Land Use Index, a summary of land use policies and maps which exist throughout the General Plan.
- The General Plan includes specific area plans, such as the Western Shoreline Area Plan, which addresses many of the open space and climate resilience goals on the western shoreline of the City.
- Action Plans come in different forms. Not all General Plan Elements have an associated action program, some action plans may be specific to a project or an area, and some action plans have been created after a General Plan Element is adopted and the General Plan is not always amended to add a reference to that action plan.

To determine if the City of San Francisco meets the open space plan legislative requirements of SB-1425, Planning Department staff reviewed the ROSE, SRE, EJ Framework, and Western Shoreline Area Plan. Additionally, Planning Department staff coordinated with Recreation and Parks Department staff to identify and review action plans that employ policies for each requirement. The action programs that meet these requirements are numerous, so those mentioned in this document are examples including the Natural Resource Management Plan, RPD Strategic Plan, RPD Acquisition Policy, India Basin Waterfront Park Plan, SF Climate Action Plan, India Basin Equitable Development Plan, and Yosemite Creek Daylighting Project.

As background, the [Recreation and Open Space Element](#) (ROSE) was last adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2014, the [Western Shoreline Area Plan](#) in 2018, [Safety and Resilience Element](#) (SRE) in 2022, and the [Environmental Justice \(EJ\) Framework](#) in 2023.

## Summary of Findings

Overall, the Planning Department finds that the ROSE sufficiently meets the three requirements of SB-1425, both in element content and action programs. A summary of the findings follows:

Requirement 1: Access to open space for all residents in a manner that considers social, economic, and racial equity, correlated with the environmental justice element or environmental justice policies in the general plan, as applicable.

- The ROSE discusses the importance of open space in environmental justice and redressing equity issues in the Introduction. Guiding Principle for Open Space and Recreation #3: Equity & Accessibility highlights the need for the equitable distribution of open space, and Policy 2.1 provides a method for achieving it.
- The Environmental Justice (EJ) Framework, which is incorporated by reference into the Introduction of the General Plan, both defines EJ communities and highlights the importance of racial and social equity. It provides the most recent framing of EJ Communities adopted by the City, and the framework for supporting them. The Recreation and Parks Department has also fully adopted the EJ Framework and uses the [EJ Communities Map](#) to measure success.
- The action program requirement is met through various plans, programs, and policies, including the RPD Strategic Plan, RPD Acquisition Policy, and the India Basin Equitable Development Plan. They show how the City considers social, economic, and racial equity in land acquisition, design, community engagement, and in evaluating access to open space for residents.

Requirement 2: Climate resilience and other co-benefits of open space, correlated with the safety element.

- The ROSE promotes environmental sustainability, biodiversity, conservation, and watershed health in Guiding Principle for Open Space and Recreation: #6 Ecological Function & Integrity. These goals, and specific methods for climate resilience such as green stormwater management and climate change adaptive infrastructure, are also addressed in Policies 2.4, 3.3, and 4.1 and their supporting texts.
- The Safety and Resilience Element (SRE) uses similar language as the ROSE, such as in Guiding Principle for Open Space and Recreation #6, with an emphasis on climate resilience through nature-based solutions that mimic or restore ecological systems and function, as well as open space as a resource in emergency response and recovery.
- The Western Shoreline Area Plan, as part of the Coastal Hazards Amendment Objective 12, has specific policies, and implementation measures for preserving, enhancing, and restoring the Ocean Beach Shoreline, and managing retreat, with a focus on climate resilience adaptation near the shoreline.
- The RPD Strategic Plan and 2021 Climate Action Plan, as well as numerous project-specific plans including India Basin Waterfront Development Plan and Yosemite Creek Daylighting Project include specific, actionable and measurable climate resilience strategies for open spaces and natural lands.

Requirement 3: Rewilding opportunities, correlated with the land use element.

- The ROSE does not use the term “rewilding,” but Guiding Principle for Open Space and Recreation #6: Ecological Function & Integrity, and Policies 2.5, 3.3, 3.6, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 describe the intent and strategies for rewilding through the preservation, restoration, enhancement, expansion, and protection of biodiversity, habitat value, ecological integrity, natural areas, and watershed lands.
- The RPD Strategic Plan, RPD Acquisition Policy, and the Natural Resources Management Plan demonstrate the actions developed by RPD to create rewilding opportunities such as by increasing biodiversity and native plant propagation and enhancing and protecting natural areas.

## Detailed Findings

The findings below highlight how each requirement is met by existing policies and action plans.

**Requirement 1: Access to open space for all residents in a manner that considers social, economic, and racial equity, correlated with the environmental justice element or environmental justice policies in the general plan, as applicable.**

### Recreation and Open Space Element

- Introduction: Why is recreation and open space important?
  - *Open space and recreation activities can help to address environmental justice across a community. Public recreation provides accessible and low-cost opportunities to all San Franciscans, regardless of income level. High rates of childhood obesity and illness often correspond to fewer acres of usable open space. Provision of open space in areas with high concentrations of density, poverty, youth or seniors can redress equity issues. A clear example is how local food production increases access to fresh local produce and provides an opportunity for communities to connect with nature.*
- Guiding Principles for Open Space and Recreation: #3 Equity & Accessibility.  
*Open space and recreational programs should be equitably distributed. They should provide access for all residents, workers and visitors, and work towards a democratic network that includes all neighborhoods.*
- Objective 2: Increase recreation and open space to meet the long-term needs of the city and bay region.
  - Policy 2.1: Prioritize acquisition of open space in high needs areas.
    - ♣ *Excerpt from supporting text: Throughout the country, safe, green open spaces are in short supply in dense communities, where low-income and minority populations tend to be concentrated, as well as large numbers of children and seniors... Priority for acquisition of new space to address open space inequities should be given to high need areas, defined as places where there is low access to open space, a conglomeration of high density, high percentages of children, youth, seniors, and low income households, and in which the most growth is projected to occur between now and 2040...New acquisitions should continue to consider the composition of current and projected neighborhood populations. There are both demographic and cultural differences in how people use parks: preschoolers, school age children, teenagers, adults, and senior citizens have*



*distinct open space needs that should be accommodated, that may also vary according to social and economic groups.*

- Objective 3: Improve access and connectivity to open space.

### *EJ Framework*

- The EJ Framework is incorporated by reference into the General Plan Introduction, thus providing a framework for improving environmental justice across the General Plan.
- Priority 2.1: Distribute public facilities equitably: Evaluate the need for community facilities in EJ Communities and add new or expand existing facilities as needed.
  - o Excerpt from supporting text: *Throughout the public engagement process, EJ Communities expressed the need for improved access to parks, recreation centers, and other community facilities.* (Open space is considered a community facility in this context)

### *Example Action Plans*

#### Recreation and Parks Department Strategic Plan, 2023-27 Update

- The Recreation and Parks Department (RPD) uses Equity Zones, informed by the Environmental Justice Communities Map (EJ Map), as a metric of success for their facilities and programming. The Equity Zones are the same as the EJ Communities in the 2022 EJ Map (the map is not stagnant), which are defined as areas facing the top one-third of cumulative environmental and socioeconomic burdens across the city. RPD also uses Equity Neighborhoods as a metric in their Strategic Plan, which are the neighborhoods that include the Equity Zones.
  - o Examples of Objectives from the SFRPD Strategic Plan that measure success with Equity Zones include:
    - ♣ Objective 1.2d: Refresh and renovate three mini parks in Equity Zones; increase activation and programming in all mini parks
    - ♣ Objective 2.1a: Track and increase outreach and education about scholarship availability in Equity Zones
    - ♣ Objective 2.3a: Develop system to capture data on current drop-in program offerings and participation; add recreation program hours to mitigate any identified inequities across Equity Zone neighborhoods
    - ♣ Objective 4.3b: Increase usage, accessibility, and awareness of Randall on the Road; track usage in Equity Zones
    - ♣ Objective 4.3h: Deliver five new nature-based amenities in Equity Zones

#### RPD Acquisition Policy (2011)

- The Acquisition Policy for RPD requires the completion of a property evaluation worksheet to determine if the land is desirable for acquisition, and thus eligible for acquisition. The policy goals that classify the land as “most desirable” include “Located within a High Needs Area” and “Located within an Open Space Deficient Area.”

#### India Basin Equitable Development Plan

- The India Basin Equitable Development Plan has 6 areas of focus: Arts, Culture and Identity; Workforce and Business Development; Transportation, Access and Connectivity; Healthy Communities and Ecology; Youth Opportunities; and Housing Security. Each area of focus

contains strategies and specific actions and programs for realizing the values and equity goals of the community.

## Requirement 2: Climate resilience and other co-benefits of open space, correlated with the safety element.

### Recreation and Open Space Element

- Guiding Principle for Open Space and Recreation: #6 Ecological Function & Integrity.  
*With environmental sustainability as a driving theme, the quantity and quality of natural systems in the City should be preserved and expanded, by promoting aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity, by designing for watershed health, and by implementing environmental, ecological and conservation-minded strategies.*
- Objective 2: Increase recreation and open space to meet the long-term needs of the city and bay region.
  - o Policy 2.4: Support the development of signature public open spaces along the shoreline.
    - ♣ *Excerpt from supporting text: ...In addition to signature open spaces, the City should consider new waterfront open space improvements that serve a non-recreational purpose, including climate change adaptive infrastructure. Inclusion and restoration of open space, particularly tidal wetlands, can act as a natural buffer and play a key role in adapting to sea level rise. Wetlands can protect shorelines from storm surges while assisting in reducing carbon levels through sequestration, so wetland restoration and habitat enhancements should be considered for inclusion in all waterfront open spaces. While many of these areas are already developed, and therefore not appropriate for open space development at this time, ecosystem-based management principles and retrofits should be considered wherever possible to ensure that shoreline retreat and flood protection are considered as measures to assist in adapting to projected sea level rise.*
- Objective 3: Improve access and connectivity to open space.
  - o Policy 3.3: Develop and enhance the City's recreational trail system, linking to the regional hiking and biking trail system and considering restoring historic water courses to improve stormwater management.
    - ♣ *Excerpt from supporting text: New trails throughout the city could consider historic water courses to incorporate stormwater management, provide trail connections, or restore aquatic and riparian habitats or wildlife corridors...*
- Objective 4: Protect and enhance the biodiversity, habitat value, and ecological integrity of open spaces and encourage sustainable practices in the design and management of our open space system.
  - o Policy 4.1: Preserve, protect, and restore local biodiversity.
    - ♣ *Excerpt from supporting text: ...The City should employ appropriate management practices to maintain a healthy and resilient ecosystem which preserves and protects plant and wildlife habitat, especially rare species which are the primary contributors to local biodiversity. Restoring some ecosystems would also help enhance local biodiversity. Wetlands and riparian areas, for example, provide habitat, biological benefits, and resource-efficient methods for treating storm water runoff in addition to serving recreational uses.*

### Safety & Resilience Element

- Objective 2.3. Nature-based solutions. Enhance nature, biodiversity, and public open space through climate resilience strategies that mimic or restore ecological systems and function.
  - o Policy 2.3.1: Maximize the preservation and maintenance of carbon sinks and landscape approaches that advance the rate of carbon sequestration.
  - o Policy 2.3.2: Prioritize nature-based solutions that restore ecosystem function and maximize ecological benefits to plants, animals, and people.
  - o Policy 2.3.3: Prioritize nature-based solutions as flood adaptation strategies, to enhance shoreline biodiversity and ecological function, manage stormwater, and protect against sea level rise and coastal flooding.
- Objective 3.3: Infrastructure and public realm. Ensure the city's lifeline systems, transportation and emergency response facilities, utilities, streets, public spaces, and coasts can withstand and adapt to all hazards.
  - o Policy 3.3.3: Conduct capital planning to advance resilient infrastructure prioritizing life safety and functional recovery, as well as the needs of Environmental Justice Communities and other vulnerable people.
  - o Policy 3.3.9: Design and utilize open spaces considering their use as emergency gathering areas, floodable spaces, and ecosystem services, per the ROSE.
    - ♣ Supporting text: *For certain hazards, such as earthquakes, flooding, pandemic, and extreme heat, open spaces in the public realm can serve as critical spaces for emergency gathering (evacuation, shelter) and buffers (retreat). Per the ROSE, design and utilize open spaces to act as emergency gathering areas that are low-risk, flexible use, and resilient. Additionally, these open spaces along and near the ocean and bay shorelines can serve as floodable spaces as part of nature-based solutions to sea level rise and flood hazards.*

### Western Shoreline Area Plan

- Objective 12: Preserve, enhance, and restore the Ocean Beach shoreline while protecting public access, scenic quality, natural resources, critical public infrastructure, and existing development from coastal hazards.
  - o Policy 12.1: Adopt managed retreat adaptation measures between Sloat Boulevard and Skyline Drive.
  - o Policy 12.2: Develop and Implement Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plans for the Western Shoreline.
  - o Policy 12.3: Develop and Implement a Beach Nourishment Program to Sustain Ocean Beach.

### Example Action Plans

#### Recreation and Parks Department Strategic Plan, 2023-27 Update

- Strategy 1: Inspire Place. Keep today's parks safe, clean, and fun; promote our parks' historic and cultural heritage; and build the great parks of tomorrow.

- o Objective 1.1 Develop more open space and improve access to existing facilities to address population growth in high-need and emerging neighborhoods
  - ♣ i. Conduct the Great Highway Pilot Project with expanded data collection, public outreach, coordination with SFMTA, the SF Estuary Institute Dune Study and the SFPUC's Long-Term Climate Adaptation Project
- Strategy 4: Inspire Stewardship. Strengthen the City's climate resiliency by protecting and enhancing San Francisco's precious natural resources through conservation, education and sustainable land and facility management practices
  - o Objective 4.1: Conserve and strengthen natural resources
    - ♣ c. Collaborate with PUC on stormwater management opportunities
    - ♣ d. Participate in collaborative initiatives to implement the City's Climate Action Plan; undertake initiatives that are consistent with RPD park management objectives
  - o Objective 4.2: Increase biodiversity and interconnectivity on City parkland
    - ♣ b. Support implementation efforts for coastal access from Sloat to Skyline for the SFPUC's long-term climate adaptation project

#### [2021 San Francisco Climate Action Plan \(CAP\)](#)

- The 2021 San Francisco Climate Action Plan sets forth a set of actionable and measurable strategies that not only charts a pathway to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, but also works toward addressing racial and social equity, public health, economic recovery, resilience, and the provision of safe and affordable housing to all. Integral to these strategies is improving San Francisco's parks, natural open spaces, and rights-of-way. The Plan includes several strategies addressing Healthy Ecosystems, including: restore and enhance parks, natural lands, and open spaces; maximize trees throughout the public realm; and increase greening and integration of local biodiversity into the built environment.

#### [India Basin Waterfront Park Plan](#)

- RPD is planning and building the India Basin Waterfront Park in partnership with Trust for Public Land, the San Francisco Parks Alliance, A. Philip Randolph Institute, and the Bayview Hunter's Point community. They endeavor to build a park that is both spectacular and crucial to the health of San Francisco's southeast communities, which have been historically underserved. The development of 900 Innes will transform a post-industrial brownfield into the 21st-century legacy park in a historic waterfront context, with an emphasis on: Habitat and wetland restoration and enhancement; Public access; Resiliency to sea level rise; Social equity; and Waterfront recreation.

#### [Yosemite Creek Daylighting Project](#)

- The Yosemite Creek Daylighting Project, led by the RPD, will daylight (i.e. uncover) a historic creek in McLaren Park, provide stormwater management, and enhance habitat and biodiversity, while creating a community amenity.

### Requirement 3: Rewilding opportunities, correlated with the land use element.

#### Recreation and Open Space Element

- Guiding Principle for Open Space and Recreation: #6 Ecological Function & Integrity.  
*With environmental sustainability as a driving theme, the quantity and quality of natural systems in the City should be preserved and expanded, by promoting aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity, by designing for watershed health, and by implementing environmental, ecological and conservation-minded strategies.*
- Objective 2: Increase recreation and open space to meet the long-term needs of the city and bay region.
  - Policy 2.5: Encourage the development of region-serving open spaces in opportunity areas: Treasure Island, Yerba Buena Island, Candlestick and Hunters Point Shipyard.
    - ♣ *Excerpt from supporting text: Several large, underutilized sites within the City offer...the chance to create new, large-scale region-serving open spaces. (It then provides details about the opportunities on Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island that can protect and restore wildlife habitat and biodiversity).*
- Objective 3: Improve access and connectivity to open space.
  - Policy 3.3: Develop and enhance the City's recreational trail system, linking to the regional hiking and biking trail system and considering restoring historic water courses to improve stormwater management.
    - ♣ *Excerpt from supporting text for the New Cross-Town Corridor: A proposed corridor would connect wildlife habitats and allow hikers an urban wildlife trail experience through some of the City's most diverse natural areas.*
  - Policy 3.6: Maintain, restore, expand, and fund the urban forest.
    - ♣ *Excerpt from supporting text: The urban forest contributes substantially to our quality of life and to the ecological functioning of our city. Trees and landscaping soften the urban environment, provide habitat, improve air quality, absorb carbon and mitigate stormwater runoff...*
- Objective 4: Protect and enhance the biodiversity, habitat value, and ecological integrity of open spaces and encourage sustainable practices in the design and management of our open space system.
  - Policy 4.1: Preserve, protect, and restore local biodiversity.
    - ♣ *Excerpt from supporting text: ...The City should employ appropriate management practices to maintain a healthy and resilient ecosystem which preserves and protects plant and wildlife habitat, especially rare species which are the primary contributors to local biodiversity. Restoring some ecosystems would also help enhance local biodiversity. Wetlands and riparian areas, for example, provide habitat, biological benefits, and resource-efficient methods for treating storm water runoff in addition to serving recreational uses. However, many of San Francisco's wetlands have been buried by development and little of the original wetlands have survived in San Francisco. A number of restoration projects have recently been completed or are underway, including projects at Crissy Field, Heron's Head, Pier 94, Mountain Lake and Lake Merced. The City should continue to support the monitoring and restoration of these wetlands.*
    - ♣ *The long-term vision for the City should also include conserving and restoring hydrological resources, including riparian communities, seeps, springs, creeks, ponds, and lakes; and exploring the feasibility of daylighting creeks that are completely or partially buried, for example Islais Creek, Yosemite Creek and*

*Mission Creek. In order to ensure the preservation and restoration of our local biodiversity, the City should increase awareness of the benefits of all ecological communities as well as how the public should and should not interact with these areas.*

- o Policy 4.2: Establish a coordinated management approach for designation and protection of natural areas and watershed lands.
  - ♣ Excerpt from supporting text: *San Francisco's natural areas are the undeveloped remnants of the historical landscape which contain rich and diverse plant and animal communities. Following the adoption of the 1986 Recreation and Open Space Element, the SFRPD enacted policies to develop a Natural Areas Program to manage the 530 acres of parks and portions of parks that constitute natural areas. The mission of the program is to restore and enhance remnant natural areas and to develop and support community-based stewardship of these areas. Policies governing access and appropriate use and enjoyment of protected natural areas should ensure that the natural resource values are not diminished or negatively affected by public use...The City should ensure that a comprehensive inventory of all natural areas owned by city agencies other than the Recreation and Park Department and by private landholders is developed, in order to preserve the City's biodiversity and natural areas more holistically. This inventory should include promoting habitat corridors among open spaces and natural areas... if such an area is at risk of loss through development, the site should be examined as a candidate for open space acquisition...*
- o Policy 4.3: Integrate the protection and restoration of local biodiversity into open space construction, renovation, management, and maintenance.
  - ♣ Excerpt from supporting text: *Habitat and Wildlife. Where appropriate, utilize materials and design spaces, facilities and buildings in a manner that provides habitat for local and migrating wildlife.*

#### EJ Framework:

- Topic: Healthy and Resilient Environments
  - o Priority 1.3: Expand nature-based solutions, green infrastructure, & urban greening. Restore natural habitats and the ecological function of the City by developing neighborhood-specific targets and stewardship programs for watersheds, tree canopy cover, green infrastructure, urban greening, and other biodiversity targets. Align these mitigation and adaptation measures to protect areas of high climate vulnerability.
- Topic: Healthy Food Access
  - o Priority 3.5: Increase nature-based food opportunities: Affirm Traditional Ecological Knowledge<sup>16</sup> and nature-based food practices. Support nature-based and culturally appropriate access to public land and open space for foraging, gathering, cultivating, fishing, and hunting<sup>17</sup> of food as well as conducting other nature-based cultural practices.

#### Example Action Plans:

##### Recreation and Parks Department Strategic Plan, 2023-27 Update

- Strategy 4: Inspire Stewardship. Strengthen the City's climate resiliency by protecting and enhancing San Francisco's precious natural resources through conservation, education and sustainable land and facility management practices.

- o Objective 4.2: Increase biodiversity and interconnectivity on City parkland.
  - ♣ a. Expand GGP's nursery propagation efforts to include more locally sourced native plant material in support of biodiversity enhancement.

#### [RPD Acquisition Policy \(2011\)](#)

- The RPD Acquisition Policy requires the completion of a property evaluation worksheet to determine if the land is desirable for acquisition, and thus eligible for acquisition. The policy goals that classify the land as "desirable" include "Natural Resources Protection."

#### [Natural Resources Management Plan](#)

- This plan addresses the restoration and management of the remaining elements of San Francisco's original ecosystem and includes site-specific recommendations and actions that contribute to rewilding as outlined in the ROSE.

# Item 14

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-District06 Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Letter of Inquiry: Street Trees (Dorsey)  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 9:02:15 AM  
**Attachments:** [Tree Canopy Equity and Resource Allocation in District 6, Letter of Inquiry March 2026.pdf](#)

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the Department Public Works (DPW), submitting a response to a letter of inquiry issued by Supervisor Matt Dorsey at the January 27, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Schneider, Ian (DPW) <[ian.schneider@sfdpw.org](mailto:ian.schneider@sfdpw.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2026 4:57 PM  
**To:** Donovan, Dominica (BOS) <[dominica.donovan@sfgov.org](mailto:dominica.donovan@sfgov.org)>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <[matt.dorsey@sfgov.org](mailto:matt.dorsey@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Short, Carla (DPW) <[Carla.Short@sfdpw.org](mailto:Carla.Short@sfdpw.org)>; Durden, DiJaida (DPW) <[DiJaida.Durden@sfdpw.org](mailto:DiJaida.Durden@sfdpw.org)>; Moore, David (DPW) <[david.moore@sfdpw.org](mailto:david.moore@sfdpw.org)>; Nawbary, Susan (DPW) <[susan.nawbary@sfdpw.org](mailto:susan.nawbary@sfdpw.org)>; Swae, Jon (DPW) <[jon.swae@sfdpw.org](mailto:jon.swae@sfdpw.org)>; Lee, Esther (DPW) <[esther.e.lee@sfdpw.org](mailto:esther.e.lee@sfdpw.org)>; Heredia, Christopher (DPW) <[christopher.heredia@sfdpw.org](mailto:christopher.heredia@sfdpw.org)>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>; Ebadi, Mahanaz (BOS) <[mahanaz.ebadi@sfgov.org](mailto:mahanaz.ebadi@sfgov.org)>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <[madison.r.tam@sfgov.org](mailto:madison.r.tam@sfgov.org)>; Dahl, Bryan (BOS) <[bryan.dahl@sfgov.org](mailto:bryan.dahl@sfgov.org)>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <[DorseyStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:DorseyStaff@sfgov.org)>; Lee, Esther (DPW) <[esther.e.lee@sfdpw.org](mailto:esther.e.lee@sfdpw.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: Letter of Inquiry: Street Trees (Dorsey)

Dear Supervisor Dorsey,

Thank you providing your January 27, 2026 Letter of Inquiry regarding Tree Canopy Equity and Resource Allocation in District 6. Attached is Public Works' response. Please let us know if you have any questions or need any additional information. Have a wonderful spring recess!

Sincerely,



Ian Schneider (he/him)

Government Affairs Manager

San Francisco Public Works | City and County of San Francisco  
49 S. Van Ness Ave, Suite 1600 | San Francisco, CA 94103  
(628) 271-3126 | [sfpublicworks.org](https://www.sfpublicworks.org)

---

**From:** Donovan, Dominica (BOS) <[dominica.donovan@sfgov.org](mailto:dominica.donovan@sfgov.org)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 27, 2026 4:16 PM

**To:** Short, Carla (DPW) <[Carla.Short@sfdpw.org](mailto:Carla.Short@sfdpw.org)>

**Cc:** Schneider, Ian (DPW) <[ian.schneider@sfdpw.org](mailto:ian.schneider@sfdpw.org)>; Lee, Esther (DPW) <[esther.e.lee@sfdpw.org](mailto:esther.e.lee@sfdpw.org)>;  
Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <[matt.dorsey@sfgov.org](mailto:matt.dorsey@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** Letter of Inquiry: Street Trees (Dorsey)

Good afternoon Director Short,

I wanted to share that Supervisor Dorsey will be introducing a Letter of Inquiry today regarding tree canopy distribution and planting outcomes, with a particular focus on South of Market and District 6.

We appreciate the ongoing engagement your team has had with our office and with District 6 residents on this issue. The letter reflects those conversations and is intended to help establish a clearer, shared understanding of how current policies, funding decisions, and operational practices are advancing the City's equity and climate goals, as well as where there may be opportunities to continue working together.

Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions as the Department prepares its response. The Clerk's office will likely be reaching out some time in the next few days with a formal notice.

All the best,

**Dominica Donovan** | Chief of Staff

Office of Supervisor Matt Dorsey, District 6

San Francisco City Hall, Room 284

[dominica.donovan@sfgov.org](mailto:dominica.donovan@sfgov.org) | (415) 554-7970



**Carla Short, Director** | Director's Office

carla.short@sfdpw.org | T. 628.271.3078 | 49 South Van Ness Ave. Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94103

March 27, 2026

Supervisor Matt Dorsey

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Tree Canopy Equity and Resource Allocation in District 6

Dear Supervisor Dorsey,

Thank you for your January 27, 2026, Letter of Inquiry regarding the City's implementation of its tree planting, replacement, and maintenance policies, particularly as they relate to South of Market and other neighborhoods in District 6. Please find responses below.

**1. Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Policies: California Senate Bill (SB) 1000 requires that cities and counties adopt policies in their General Plan to address environmental justice. In response, the Planning Commission adopted the Environmental Justice Framework in 2023 to establish a clear set of visions and priorities to advance health in communities of color and low-income communities. This was later codified by the Board of Supervisors via Ordinance No. 084-23.**

**a. How does the Department operationalize the San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework in tree planting and maintenance decisions, and does it use the City's Environmental Justice Burden Scores to guide or weight resource allocation?**

The Environmental Justice Framework is available at:

[https://generalplan.sfplanning.org/Environmental\\_Justice\\_Framework.htm](https://generalplan.sfplanning.org/Environmental_Justice_Framework.htm)

As stated in the Framework:


"DISCLAIMER: This Environmental Justice Framework articulates broad visions and priorities to guide city policy objectives. The Environmental Justice Framework does not identify specific future city policies and does not approve, fund, or authorize implementation of any specific projects. New and amended City policies and any implementation project will be reviewed and approved over time and follow protocols and best practices for adoption, which may require additional public review, review by City decision-makers, and/or environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act. As a result of those reviews, there may be alternatives and mitigation measures developed that may be implemented as well.

The Environmental Justice Framework also names example strategies and actions being performed in the community related to environmental justice. They include City-led initiatives, community-led initiatives, and partnerships between the City and community. Some of these examples are broad vision documents that guide City policies, and some are more concrete. Some have been adopted, and some are still under review at the time of this document's writing. If and when any of the examples still under review is proposed for adoption, it will go through robust community planning and environmental review, as needed."

San Francisco Public Works does not have a dedicated, locally controlled funding source for new street tree planting. As a result, the majority of tree planting activities are supported through grant funding, which the department proactively seeks out with the intention of expanding tree planting operations in equity priority communities. Since 2022, Public Works has applied for and has been awarded over \$17 Million in urban forestry-related grants focused in equity priority communities, some of which are completed and others currently in progress (see attached map titled Urban Forestry Grant Funding in District 6 2022-2029). The geographic areas eligible for these grants are typically defined by the funding entity, based on equity-related criteria. Federal and State grant programs often apply their own equity metrics and scoring methodologies to determine priority geographies, which may differ from the City's Environmental Justice Burden Scores. Accordingly, planting locations funded through these sources must align with the eligibility criteria and equity frameworks established by the grantor – outside of City control.



## Urban Forestry Grant Funding in District 6 (2022-2029)



-  BOS District 6
-  US Forest Service Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) Grant: \$12,000,000
-  California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) Grant: \$456,000
-  San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) Proposition L Grant: \$1,100,000
-  Street Tree Nursery:
  - CAL FIRE Urban & Community Forestry Grant: \$1,193,594
  - Caltrans Clean California Grant: \$3,825,000

With respect to tree maintenance — specifically the pruning of mature street trees — Public Works employs a citywide strategy that considers multiple factors. These include tree species, growth characteristics, maintenance requirements, logistical efficiency, and equity considerations. Public Works is responsible for maintaining all street trees citywide, with the exception of properties that have formally opted out. Tree maintenance is conducted as a routine, ongoing activity to support public safety, tree health, and a variety of environmental benefits intrinsic to a sustainable and robust urban forest.

**b. Priority 1.3 of the Environmental Justice Framework calls for developing neighborhood specific targets for tree canopy cover. This echoes a recommendation the Budget and Legislative Analyst made in their 2021 Street Resurfacing Program and StreetTreeSF Program Performance Audit. Do such targets exist for neighborhoods in District 6, including South of Market, South Beach, Mission Bay, and Treasure Island? If so, what are those targets? If not, what is the timeline for their creation?**

Tree canopy cover refers to the total area of ground shaded by tree canopy. This coverage is generated by multiple sources, including street trees, park trees, trees in other public open spaces, trees located on private property, and on the properties of other agencies. Because tree canopy is influenced by several land jurisdictions and managing entities, the establishment of neighborhood-specific canopy targets is inherently an interdepartmental effort led by the Planning Department. Public Works participates in this coordination alongside other relevant agencies.

With respect to street trees specifically, Public Works' operational target is to achieve full stocking of viable planting sites, as outlined in the Urban Forest Master Plan: Phase I Street Trees. Full stocking refers to planting and maintaining street trees in all suitable and eligible locations. As noted in the disclaimer to the Environmental Justice Framework, the Framework articulates broad policy direction and does not itself establish binding implementation targets.

At this time, formally adopted neighborhood-specific tree canopy cover targets do not exist for District 6 neighborhoods, including South of Market, South Beach, Mission Bay, and Treasure Island. There is currently no defined timeline for the creation of such targets.

Public Works, nonprofit partner Friends of the Urban Forest (with funding from San Francisco Public Works), the SoMaWest Community Benefit District and local volunteers are actively planting and caring for young street trees within District 6. These partnerships are critical to achieving our mutual tree planting goals. We look forward to continued collaboration and success in these efforts.

## **2. Funding Equity and Allocation**

**a. In November 2022, San Francisco voters approved Proposition L, which replaced the prior half-cent transportation sales tax under Proposition K. Proposition L funds include support for the planting and establishment of street trees in the public right of way. In November 2023, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) announced a \$1 million allocation to plant and establish 408 street trees, with weekly watering for three years during the establishment period and lifetime maintenance through Public Works' StreetTreeSF program. Program materials indicate that this investment was intended to prioritize Districts 5, 6, and 10 based on tree census data identifying areas with**

**the lowest canopy coverage. Planning documents subsequently show that, “SFPW [San Francisco Public Works] preliminarily expect[ed] to focus on planting in District 10 based on tree census data, low canopy coverage, and geographic equity”. Can the Department confirm the final locations where these 408 trees were planted and describe the specific criteria and decision-making process that resulted in the final planting strategy?**

Based on the grant agreement with the SFCTA, Public Works allocated tree planting funding proportionally based on contributions from different funding sources. Rather than tracking which specific 408 trees were planted using SFCTA funds, the department reported all tree planting performed with multiple funds, including the SFCTA. Proposition L funds were fully expended at the grant-estimated level of 408 trees. Any trees planted beyond that amount during the reporting period were supported through other funding sources.

With respect to geographic allocation, early program materials anticipated prioritization of Districts 5, 6, and 10 based on tree census data and identified areas with comparatively low canopy coverage. The California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) grant provided resources for tree planting in Districts 5 and 6, so the department pivoted SFCTA funds to increase planting in Districts 9, 10, and 11, rather than overlapping with the CNRA funding.

Districts 9, 10, and 11 met universal equity priority metrics and are largely residential in character, with fewer large-scale development projects contributing to street tree planting through entitlement requirements. By contrast, District 6 contains a higher concentration of commercial and office development, as well as substantial infrastructure improvement projects that involve tree planting. Examples include the Folsom and Transbay streetscape projects. As a result, grant resources were directed toward districts where publicly funded planting would address canopy gaps not otherwise being supplemented through development-related installations.

In summary, the final planting locations were determined based on equity metrics, tree census data, residential planting opportunity, development context and the objective of deploying limited grant funds where they would have the greatest incremental impact. Attached please find the tree planting records submitted to the SFCTA. Public Works can provide confirmation of planting locations consistent with grant reporting records.

**b. In December of last year, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority announced a \$1.1 million allocation of transportation sales tax funds to support the San Francisco Public Works Tree Planting and Establishment Project, which will plant approximately 407 additional street trees. Planting locations were identified and prioritized based on tree census data showing low canopy coverage and heightened exposure to extreme heat and air pollution, as well as equity indicators including Equity Priority Communities and Environmental Justice Communities. What specific framework, criteria, or scoring methodology did the Department use to translate these data inputs into district level planting decisions, and how did that analysis result in the selection of the final planting locations? Please confirm the final planting locations.**

Proposed tree planting locations funded by this allocation were informed by a combination of canopy, equity data and where we already had grant eligible locations. The Department considered tree census data identifying areas with low existing canopy coverage, along with equity indicators, including

the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's (SFCTA) Equity Priority Communities designations and related environmental burden metrics.

As part of the grant application process, Public Works developed and submitted a map identifying potential planting areas based on these combined data inputs. The application, including the mapped project areas, was reviewed and approved by both the SFCTA Community Advisory Committee and San Francisco supervisors through their role as members of the SFCTA Board. The mapped areas reflect concentrations of viable *potential* planting sites derived from census and right-of-way data.

It is important to note that not all identified potential sites are ultimately plantable. A portion of candidate locations are eliminated during implementation due to underground utility conflicts, subsurface infrastructure constraints, driveway clearances, accessibility requirements or other site-specific feasibility issues. Final planting site selection therefore occurs during program implementation and requires field verification by Urban Forestry inspectors, including utility checks and site suitability assessments.

The identified project areas were also selected to complement, rather than duplicate, tree planting efforts being carried out by our grant partners and other programs. This coordination is intended to maximize overall canopy gains within priority geographies.

Final site confirmation is expected to begin in spring 2026. Upon completion of field verification and planting, Public Works will be able to confirm the final planting locations consistent with grant reporting requirements.

**c. In September of 2023, San Francisco was awarded \$12 million in federal grant funding to plant and maintain trees. At the time of the announcement, then Mayor London Breed shared that this funding would "strengthen our urban canopy", particularly in neighborhoods like the South of Market, among others. To date, how has the South of Market neighborhood benefited from this funding, including the number and location of trees planted or maintained? Looking ahead, what portion of this funding is planned for investment in SoMa, and what is the anticipated timeline and scope of those future benefits?**

A portion of the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood has been identified as eligible for tree planting under the federal Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) grant program (see attached map Urban Forestry Grant Funding in District 6 2022-2029). Eligibility was determined based on the grant's recommended geographic and equity criteria.


To date, four (4) trees have been planted in SoMa under the IRA grant. Planting locations for the full scope of the IRA-funded work are still being assessed for feasibility and finalized. The grant performance period extends through June 2029. Throughout the grant duration, the remaining planting locations citywide will be identified, verified, and planted in accordance with the grant agreement. A subset of those locations are likely to fall within SoMa, subject to eligibility parameters, site feasibility and field verification.

As noted above, in addition to the IRA funding, Public Works has received a separate grant from the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) that covers a broader geographic area within SoMa. Under the CNRA grant, twenty five (25) trees have been planted in SoMa to date.





## California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) Grant Plantings in District 6 (as of 3/24/26)



In addition to the trees mentioned above, Public Works has planted 299 trees in District 6 over the past five years. With funding from San Francisco Public Works, Friends of the Urban Forest is actively planting trees in District 6 that will be watered by Public Works. Public Works has a community-driven tree planting event scheduled in SoMa on Saturday, April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2026, constituting another nineteen (19) street trees near Columbia Square. Twenty-five (25) additional street trees have been scoped in SoMa with the help of community advocate Joshua Klipp, planting date TBD in 2026. Though these projects are not specifically funded by outside grants, they illustrate the mosaic approach to providing tree planting services and tree canopy expansion in District 6 with a variety of funding sources and programs.

**d. Last year, San Francisco Clean City Coalition was awarded a sole source grant contract in an amount not to exceed \$4,931,307.00 to, in part, plant up to 600 replacement trees and water 2,400 street trees. How were neighborhoods prioritized for replacement planting and watering under this contract?**



The grant associated with this scope of work was initially awarded through a competitive solicitation process. Following evaluation, the San Francisco Conservation Corps was selected as the lowest-cost responsive bidder, with the Clean City Coalition identified as the second-ranked proposer. After approximately 13 months, the San Francisco Conservation Corps withdrew from the agreement, indicating it was unable to fulfill the contractual requirements. At that point, the Department sought and received authorization to award the grant to the Clean City Coalition.

The grant agreement includes the potential to replace up to 600 street trees and to provide watering services for up to 2,400 trees during their establishment period. Replacement tree planting under this contract is anticipated to occur primarily in Districts 9, 10, and 11. These districts were prioritized based on equity considerations, and logistical concentration to maximize operational efficiency and service delivery.

In parallel with this contract, Public Works continues to provide establishment watering for approximately 3,500 trees using in-house crews. Friends of the Urban Forest, under a separate grant agreement with Public Works, waters approximately 1,000 additional trees located near its facilities. These figures may fluctuate month-to-month, depending on the number of trees within their standard three-year establishment period following planting.

### **3. Discretionary Guidelines**

**a. In a document obtained by my constituents via Public Records Request #25-8453, a document titled "Deferral Criteria from FUF (Friends of the Urban Forest) October 2023" appears to describe "criteria for evaluating a resident's tree planting concern and escalating it above the public good, resulting in Friends of the Urban Forest choosing to not plant a basin." Mentioned in the document is an allowance for deferrals when "a shockout or empty basin is in close proximity to a temporary shelter for unhoused people." Is this deferral criterion an active policy or practice for the Department and/or Friends of the Urban Forest today? What is the origin and rationale for this policy? Do our nonprofit partners or grantees rely on or apply it when making tree planting decisions? Please also clarify whether this criterion has been formally adopted, how it is communicated to residents, and how its use is tracked and reviewed to ensure consistency with the City's equity and environmental justice goals.**

It is the Department's understanding, based on consultation with Friends of the Urban Forest, that neither Friends of the Urban Forest nor the Public Works' Bureau of Urban Forestry maintains or applies a policy that allows for permanent deferral of tree planting based solely on the presence of a temporary sidewalk encampment on or near a planting site.

The Bureau of Urban Forestry does not authorize planting deferrals on the basis of encampments. However, the safety of City staff, nonprofit partners and volunteers is a primary operational consideration. In circumstances where an active encampment is present at or immediately adjacent to a proposed planting location, planting activities may be temporarily postponed to ensure that the work can be completed safely and without obstruction.

Such postponements are operational decisions based on site-specific safety and access conditions, rather than a formally adopted policy excluding locations from planting. Once conditions allow for safe access, the site may proceed through standard planting review and implementation processes.

**b. Director’s Order 187246, adopted in 2018, outlines how the planting, maintenance, or removal of trees and landscape material on public sidewalk areas are regulated. Section V outlines the requirements for new tree basin construction and dimension and specifies that “No street tree planting will be allowed in sidewalks with a width less than 7’-6”. Exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis, as approved by Public Works”. What are the specific criteria for granting an exception under Section V(B)(ii) and, what is the process for residents to apply for an exception? How many exceptions have been granted since the Order was signed in 2018?**

Under Section V(B)(ii) of Public Works Director’s Order 187246, street tree planting is generally prohibited where the sidewalk width is less than 7 feet 6 inches (this measurement includes the 6 inch wide curb). Exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis, subject to Public Works’ approval. This policy is in place to ensure adequate space is available for tree growth and pedestrian clearance, ensure ADA compliance, to reduce conflicts with surrounding infrastructure and vehicles, and limit risks to public safety and tree survival.


Experience in locations, such as Federal Street, demonstrates the challenges associated with planting in constrained sidewalks. In narrow sidewalk environments, tree roots frequently cause pavement uplift, resulting in trip hazards and the need for repeated repairs. Mitigation measures such as root pruning—particularly when exceeding approximately 30 percent of the root structure—can significantly compromise tree health and structural stability, elevating the risk of failure and compromising public safety.



*40 Federal Street*

Additionally, trees planted in narrow sidewalks along narrow roadways are more susceptible to damage from trucks and other large vehicles. In locations such as Stevenson Alley near 6th Street (trees planted

in 2011), trees installed in constrained conditions were subsequently damaged or removed, and in later years vehicles were observed encroaching onto sidewalk areas (see comparison photo from 2023). These site conditions illustrate the operational and survivability challenges that inform the Department's cautious approach to granting exceptions.



*Stevenson Alley in 2011 (left) and 2023 (right)*

Residents seeking an exception may contact the Bureau of Urban Forestry to request site evaluation at 628-652-TREE (8733) or [urbanforestry@sfdpw.org](mailto:urbanforestry@sfdpw.org). Requests are reviewed administratively by Public Works staff as part of a site inspection process. During this evaluation, staff assess existing sidewalk conditions, pedestrian clearances, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility requirements, subsurface utility conflicts, surrounding infrastructure, driveway curb cuts, roadway width, traffic conditions, long-term maintenance feasibility and public safety considerations.

Public Works does not maintain a centralized log of exceptions granted under this provision. Exceptions have been made in District 6 over the past several months due to enthusiastic community demand and buy-in for tree planting in sidewalks less than 7 feet 6 inches. The Department hopes that community support will contribute to long-term tree survivability in the face of constrained site conditions.

- c. My constituents have identified more than 130 empty tree wells on streets with a width less than 7'-6". For locations where an exception is not requested or approved per Director's Order 187246, what is Public Works' standard approach to these empty planting sites?**

Public Works is prepared to review the more than 130 identified locations, as well as any additional empty tree wells, upon receipt of a site list.

Where a location does not meet the minimum sidewalk width requirement under Director's Order 187246 and no exception is requested or approved, the location may still undergo a standard site evaluation process to determine feasibility under current technical and safety standards.

This process includes:

- Field verification by Bureau of Urban Forestry staff to assess sidewalk width, pedestrian clearances, ADA compliance and overall site suitability;
- A utility clearance request through 8-1-1 to identify potential conflicts with underground infrastructure;
- Coordination with development records to determine whether the site is associated with an approved or pending private development project that would be responsible for planting;
- Cross-referencing with current grant programs and partner-led initiatives (e.g., Friends of the Urban Forest) to determine funding eligibility or if they are already scheduled for planting through an existing grant program; and
- Successful sidewalk demolition and excavation that does not reveal any unexpected or unmarked buried infrastructure that would prohibit tree planting (e.g., abandoned pipes, vaults)

Only after these steps are completed can the Department determine whether a location is feasible for planting and identify the appropriate funding or delivery mechanism.

Public Works also considers community interest and stewardship when prioritizing plantable locations. Community support and engagement are important factors influencing tree stewardship, long-term health and survivability. The Department welcomes collaboration and input regarding potential planting sites and is committed to working with community partners to identify locations that meet technical standards and advance canopy goals.

**Is the default outcome to fill the basin with concrete, or are there alternative treatments or interim solutions available to preserve future planting opportunities?**

Filling a tree basin with concrete is not the default outcome. The standard approach is to inspect the site and evaluate planting feasibility in accordance with Director's Order 187246.

In many instances, planting is determined to be infeasible due to underground utility conflicts, proximity to driveways or building infrastructure, ADA clearance requirements or other public safety considerations. In addition, for trees to provide meaningful long-term canopy and environmental benefits, they must be able to grow to maturity. In highly constrained environments, such as narrow alleys, limited soil volume and repeated pruning or root disturbance can adversely affect tree health and increase long-term maintenance needs.

Where tree planting is not feasible due to existing site constraints, the Department does not treat concrete infill as an automatic or preferred solution. Alternative or interim treatments may be considered to preserve future planting opportunities rather than permanently eliminating them through hardscape conversion.

In some cases, Public Works has worked with adjacent property owners and Community Benefit Districts (CBDs) to install alternative landscaping treatments where feasible. Such arrangements are evaluated on a case-by-case basis and require an identified party, such as a CBD or adjacent property owner, willing and able to assume watering for the first three years after planting.

More durable, long-term solutions—such as those implemented through Living Alley projects—may include widening sidewalks, adding bulb-outs, modifying roadway configurations, or otherwise redesigning the public realm to create sufficient space for healthy tree growth. These approaches require broader capital planning, funding, and approval through established City processes.

- d. Was an impact analysis conducted prior to the adoption of Director's Order 187246 to assess how many existing street trees or planting sites would become ineligible for replacement? If so, what were the findings of that analysis? If known, how many planting sites in District 6 were identified as ineligible for replanting following enactment of the Order?**

Director's Order 187246 superseded several prior Director's Orders that provided guidance on street tree planting standards and basin dimensions.

No formal impact analysis was conducted prior to adoption of Director's Order 187246 to quantify how many existing street trees or planting sites would become ineligible for replacement, either citywide or by district. The Department did not prepare a district-level inventory of potentially affected sites, nor did it conduct a quantified assessment of potential canopy impacts associated with the updated standards.

However, the Order was informed by longstanding operational experience and arboricultural considerations. Many street trees — including small-stature species — ultimately outgrow 2-foot tree wells and require substantially greater soil volume and lateral root space to reach maturity. Even small-stature trees typically develop canopy spreads of approximately 15 feet, with root systems extending significantly beyond the drip line.

In sidewalks narrower than 7 feet 6 inches, root growth frequently exceeds the available space, resulting in sidewalk uplift, recurring repair cycles, root pruning and, in some cases, premature tree removal. Repeated structural root pruning — particularly when extensive — can compromise tree health and stability, shorten lifespan and increase long-term maintenance costs. From a lifecycle perspective, premature removal and replacement also carries a carbon cost that can offset a portion of the tree's long-term sequestration benefits.

The dimensional standards established in Director's Order 187246 were therefore intended to improve long-term survivability, reduce infrastructure conflicts, and support the establishment of a more sustainable urban forest.

#### **4. Empty Tree Well Backlog**

- a. A document obtained by my constituents through Public Records Request No. 25-8280 indicates that Public Works was aware of more than 500 existing empty tree wells in the South of Market neighborhood. Is this figure still accurate? If not, please provide the current number. What specific plan and timeline does the Department have to address and fill these empty tree wells?**

Public Works is actively working, within available resources, to expand and sustain the City's street tree population. The Urban Forest Master Plan establishes a long-term goal of approximately 155,000 street trees citywide. To achieve and maintain that target, the Plan recommends replacing approximately 1,500 trees annually and planting approximately 2,500 new trees per year, for a total of roughly 4,000 plantings annually. Developing and funding a strategy to meet this scale of annual planting and establishment watering remains a central objective of the Bureau of Urban Forestry.

Current funding for planting and establishment activities relies heavily on time-limited grant awards and development-related fees. These sources are not permanent or consistent, which present ongoing implementation challenges.



With respect to the referenced figure of more than 500 empty tree wells in the South of Market, a review of current records does not confirm that number. Based on the Department's most recent data, approximately 135 empty basins are identified in the neighborhood. Citywide, there are approximately 9,034 known empty basins. Based on these figures, District 6 accounts for 1.5 percent of currently identified empty basins citywide.



## Empty Basins in SOMA



● Empty Basins in SOMA Census Tracts (135)  
 ■ SOMA Census Tracts

The Department does not maintain a district-specific planting schedule exclusively dedicated to addressing empty basins. Rather, as discussed, basin infill is incorporated into ongoing planting efforts funded through grants, development requirements, partner programs, and available operational capacity. Sites are evaluated for feasibility, utility conflicts, and funding eligibility before being scheduled for planting. Continued progress in reducing empty basins will depend on available funding, staffing capacity, and site feasibility determinations.

- b. My constituents have informed me that more than 900 empty tree well requests were closed by the Department on December 4 and 5, 2025, with the closure reason cited as “Planned Maintenance.” Please elaborate on what this means and provide the specific capital project codes and funding sources assigned to these locations. If no funded project exists for these sites, please explain the rationale for removing these public reports from the active request queue.**

In late fall, the Bureau of Urban Forestry’s Planting and Young Tree Care Supervisor conducted a detailed review of empty basin and backfill-related service requests. This review determined that several hundred requests in the system were duplicative or miscategorized. For example, some basins containing recently planted trees were reported as “empty,” when the actual issue involved minor maintenance needs, such as adding decomposed granite to level the basin surface with the adjacent sidewalk.

Each request was reviewed individually, and closures were made on a case-by-case basis to reconcile duplicates, correct misclassifications and more accurately reflect the true backlog of actionable empty basin locations. The intent of this effort was to improve data integrity and ensure that the active queue more accurately represents sites requiring planting or maintenance intervention, reducing staff time spent responding to inaccurate reports.

The Department’s service order management system provides a limited set of standardized closure codes from which supervisors must select. In many of these cases, “Planned Maintenance” was used because it was the closest available option within the system. The Department acknowledges that this designation may not accurately describe the underlying reason for closure in all instances.

The closure of these requests was not tied to a capital project, nor were specific capital project codes or dedicated funding sources assigned to each of the affected service requests. Rather, the action reflected a data reconciliation effort within the work order system.

Public Works works closely with San Francisco 311 to improve request accuracy and integration with the Department’s asset management database. We are also evaluating the closure categories available to field supervisors. There may be structural limitations within the current reporting framework that contribute to misreporting and data quality challenges — for example, instances where a loose tree grate repair is reported by the public as “backfill,” or a maintenance adjustment is logged as an “empty basin.” Addressing these issues is an ongoing effort that requires coordination across departments to improve transparency, categorization accuracy and public-facing reporting.

- c. Please provide the number of 311 requests for tree planting by district over the last 12 months. How many of these requests were approved, and what were the primary barriers to approval?**

Over the past 12 months, the Department received a total of 1,185 311 requests related to tree planting. The distribution of requests by Supervisorial District is as follows:

District 1: 19

District 2: 123

District 3: 229

District 4: 38

District 5: 155

District 6: 150

District 7: 62

District 8: 217

District 9: 112

District 10: 64

District 11: 16

Public Works prioritizes planting efficiency through block-based or corridor-based planting strategies. This approach maximizes limited staffing and funding resources by clustering plantings geographically, reducing mobilization costs and aligning establishment watering operations. As a result, individual one-off planting requests are not typically scheduled independently unless they align with an existing planting project, grant-funded initiative or development-related requirement.

As previously noted, requests are reviewed for site feasibility and funding eligibility. Approval is contingent upon a variety of factors, including, utility clearance results, ADA and pedestrian clearance requirements, driveway and infrastructure conflicts, sidewalk width and compliance with Director's Order 187246, availability of funding for planting and the required three-year establishment watering period.

The Department does not maintain a single approval metric tied directly to 311 requests, as many requests are incorporated into broader planting initiatives rather than processed as standalone approvals or denials. And, as in the case described above, when our young tree care supervisor closed many requests, we receive many 311 requests that may not, in fact, be requests for a new tree, but rather requests for other work through the wrong category.

## **5. Deferred Tree Replacements and Legal Compliance**

- a. In January 2022, the Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance 001 22, amending Public Works Code Article 16 Section 806(a)(6)(c) to require tree replacements within 120 days or inclusion on a Delayed Tree Replacement Report. Please provide the most recent Delayed Tree Replacement Report. If such a report does not exist, please explain.**

Public Works maintains records of tree removals and stump removals within its asset management database. However, the current system does not automatically link removal or stump service orders to subsequent replacement planting work orders. As a result, replacement activity is not systematically tracked in a manner that readily produces a consolidated "Delayed Tree Replacement Report" as contemplated by Ordinance 001-22 (Public Works Code Article 16, Section 806(a)(6)(c)).

Creating such a report currently requires a labor-intensive, manual process. The most recent report was created by extracting and reconciling separate datasets —matching tree assets on removal lists to corresponding planting records, linking multiple spreadsheets, and performing date calculations to determine whether replacement occurred within the 120-day timeframe specified in the ordinance.



While attempts have been made to compile this information, the ongoing need for manual data upkeep and case-by-case review means that any such report can become outdated or inaccurate relatively quickly.

Accordingly, the Department has not maintained a standing, automatically generated Delayed Tree Replacement Report in the format contemplated by the ordinance. However, our performance team is working with our IT team to determine how we can automate this tracking, reducing the burden on staff time, and providing more accurate reporting.

The Department also recognizes that timely replacement of street trees following removal provides clear community benefits and aligns with the Department's broader urban forestry and equity goals.

While the administrative and data management processes described above present structural challenges, current staffing capacity is an additional limiting factor. The Urban Forestry inspection team responsible for tree data management, planting site verification, and coordination of replacement planting, as well as all tree permitting, is currently operating at approximately 50 percent of authorized staffing levels. This staffing shortfall, driven in large part by the citywide hiring freeze, directly affects the Department's ability to conduct field verification, reconcile records, and advance replacement scheduling within the 120-day timeframe. The Department is actively evaluating strategies to increase staffing capacity and restore operational bandwidth necessary to improve replacement tracking, compliance reporting, and timely replanting outcomes.

#### **b. How does the Department track the replacement of dead or removed trees?**

The Department tracks the replacement of dead or removed trees through multiple, complementary mechanisms.

First, Public Works maintains an asset management database of street tree assets and associated work orders. Trees that have been removed are reflected either as completed removal service orders or as stump assets within the system, which are used as records of locations requiring future replacement planting, subject to feasibility and funding.

Contractors performing grid-based pruning operations identify and report stumps or dead trees encountered within their assigned areas. These reports are incorporated into the Department's work records for follow-up.

In addition, Urban Forestry inspectors proactively identify dead or hazardous trees during routine field inspections and initiate removal service orders as needed. Inspectors also update asset records in the field to ensure that the database reflects current site conditions.

Finally, partner organizations, including Friends of the Urban Forest, provide updated planting data following installation of new trees. These records are incorporated into the Department's asset management system to document replacements and newly established plantings.

Through these combined processes — asset tracking, public reporting, contractor input, inspector-initiated actions and partner data integration — the Department maintains an evolving record of removals and replacements.

## **6. Public Works Code Article 16: Enforcement and Compliance**

- a. Public Works Code Article 16 establishes permitting, replacement, and enforcement requirements for the planting and removal of street trees by parties other than the Department, including obligations tied to development projects. With that framework in mind, after completion of a qualifying development project, what processes does Public Works use to verify compliance with required street tree planting permits, including confirmation that permitted trees have been planted within the required timeframe and in accordance with approved species and locations?**

Public Works' compliance verification processes for development-related street tree requirements are integrated into the City's broader permitting and final inspection framework pursuant to Public Works Code Article 16, including Section 806(d).

As part of the development review process, proposed street trees, including species, quantity and planting locations, must be reflected in approved site plans and are tracked through the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) permit system. A development project cannot receive approval of its building plans without demonstrating compliance with applicable street tree requirements.

At project completion, Public Works staff will not sign the job card or authorize issuance of a Certificate of Final Completion and Occupancy (CFC) unless the required street trees have been planted in accordance with the approved plans. This includes verification by a site visit by an urban forestry inspector, of planting location, species consistency and general conformance with permit conditions.

Following installation, Public Works issues a tree planting permit documenting completion of the planting requirement. Developers are responsible for establishment of the required trees until such time as maintenance responsibility is formally transferred to the City. The permit and job card sign-off clearly communicate that the property owner must contact Public Works to initiate transfer of maintenance once establishment conditions are met.

Through this coordinated permitting, inspection, certification and enforcement framework, Public Works verifies that development-related street tree obligations are satisfied prior to project close-out and maintains mechanisms for post-installation compliance.

- b. If required trees cannot be planted as permitted due to infrastructure conflicts, site constraints, or other conditions, what is the Department's protocol for modifying permit requirements, approving alternative planting locations, or assessing in lieu fees, and what written findings are required to support such determinations?**

Public Works seeks to prevent post-permit conflicts by integrating Urban Forestry review early in the project intake process. During plan review, staff require applicants to clearly show on their site plans proposed tree locations, species and adjacent infrastructure, including utilities, driveways and streetscape elements. Plans are not stamped or approved unless required street trees are adequately reflected and appear feasible based on available information. If there are no feasible planting locations, in-lieu fees are assessed and recorded in the DBI permit tracking system, ensuring that they must be paid before the building permit will be issued.

If, after permit approval, a required tree cannot be planted as originally permitted due to newly identified infrastructure conflicts, subsurface utility constraints, or other site conditions, the Department evaluates the situation on a case-by-case basis. The protocol may include:

- Field verification by Urban Forestry staff;
- Coordination with the project sponsor to identify feasible alternative planting locations within the project frontage or nearby area, where consistent with Article 16 requirements;
- Review of revised plans reflecting proposed modifications; and
- Documentation of the basis for the modification within the permit record.

Where on-site planting is determined to be infeasible and no reasonable alternative location can satisfy the frontage requirement, the Department may consider alternative compliance mechanisms consistent with Public Works Code Article 16, which may include in-lieu fee assessments where authorized. Such determinations are supported by written documentation in the permit file describing the site constraints, feasibility analysis and rationale for the approved alternative.

Public Works continues to coordinate with partner agencies to strengthen interdepartmental review processes and reduce late-stage conflicts. The current intake and routing procedures — implemented and refined since 2020 — have improved early identification of infrastructure conflicts and reduced the frequency of post-approval modifications.

**c. Once trees are planted pursuant to a development related permit, how does Public Works ensure that those trees are maintained through establishment, including monitoring survival, enforcing replacement obligations if trees are stolen or fatally damaged, and determining when maintenance responsibility transfers to the Department?**

When a tree is planted pursuant to a development-related permit, Public Works issues a tree planting permit documenting the installation and outlining establishment responsibilities. Under Article 16, the property owner is responsible for maintaining the tree through its establishment period, including watering, basic care and ensuring survival.

Maintenance responsibility remains with the property owner until they formally request transfer to the City. To initiate transfer, the owner must contact Public Works and demonstrate that the tree is healthy and successfully established. Upon verification by Urban Forestry staff, maintenance responsibility may then transfer to the Department consistent with StreetTreeSF program procedures.

If a tree planted under permit is reported missing, dead and maintenance responsibility has not been formally transferred, the property owner remains responsible for replacement. In such cases, Public Works issues written notice requiring the owner to replant the required tree(s). If the owner fails to comply after notice, the Department may assess a failure-to-plant penalty consistent with Public Works Code Article 16 to compel compliance.

Through this permit, inspection, notification, and enforcement framework, Public Works monitors establishment and ensures that required development-related trees are either successfully transferred to City maintenance or replaced at the property owner's expense if they do not survive.

**d. Once trees are planted pursuant to a development related permit, how does Public Works ensure that those trees are maintained through establishment, including monitoring survival,**

**enforcing replacement obligations if trees are stolen or fatally damaged, and determining when maintenance responsibility transfers to the Department?**

Public Works monitors and enforces compliance with tree protection requirements under Public Works Code Article 16, Section 808, through multiple stages of the construction lifecycle: permitting, active construction and project close-out.

During Permitting:

Projects subject to review are routed to Urban Forestry staff as part of the intake and interdepartmental plan review process. Applicants are required to show tree protection measures on their construction plans, including protection zones, fencing, and other safeguards consistent with Article 16 requirements. Public Works does not authorize release of the building permit unless an acceptable tree protection diagram is incorporated into the approved plan set.

In addition, a condition placeholder is added within the Development and Impacts requirement tab of the building permit record. This condition prevents final job card sign-off unless required tree protection inspections are completed.

During Active Construction:

Urban Forestry inspectors conduct intermittent field inspections to verify that required tree protection measures are properly installed and maintained. If damage to a street tree or failure to maintain approved protection measures is observed, enforcement action may be initiated. This can include issuance of fines consistent with Article 16 and documentation of required corrective measures.

At Project Close-Out:

The Department will not sign off on the job card or allow closure of the associated DBI permit if outstanding tree protection violations remain unresolved. If damage has occurred, fines must be paid and any required mitigation—such as replacement planting—must be completed or formally resolved prior to permit closure.

Through this integrated review, inspection, and enforcement framework, Public Works seeks to ensure that street trees are protected throughout construction and that violations are addressed before a project is finalized.

- e. When a violation of Section 808 occurs, how does the Department determine whether the injury or damage resulted from intentional, malicious, or grossly negligent conduct, and what penalties, replacement obligations, or corrective actions are assessed as a result?**

When a potential violation of Public Works Code Article 16, Section 808 is identified, Urban Forestry staff evaluate the condition of the tree using industry standards, including International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Best Management Practices. Inspectors assess visible structural damage, root disturbance, canopy injury, soil compaction, unauthorized pruning or removal of required tree protection measures.

Section 808 requires affirmative protection of street trees during construction. Where required protections were not installed, were improperly maintained or where construction activity results in injury to a protected tree, the damage is generally treated as noncompliance with the code. Because the

ordinance mandates protection measures, injury occurring within an active construction context is typically presumed to result from gross negligence if not intentional or malicious conduct.

Penalties are assessed based on the extent and severity of the damage. Enforcement actions may include monetary fines, replacement planting requirements, mitigation measures or a combination thereof, consistent with the penalty provisions of Article 16. The valuation of damage and associated penalties is determined administratively, taking into account the degree of injury and impact to the tree.

Property owners or responsible parties are provided notice of the violation and have the opportunity to appeal the assessed fine if they believe mitigating circumstances exist. Permit closure may be withheld until fines are resolved and any required corrective actions are completed.

**f. How does the Department track violations, assess replacement costs, fines, and penalties associated with tree damage during construction, and does the Department maintain an accounting of these amounts by project or district? How are those funds used?**


When a violation is identified, inspection staff issue a notice of violation and assess a fine consistent with Public Works Code Article 16. A corresponding fine record is created within the Department's permit and enforcement database, which tracks the project, responsible party and assessed amount.

If a street tree has been unlawfully removed or damaged to the point that removal is required, the responsible party is typically required to replace the tree in addition to paying any applicable penalties. Replacement obligations are documented through the permit record and must be satisfied prior to project close-out, where applicable.

Collected fines are deposited into the Adopt-A-Tree Fund, as specified in the Public Works Code. By statute, monies in the Adopt-A-Tree Fund may be used only for street tree planting and maintenance activities. These funds support tree planting projects administered by the Department directly and may also support planting or maintenance activities carried out by partner organizations through grant agreements.

The Department tracks violations and associated fines at the project level within its permit database. However, it does not maintain a standing accounting of violation-related revenue aggregated by Supervisorial District.

Best Regards,

DocuSigned by:  
  
073CF73A4EA6486...

Carla Short  
Director  
San Francisco Public Works

# Item 15

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 3/26/26 ISCOTT Meeting Minutes  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 7:58:14 AM  
**Attachments:** [ISCOTT\\_1612\\_Minutes.pdf](#)

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) meeting minutes for the March 26, 2026, meeting.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 30, 2026 5:20 PM  
**Cc:** SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>  
**Subject:** 3/26/26 ISCOTT Meeting Minutes

Hello –

Attached are the minutes of the [March 26, 2026 ISCOTT public hearing](#).  
If you have any questions, please let us know.

Thank you,  
Dianne Yee  
Transportation Planner III, Special Events – Shared Spaces  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103



# ISCOTT MINUTES

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE  
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR  
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

**Meeting of March 26, 2026 - Thursday, 9:00 AM**  
**1612<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting**  
**Online Meeting**

| COMMITTEE                | REPRESENTATIVE                                                                                 |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SFMTA                    | Bryant Woo (Chair)                                                                             |
| SFPD                     | Sgt. Eric Elias, Off. Loren Chiu, Sgt. Dion McDonnell, Off. Ronald Quock, Off. Milad Rashidian |
| SFFD                     | Capt. Carol Wong, Insp. Jared Franklin                                                         |
| Public Health            | Aron Wong                                                                                      |
| Public Works             | Absent                                                                                         |
| Entertainment Commission | May Liang                                                                                      |
| Planning                 | Absent                                                                                         |

| DEPARTMENTS           | REPRESENTATIVE                                           |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| SFMTA Special Events  | Dianne Yee, Elizabeth Hsu                                |
| SFMTA Transit         | Leslie Bienenfeld, Helen Kwan, Tony Chou                 |
| SFMTA Enforcement     | James Sarracino                                          |
| SFMTA Temporary Signs | Gretchen Rude, Houston Forrester, Sean Muneno, Gary Chau |
| SFMTA Taxis           | Scott Leon                                               |
| Emergency Management  | Leo Ishoda                                               |

| GUESTS                        | ITEM       | GUESTS          | ITEM |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------|
| Nancy Yu                      | R          | Lily Lo         | Q    |
| Jaisey Joseph                 | C          | Tamara          | P    |
| Katy Birnbaum, Javier Sanchez | U, V, W, X | Emily Provansal |      |
| Arturo Carrillo               | G          | Jesse Kay-Rugen | S    |
| Melissa McLeod                | D          | Alexis & Ella   | E    |
| Jeff Roy                      | O          | Nicolas Figone  | N    |
| Timothy Hampton               | K          | Joan Touchstone | J    |
| Symone Bullock                | M          | Ariel Vaughan   | H    |
| Carol Lau                     | T, Y       | Chris Keene     | I    |
| Nancy Andrade, Blair Randall  | F          | Kyle Meyers     | Z    |



|                |  |               |  |
|----------------|--|---------------|--|
| Kimberly Londt |  | Scott Dora    |  |
| Gabriel-Natoma |  | Barry Taranto |  |

### **MINUTES OF THE MARCH 12, 2026, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)**

The Committee adopted the Minutes.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**These proposed actions are an Approval Action as defined by S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31.**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A. Grove Street between Polk and Larkin streets  
Monday, May 11, 2026, 10 am to 8 pm  
**UC Law SF Commencement 2026**
- B. Byxbee Street between Shields and Sargent streets  
Friday, July 10, 2026, 7 am to 5 pm  
**OMI Lakeview Family Day**
- C. 17th Street between Carolina and Wisconsin streets  
Saturday, June 6, 2026, 5 am to 10 pm  
**Book Sale Block Party**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

### **REGULAR CALENDAR**

- D. Pine Street (northside parking lane only) between Fillmore Street and 60' east  
Thursday, April 2, 2026, 12 pm to 10 pm  
**Malbon San Francisco Grand Opening**

**APPROVED (5-0)**





E. 12th Street between Bernice and Harrison streets

Saturday, April 18, 2026, 8 am to 2 pm

**SoMa Community Tree Planting**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

F. Elsie Street between Santa Marina Street and Holly Park Circle

Sunday, April 19, 2026, 9 am to 5 pm

**College Hill Learning Garden 10-Year Anniversary & Earth Day Celebration**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

G. 19th Street between Dolores and Guerrero streets

Saturday, April 11, 2026, 9 am to 7 pm

**Dolores Huerta Parade Staging**

24th Street between Folsom and Bryant streets; Treat Avenue between 23rd and 25th streets; Harrison Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Alabama Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Florida Street between 23rd and 25th streets; Lucky Street between 24th and 25th streets; Balmy Street between 24th and 25th streets

Intersections closed: 24th Street at Lucky, Treat, Balmy, Harrison, Alabama, and Florida streets

Saturday, April 11, 2026, 9 am to 7 pm

**Dolores Huerta Holiday Parade/Festival**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

H. Somerset Street between Burrows and Bacon streets

Wednesday, April 22, 2026, 12 pm to 4 pm

**E.R. Taylor Elementary Earth Day STEAM Block Party**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

I. Sanchez Street between Clipper and 26th streets

Saturday, May 16, 2026, 9:30 am to 4:30 pm

**Slow Sanchez + Friends of Noe Valley Garden Tour Block Party**

**APPROVED (5-0)**



- J. 23rd Avenue between Clement and California streets  
Intersection closed: Clement Street at 23rd Avenue  
Saturday, May 16, 2026, 1 pm to 9 pm  
**Alamo Centennial Spring Block Party**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- K. Waller Street between Octavia and Laguna streets; Octavia Street (southbound frontage road) between Haight and Waller streets  
Intersection closed: Waller St at Octavia Street  
Saturday, June 6, 2026, 6 am to 8 pm  
**Building the Block Party: Queer Joy is Our Cornerstone**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- L. Newcomb Avenue between 3rd and Lane streets; Oakdale Avenue between 3rd and Lane streets; Mendell Street between Newcomb and McKinnon avenues  
Intersection closed: Newcomb Avenue at Mendell Street  
Saturday, April 18, 2026, 8 am to 6:30 pm  
**415 Classic Car Business Crawl**

**WITHDRAWN**

- M. Galvez Avenue between Newhall and Mendell streets  
Saturday, May 16, 2026, 7 am to 7 pm  
**Safer Together's Car Show x Block Party**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- N. Stockton Street between Union and Filbert streets; Filbert Street between Stockton and Powell streets  
Saturday June 6, 2026, 4 am  
Sunday, June 7, 2026, 10 pm  
**Festa Italiana**

Stockton Street between Filbert and North Point streets; North Point Street between Stockton Street and The Embarcadero  
Sunday, June 7, 2026, 7 am to 12 pm  
**105th Statuto Race**

**APPROVED (5-0)**



- O. Green Street between Columbus and Grant avenues  
(Local access only on Jasper and Bannam places between Union and Green streets.)

Sunday, June 7, 2026, 8 am to 3 pm

**Firefighter Olympic Stickball**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- P. Green Street between Columbus and Grant avenues  
(Local access only on Jasper and Bannam places between Union and Green streets.)

Saturday, May 30, 2026, 5 am to 8 pm

**Ardbeg Day**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- Q. Grant Avenue between California Street and Pacific Avenue; Commercial Street between Kearny Street and Grant Avenue  
Intersection closed: Grant Avenue at Commercial Street

Friday, May 8, 2026, through

Friday, October 9, 2026

1 pm to 11:59 pm, **every second Friday**

**Chinatown Night Market**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- R. Grant Avenue between California Street and Broadway; Commercial Street between Grant Avenue and Kearny Street  
Intersection closed: Grant Avenue at Commercial Street

Sunday, May 31, 2026, 7 am to 4 pm

**3rd Annual Cultural Festival in Chinatown**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- S. Union Street between Laguna and Buchanan streets

Saturday, May 16, 2026, 6 am to 10 pm

**Bus Stop Anniversary Block Party**

**APPROVED (5-0)**



- T. Union Street between Gough and Fillmore streets; Octavia Street between Filbert and Green streets; Laguna Street between Filbert and Green streets; Buchanan Street between Filbert and Green streets; Webster Street between Filbert and Green streets  
Intersections closed: Union Street at Octavia, Laguna, Buchanan, and Webster streets

Saturday, June 6, 2026, 12:01 am to

Sunday, June 7, 2026, 11:59 pm

**Union Street Festival**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- U. Valencia Street between 16th and 19th streets; Clarion Alley between Valencia and Mission streets; Sycamore Street between Valencia and Lexington streets  
Intersections closed: Valencia Street at Clarion Alley and at Sycamore Street

Thursday, May 14, 2026, 12 pm to 11:59 pm

*and*

Thursday, June 11, 2026, 12 pm to 11:59 pm

**Valencia Live 2026! (May, June)**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- V. Valencia Street between 17th and 20th streets; Clarion Alley between Valencia and Mission streets; Sycamore Street between Valencia and Lexington streets  
Intersections closed: Valencia Street at Clarion Alley and at Sycamore Street

Thursday, July 9, 2026, 12 pm to 11:59 pm

*and*

Thursday, August 13, 2026, 12 pm to 11:59 pm

**Valencia Live 2026! (July, August)**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- W. Valencia Street between 18th and 21st streets  
(Intersections to remain open.)

Thursday, September 10, 2026, 12 pm to 11:59 pm

*and*

Thursday, October 8, 2026, 12 pm to 11:59 pm

**Valencia Live 2026! (September & October)**

**APPROVED (5-0)**



- X.** 2nd Street between Market and Howard streets; Stevenson Street between New Montgomery and 1st streets; Jessie Street between New Montgomery and 2nd streets; Minna Street between New Montgomery and 1st streets; Natoma Street between New Montgomery and 1st streets  
Intersections closed: 2nd Street at Stevenson, Jessie, Minna, Natoma streets  
Thursday, May 7, 2026, through  
Thursday, April 1, 2027  
12 noon to 11:59 pm, **every first Thursday**  
**DFT [Downtown First Thursdays] 2026-2027**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

- Y.** Grant Avenue between Columbus Avenue and Filbert Street; Columbus Avenue between Broadway and Green Streets; Vallejo Street between Stockton Street and Margate Place; Green Street between Columbus and Grant Avenues; Stockton between Filbert and Green streets  
Intersections closed: Grant Avenue at Vallejo and Green streets; Columbus Avenue at Grant Avenue, Vallejo, Green, and Stockton streets  
Saturday, June 20, 2026, 12:01 am to  
Sunday, June 21, 2026, 11:59 pm  
**North Beach Festival**

**APPROVED (5-0)**



- Z. Howard Street between The Embarcadero and Beale Street; Steuart Street between Mission Street and southerly terminus; Spear Street between Mission and Folsom streets  
Saturday, May 16, 2026, 7 pm  
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 11 am  
and  
Main Street between Mission and Folsom streets  
Saturday, May 16, 2026, 7 pm  
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 5 pm  
and  
Beale Street between Mission and Folsom streets; Fremont Street between Mission and Folsom streets; 1st Street between Mission and Folsom streets; 2nd Street between Mission and Folsom streets; New Montgomery Street between Mission and Howard streets; Howard Street between Beale and 3rd streets  
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 3 am to 11 am  
and  
Mission Street between Fremont and Steuart streets (Muni allowed); Beale Street between Market and Mission streets; Spear Street between Market and Mission streets; Market Street between Drumm and Steuart streets (Mission Street Public Safety Closure)  
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 5 am to 11 am  
and  
Howard Street between 3rd and 9th streets; 9th Street between Howard and Market street  
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 6 am to 11 am  
and  
Hayes Street between Market and Divisadero streets; Scott Street between Grove and Hayes streets; Steiner Street between Grove and Hayes streets; Divisadero Street between Grove and Oak streets  
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 6 am to 12:30 pm  
and  
Baker Street between Oak and Fell streets  
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 5 am to 3 pm  
and  
Fell Street between Divisadero and Stanyan streets  
Sunday, May 17, 2026, 6 am to 2 pm  
and  
La Playa between Cabrillo and Fulton streets; Fulton Street (westbound) between 46th Avenue and the Great Highway; Fulton Street (eastbound) between the Great Highway and 48th Avenue; Lincoln Way (eastbound) between the Great Highway and 48th Avenue, Lincoln Way (westbound)



between 45th Avenue and Great Highway, Cabrillo Street between 46th Avenue and La Playa, Balboa Street between 46th Avenue and Great Highway; Point Lobos Avenue between 48th Avenue and the Great Highway (Ancillary Streets)

Sunday, May 17, 2026, 3 am to 4 pm

**Bay To Breakers 2026**

**APPROVED (5-0)**

Categorically exempt from CEQA: CEQA Guidelines Section 15304 Class 4(e) minor temporary use of land having negligible or no permanent effects on the environment, including carnivals, sales of Christmas trees, etc. and/or Section 15305 Class 5(b) minor alterations in land use limitations, including street closings and equipment for special events.

#### **ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)**

The following item has been environmentally cleared by the Planning Department on April 19, 2021, Addendum #2 to San Francisco Better Streets Plan Project [Case No. 2021-003010ENV (addendum to Case No. 2007.1238E)]:

**None**

#### **ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (INFORMATIONAL ITEMS)**

The following items are presented for informational purposes and public comment. Closures are subject to review and approval by the SFMTA Board.

**None**



\*\*SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY'S OFFICES, ONE SOUTH VAN NESS, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103, DURING NORMAL BUSINESS HOURS. PLEASE CONTACT TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES AT [specialevents@sfmta.com](mailto:specialevents@sfmta.com) \*\*\*

### **Sound Producing Devices**

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

### **Disability Access**

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact (415) 701-4683 at least two business days before the meeting. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to perfumes and various other chemical-based scented products. Please help the City to accommodate these individuals.

### **Know Your Rights under the Sunshine Ordinance**

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator by mail to Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco CA 94102, by phone at (415) 554-7724, by fax at (415) 554-7854 or by email at [sotf@sfgov.org](mailto:sotf@sfgov.org). Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at web site <http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine>.

### **Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements**

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2200, fax (415) 581-2217, web site [www.sfgov.org/ethics](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Appeal Rights under S.F. Admin. Code Chapter 31: For identified Approval Actions, the Planning Department or the SFMTA has issued a CEQA exemption determination or negative declaration, which may be viewed online at the Planning Department's website. Following approval of the item by ISCOTT, the CEQA determination is subject to appeal within the time frame specified in S.F. Administrative Code Section 31.16 which is typically within 30 calendar days. For information on filing a CEQA appeal, contact the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, or call (415) 554-5184. Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or submitted in writing to the City prior to or at such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, April 9 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:18:37 AM  
**Attachments:** [ISCOTT\\_1613\\_Agenda.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see blow and attached from San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) meeting agenda for the April 9, 2026, meeting.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 6:55 AM  
**To:** SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>  
**Subject:** ISCOTT Hearing on Thu, April 9 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Good morning –

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on Thursday, April 9, 2026.

If you have any questions, please email us.

**Nick Chapman**

Manager, [ISCOTT](#) and [SFMTA Special Events](#)  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

*Pronouns: he/him, they/them*

*Please consider the environment before using AI to respond to this email*



## ISCOTT AGENDA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE  
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR  
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

**Meeting of April 9, 2026 - Thursday, 9:00 AM**  
**1613<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting**

### **Online Participation**

Please join Microsoft Teams Meeting at  
[SFMTA.com/ISCOTTHearing](https://sfmta.com/ISCOTTHearing)

Click on the Raise your hand icon . When you are prompted to unmute, click on the microphone icon  to speak.

### **Phone Participation**

Please dial +1 415-523-2709,,397937701# [Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 397 937 701#

Dial \*5 to be placed in the queue for public comment. When prompted dial \*6 to unmute yourself.

Please ensure that you are in a quiet location, speak clearly, and turn off any TVs or radios around you.

### **Written Participation**

Submit your written comments to [SpecialEvents@SFMTA.com](mailto:SpecialEvents@SFMTA.com) with "Public Hearing" in the subject line or by mail to SFMTA, 1 South Van Ness, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Written comments must be received by 12 noon on the day prior to the hearing to be considered.

 **415.646.2414:** For free interpretation services, please submit your request 48 hours in advance of meeting. / 如果需要免費口語翻譯，請於會議之前 48 小時提出要求 / Para servicios de interpretación gratuitos, por favor haga su petición 48 horas antes de la reunión. / Para sa libreng serbisyo sa interpretasyon, kailangan mag-request 48 oras bago ang miting.



**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 26, 2026, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)**

The Committee to adopt the Minutes.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Members of the public may address ISCOTT members on matters that are within ISCOTT purview and are not on today's agenda.

**TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)**

These proposed actions are an Approval Action as defined by S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

If there are no objections from the committee or the public, the following items will be voted on as a group.

- A.**     9th Avenue between Anza and Balboa streets  
          Sunday, May 3, 2026, 9 am to 3 pm  
          **Block Party – 9th Avenue**
- B.**     Amethyst Way between Turquoise Way and Amber Drive  
          Saturday, July 4, 2026, 8 am to 3 pm  
          **Block Party - 4th of July on Amethyst Way**
- C.**     27th Street between Church and Sanchez streets  
          Sunday, September 20, 2026, 11 am to 5 pm  
          **Block Party – 27th St. Block-Tober Fest**
- D.**     Lyon Street between Fulton and McAllister streets  
          Saturday, June 6, 2026, 9 am to 4 pm  
          **NOPNA Block Party**
- E.**     28th Avenue between Cabrillo and Fulton streets  
          Tuesday, May 5, 2026, 7 am to 2 pm  
          **Lag B'Omer Community Celebration**
- F.**     Minna Street between 2nd and New Montgomery streets  
          Friday, April 10, 2026, 2 pm to 11 pm  
          **111 Minna – Pangeaseed**



- G.** Heron Street between 8th Street and Berwick Place  
Saturday, June 27, 2026, 5 am to 9 pm  
*and*  
Saturday, July 25, 2026, 5 am to 9 pm  
*and*  
Friday, September 25, 2026, 5 am to  
Saturday, September 26, 2026, 9 pm  
***Mr. S Geared Up Street Parties***
- H.** Barneveld Avenue between Apparel Way and Apparel Way  
Saturday, June 27, 2026, 12 noon to  
Sunday, June 28, 2026, 8 am  
***AfterGlow Pride***
- I.** Marin Street between Illinois and Easterly Terminus; Michigan Street  
between Cesar Chavez and Marin Street  
Intersection closed: Michigan Street at Marin Street  
(Local access allowed on Michigan Street via Cesar Chavez and Marin Street  
via Illinois.)  
Friday, April 17, 2026, 4 pm to  
Monday, April 20, 2026, 6 am  
*and*  
Friday, June 5, 2026, 4 pm to  
Monday, June 8, 2026, 6 am  
***The Midway - Block Party Events as of 03/13/2026***
- J.** Mint Plaza between 5th and Mint streets  
Thursday, April 16, 2026, 8 am to 11:59 pm  
*and*  
Thursday, May 21, 2026, 8 am to 11:59 pm  
***Third Thursdays***



- K.** Jane Warner Plaza area (17th Street between Castro and Hartford streets)  
Friday, May 22, 2026, 4:30 pm to 7 pm  
**Harvey Milk Day**  
and  
Friday, June 12, 2026, 4:30 pm to 7 pm  
**Pulse Nightclub Memorial**  
and  
Monday, October 12, 2026, 4:30 pm to 7 pm  
**Fleet Week**  
and  
Monday, December 7, 2026, 4:30 pm to 7 pm  
**Menorah Lighting**  
**(Jane Warner Plaza Events)**

#### **REGULAR CALENDAR**

- L.** 10th Avenue between Balboa and Cabrillo streets  
Saturday, June 6, 2026, 1 pm to 9 pm  
**Block Party - 10th Avenue**
- M.** Precita Avenue (westbound) between Alabama and Harrison streets  
Saturday, May 9, 2026, 12 pm to 8 pm  
**Block Party - Precita Porchfest**
- N.** Lee Ave between Ocean and Holloway avenues  
Saturday, May 30, 2026, 6 am to 3 pm  
**Ocean Avenue Car Show**
- O.** Lyon Street between McAllister and Fulton streets  
Thursday, May 7, 2026, through  
Tuesday, May 12, 2026  
9 am to 6 pm each day  
**Lyon St Mural Refresh**
- P.** Russ Street between Howard and Folsom streets  
Thursday, April 16, 2026, 4 pm to 7 pm  
**Russ Street Community Gathering & Neighborhood Demonstration**
- Q.** Waverly Place between Sacramento and Washington streets  
(Intersection of Waverly Place at Clay Street to remain open.)  
Saturday, May 30, 2026, 9 am to 7 pm  
**Asian and Pacific Heritage Festival**



- R.**    King Street between 7th and De Haro streets  
Thursday, July 23, 2026, 6 am to 6 pm  
***Adobe San Francisco Street Food Festival***
- S.**    Ringold Street between 8th and 9th streets  
Sunday, June 7, 2026, 9 am to 5 pm  
***Ringold Street Anniversary Celebration***
- T.**    21st Street between Bryant and York streets  
Sunday, June 28, 2026, 12 pm to 8 pm  
***Bar Bibi / El Chato Pride Party***
- U.**    York Street between Mariposa and 18th streets  
Friday, May 8, 2026, 12 pm to  
Saturday, May 9, 2026, 11:59 pm  
***KQED Fest***
- V.**    23rd Street between Mission and Capp streets  
Sunday, May 3, 2026, 7 am to 7 pm  
***Mother's Day Pop-Up Market***
- W.**    Sansome Street between Sutter and Bush streets; Sutter Street between  
Sansome and Montgomery streets (southern curb lane and travel lane only)  
Friday, April 24, 2026, 5 am to  
Wednesday, April 29, 2026, 5 pm  
***What's Next 2026 (AWS)***

Categorically exempt from CEQA: CEQA Guidelines Section 15304 Class 4(e) minor temporary use of land having negligible or no permanent effects on the environment, including carnivals, sales of Christmas trees, etc. and/or Section 15305 Class 5(b) minor alterations in land use limitations, including street closings and equipment for special events

---

Forrest Chamberlain  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Date



**ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)**

The following item has been environmentally cleared by the Planning Department on April 19, 2021, Addendum #2 to San Francisco Better Streets Plan Project [Case No. 2021-003010ENV (addendum to Case No. 2007.1238E)]:

***NONE***

**ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (INFORMATIONAL ITEMS)**

The following items are presented for informational purposes and public comment. Closures are subject to review and approval by the SFMTA Board.

***NONE***





\*\*\*SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY'S OFFICES, ONE SOUTH VAN NESS, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103, DURING NORMAL BUSINESS HOURS. PLEASE CONTACT TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES/SPECIAL EVENTS AT [specialevents@sfmta.com](mailto:specialevents@sfmta.com). \*\*\*

### ***Sound Producing Devices***

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

### ***Disability Access***

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact (415) 701-4683 at least two business days before the meeting. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to perfumes and various other chemical-based scented products. Please help the City to accommodate these individuals.

### ***Know Your Rights under the Sunshine Ordinance***

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator by mail to Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco CA 94102, by phone at (415) 554-7724, by fax at (415) 554-7854 or by email at [sotf@sfgov.org](mailto:sotf@sfgov.org). Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at web site <http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine>.

### ***Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements***

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2200, fax (415) 581-2217, web site [www.sfgov.org/ethics](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Appeal Rights under S.F. Admin. Code Chapter 31: For identified Approval Actions, the Planning Department or the SFMTA has issued a CEQA exemption determination or negative declaration, which may be viewed online at the Planning Department's website. Following approval of the item by ISCOTT, the CEQA determination is subject to appeal within the time frame specified in S.F. Administrative Code Section 31.16 which is typically within 30 calendar days. For information on filing a CEQA appeal, contact the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, or call (415) 554-5184. Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or submitted in writing to the City prior to or at such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.

# Item 16

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Resignation from the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 10:38:11 AM

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see below communication from Gen Fujioka, tendering their resignation from the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Gen Fujioka <gfujioka@chinatowncdc.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 7:13 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Fujioka, Gen (MYR - Contractor) <gen.fujioka@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Resignation from the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board

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

Dear Madam Clerk,

I am writing to submit my resignation from the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board effective immediately.

Please let me know if there are any additional steps I should take in order to complete this resignation.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Gen Fujioka

415-849-9579

# Item 17

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 12B waivers - 4 waivers  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:10:50 AM  
**Attachments:** [4 waivers.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached for 4 approved requests to waive 12B requirements.

Requester: Alejandro Garcia

Department: DPH

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

Supplier ID: 0000009020

Requested total cost: \$196.34

Short Description: S-17380-Uline Laser Labels Bulk Pack - White, 3 1/2 x 5"

Requester: Stanley Lam

Department: ADM

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

Supplier ID: 0000012556

Requested total cost: \$1,570.00

Short Description: Preventative Maintenance for OCME Radiometer ABL80

Requester: Alejandro Garcia

Department: DPH

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

Supplier ID: 0000059831

Requested total cost: \$803.89

Short Description: XPF apron large Protective gear from radiation

Requester: Alejandro Garcia

Department: DPH

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

Supplier ID: 0000059831

Requested total cost: \$1,646.97

Short Description: XPF apron large Protective gear from radiation

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**

**Office of the Clerk of the Board**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**Report Title:** Equal Benefits Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2026-04-02 10:14:28 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

Equal Benefits

|                                      |                     |                             |                  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0004810       | Request Status:             | Completed        |
| Requested for:                       | Alejandro Garcia    | State:                      | Completed        |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Michelle Ruggels    | Waiver Type:                | 12B Waiver       |
| Opened:                              | 2026-03-20 10:38:45 | Equal Benefits Waiver Type: | Standard         |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department:      | DPH              |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:            |                  |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:         |                  |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:       |                  |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:                  | Alejandro Garcia |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:                 |                  |

Short Description:

XPF apron large Protective gear from radiation

|                                                                          |                                 |                             |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000059831                      | Requested Amount:           | \$1,646.97 |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | New Waiver                      | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00     |
| Last Approved Equal Benefits Waiver Request:                             |                                 | Previously Approved Amount: | \$0.00     |
|                                                                          |                                 | Total Requested Amount:     | \$1,646.97 |
| Document Type:                                                           | Purchase Order                  | Enter Contract ID:          |            |
| Equal Benefits Waiver Justification:                                     | 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) | Enter Requisition ID:       |            |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                   | Enter Purchase Order ID:    | 0001021338 |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21A GPO (DPH Only)      | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |            |
| Select Chapter 21.04 Section:                                            |                                 | Waiver Start Date:          | 2026-03-01 |
| Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:            |                                 | Waiver End Date:            | 2027-01-01 |

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

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

Bloxr Solutions LLC XPF apron large Protective gear from radiation

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

We have made the vendor aware of their status on the system

Cancel Notes:

#### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst: Maria-Zenaida Camua

CMD Director: Regina Chan

CMD Analyst Decision: Reviewed and Approved

Select the reason for this request: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

CMD Analyst Comments: This waiver is recommended for approval as it falls under a Public Health Group Purchasing Order for a Vizient contractor, allowing for reduced costs and continued quality of care.

#### CMD Director

CMD Director: Regina Chan

CMD Director Decision: Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

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

#### 131.6(a)(1) (Sole Source – Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### 131.6(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property)

City Property Status:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

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

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

#### 131.6(a)(1)(Sole Source – Property)

Sole Source – Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this  
agreement as a Sole Source under  
Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as  
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**131.6(b) (Waiver by Treasurer)**

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

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

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

**131.6(c) (Waiver by PUC)**

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false



Bulk Gas: false

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

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

### 131.6(a)(3) (No Compliant Bidders)

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

### 131.6(a)(3)(No Compliant Bidders)

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk  
Purchasing under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

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

Per Admin Code Section 21A.2(a)

(2) Healthcare GPOs obtain cost savings by pooling their members' purchasing power and negotiating lower prices from their participating vendors. Healthcare GPOs also provide their members with cost savings by conducting a competitive bidding process for some – though not all – of the goods and services offered by their suppliers.

(3) Membership in Healthcare GPOs allows DPH to employ a streamlined process for procuring goods and services, thereby reducing administrative burdens, facilitating improved quality of care, and saving DPH millions of dollars each fiscal year.

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

Per Admin Code Section 21A.2(a)

(2) Healthcare GPOs obtain cost savings by pooling their members' purchasing power and negotiating lower prices from their participating vendors. Healthcare GPOs also provide their members with cost savings by conducting a competitive bidding process for some – though not all – of the goods and services offered by their suppliers.

(3) Membership in Healthcare GPOs allows DPH to employ a streamlined process for procuring goods and services, thereby reducing administrative burdens, facilitating improved quality of care, and saving DPH millions of dollars each fiscal year.

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

To fulfill the Board's desire to obtain the cost savings from using a GPO, pursuant to Chapter 21A.

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

We have made the vendor aware of their status on the system

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

The purpose of Chapter 12B is to ensure equal access to benefits, including health benefits, regardless of one's protected category. The use of a GPO ensures DPH can access the goods and services it needs to provide healthcare to SF residents in a cost-effective and reliable manner, thereby increasing their access to healthcare regardless of their status. In this regard, the use of this Vizient contractor is aligned with the intent of Chapter 12B.

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

Yes

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

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

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

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

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

131.6(a)(4) (Adverse Impact on Services)

Explain the Adverse Impact on Services:

131.6(a)(5) (Cooperative Purchasing)

Select the Admin Code section that agreement is being procured under:

Confirm the agreement being procured is in the best interest of the City:

Confirm that without a waiver, awarding agency could not enter the agreement:

Confirm the agreement being procured will significantly lower the City's costs:

131.6(a)(2) (Only One Qualified Bidder)

Confirm only one qualified, responsive bidder or proposer who can perform work:

Confirm supplier not disqualified from doing business with the City at this time:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title:

Approval List

Table name:

sysapproval\_approver

Query Condition:

Approval for = CMD12B0004810

Sort Order:

Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver         | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Michelle Ruggels | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004810 | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 |              |          |

Related List Title:

Metric List

Table name:

metric\_instance

12 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                            | Value                          | Start               | End                 | Duration          | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 2026-03-20 10:59:20 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval  | 2026-03-20 10:59:16 | 2026-03-24 11:36:03 | 4 Days 36 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 11:36:05 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Awaiting CMD Director Approval | 2026-03-24 11:36:03 | 2026-03-24 12:53:54 | 1 Hour 17 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-20 10:51:25 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Draft                          | 2026-03-20 10:51:20 | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 | 1 Minute          | true                 |
| 2026-03-20 10:52:30 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Draft                          | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 | 0 Seconds         | true                 |
| 2026-03-20 10:52:31 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Dept. Head approval            | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 | 2026-03-20 10:59:16 | 6 Minutes         | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 12:53:55 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Completed                      | 2026-03-24 12:53:54 |                     |                   | false                |
| 2026-03-20 10:59:20 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval  | 2026-03-20 10:59:16 | 2026-03-24 11:36:03 | 4 Days 36 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-20 10:51:25 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Draft                          | 2026-03-20 10:51:20 | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 | 1 Minute          | true                 |
| 2026-03-20 10:52:31 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Draft                          | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 | 0 Seconds         | true                 |
| 2026-03-20 10:52:31 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Dept. Head approval            | 2026-03-20 10:52:25 | 2026-03-20 10:59:16 | 6 Minutes         | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 11:36:05 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Awaiting CMD Director Approval | 2026-03-24 11:36:03 | 2026-03-24 12:53:54 | 1 Hour 17 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 12:53:55 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004810 | Completed                      | 2026-03-24 12:53:54 |                     |                   | false                |

**Report Title:** Equal Benefits Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2026-04-02 10:13:23 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

Equal Benefits

|                                      |                      |                             |                |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0004813        | Request Status:             | Completed      |
| Requested for:                       | Stanley Lam          | State:                      | Completed      |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Katharine Petrucione | Waiver Type:                | 12B Waiver     |
| Opened:                              | 2026-03-24 12:37:02  | Equal Benefits Waiver Type: | Standard       |
|                                      |                      | Requesting Department:      | ADM            |
|                                      |                      | Requester Phone:            | (415) 641-3604 |
|                                      |                      | Awaiting Info from:         |                |
|                                      |                      | Awaiting Info reason:       |                |
|                                      |                      | Opened by:                  | Stanley Lam    |
|                                      |                      | Watch list:                 |                |

Short Description:

Preventative Maintenance for OCME Radiometer ABL80

|                                                                          |                                    |                             |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000012556                         | Requested Amount:           | \$1,570.00 |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | New Waiver                         | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00     |
| Last Approved Equal Benefits Waiver Request:                             |                                    | Previously Approved Amount: | \$0.00     |
|                                                                          |                                    | Total Requested Amount:     | \$1,570.00 |
| Document Type:                                                           | Purchase Order                     | Enter Contract ID:          |            |
| Equal Benefits Waiver Justification:                                     | 131.6(a)(3) (No Compliant Bidders) | Enter Requisition ID:       |            |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                      | Enter Purchase Order ID:    | 0001023317 |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21 Goods and Services      | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |            |
| Select Chapter 21.04 Section:                                            |                                    | Waiver Start Date:          | 2026-03-18 |
| Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:            |                                    | Waiver End Date:            | 2027-03-17 |

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

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

A) Radiometer America Inc.

B) This supplier will provide annual preventative maintenance for the ABL80 instrument, used by the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME)'s Forensic Toxicology laboratory for determining cause and manner of death in fire-related cases.

c) The "No Vendors Comply" 12B Waiver justification is relevant to this service because the supplier is the original manufacturer of the instrument, and other compliant vendors do not provide the required expertise or the same level of support for the instrument's continued performance. Additionally other vendors identified only provide service to instrument purchased directly from them, and this supplier offers annual maintenance at a nominal cost.

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

We confirmed that the supplier's HR policy provides equal benefits to domestic partners. But despite our providing information to complete the formal 12B compliance certification, the supplier has not completed it. OCME has encouraged them to finish the process to prevent future procurements from requiring a waiver.

Cancel Notes:

### CMD Analyst

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                     |                                    |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| CMD Analyst:          | Ruth Santana                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | CMD Director:                       | Regina Chan                        |
| CMD Analyst Decision: | Reviewed and Approved                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Select the reason for this request: | 131.6(a)(3) (No Compliant Bidders) |
| CMD Analyst Comments: | Provides annual preventative maintenance for the ABL80 instrument, used by the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME)'s Forensic Toxicology laboratory for determining cause and manner of death in fire-related cases. Supplier is the original manufacturer of the instrument, and other compliant vendors do not provide the required expertise or the same level of support for the instrument's continued performance as well as annual maintenance at a nominal cost. |                                     |                                    |

### CMD Director

|                                   |             |                        |                       |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| CMD Director:                     | Regina Chan | CMD Director Decision: | Reviewed and Approved |
| Reason for Determination:         |             |                        |                       |
| 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) |             |                        |                       |

### 131.6(a)(1) (Sole Source – Non Property)

|                                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:                                                 |
| Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:                       |
| Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?: |

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### 131.6(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property)

City Property Status:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

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

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

#### 131.6(a)(1)(Sole Source – Property)

Sole Source – Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**131.6(b) (Waiver by Treasurer)**

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

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

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

**131.6(c) (Waiver by PUC)**

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

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

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

**131.6(a)(3) (No Compliant Bidders)**

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

A copy of the quoted service from Radiometer is attached for reference. In a search for a compliant vendor with comparable expertise, OCME found none that could provide onsite maintenance of the ABL80 instrument; in one instance another vendor offered service for instruments, but only those purchased directly from them are eligible.

**131.6(a)(3)(No Compliant Bidders)**

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:  
Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk  
Purchasing under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

131.6(a)(4) (Adverse Impact on Services)

Explain the Adverse Impact on Services:

131.6(a)(5) (Cooperative Purchasing)

Select the Admin Code section that agreement is being procured under:

Confirm the agreement being procured is in the best interest of the City:

Confirm that without a waiver, awarding agency could not enter the agreement:

Confirm the agreement being procured will significantly lower the City's costs:

131.6(a)(2) (Only One Qualified Bidder)

Confirm only one qualified, responsive bidder or proposer who can perform work:

Confirm supplier not disqualified from doing business with the City at this time:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title:

Approval List

Table name:

sysapproval\_approver

Query Condition:

Approval for = CMD12B0004813

Sort Order:

Order in ascending order

1 Approvals



| State    | Approver             | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Approved | Katharine Petrucione | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 |              | 2026-03-25 14:04:18 -<br>Katharine Petrucione<br>(Comments)<br>reply from:<br>katharine.petrucione@sf<br>gov.org<br><br>Ref:TIS6548316_NGNB<br>Kk3SOnSIUxKV0Im |

**Related List Title:** Metric List

**Table name:** metric\_instance

12 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                               | Value                          | Start               | End                 | Duration                 | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 2026-03-24 12:37:05 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Draft                          | 2026-03-24 12:37:02 | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 | 23 Hours 20 Minutes      | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 11:57:20 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Dept. Head approval            | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 | 0 Seconds                | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 11:57:20 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Draft                          | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 | 2026-03-25 14:04:19 | 2 Hours 7 Minutes        | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 14:04:20 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval  | 2026-03-25 14:04:19 | 2026-03-25 15:41:34 | 1 Hour 37 Minutes        | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 15:41:35 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Awaiting CMD Director Approval | 2026-03-25 15:41:34 | 2026-03-26 18:00:34 | 1 Day 2 Hours 19 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-26 18:00:35 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Completed                      | 2026-03-26 18:00:34 |                     |                          | false                |
| 2026-03-24 12:37:05 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Draft                          | 2026-03-24 12:37:02 | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 | 23 Hours 20 Minutes      | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 11:57:20 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Dept. Head approval            | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 | 0 Seconds                | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 11:57:20 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Draft                          | 2026-03-25 11:57:19 | 2026-03-25 14:04:19 | 2 Hours 7 Minutes        | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 14:04:20 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval  | 2026-03-25 14:04:19 | 2026-03-25 15:41:34 | 1 Hour 37 Minutes        | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 15:41:35 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Awaiting CMD Director Approval | 2026-03-25 15:41:34 | 2026-03-26 18:00:34 | 1 Day 2 Hours 19 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-26 18:00:35 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004813 | Completed                      | 2026-03-26 18:00:34 |                     |                          | false                |

**Report Title:** Equal Benefits Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2026-04-02 10:13:59 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

Equal Benefits

|                                      |                     |                             |                  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0004814       | Request Status:             | Completed        |
| Requested for:                       | Alejandro Garcia    | State:                      | Completed        |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Michelle Ruggels    | Waiver Type:                | 12B Waiver       |
| Opened:                              | 2026-03-24 14:21:49 | Equal Benefits Waiver Type: | Standard         |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department:      | DPH              |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:            | (628) 206-7456   |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:         |                  |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:       |                  |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:                  | Alejandro Garcia |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:                 |                  |

Short Description:

XPF apron large Protective gear from radiation

|                                                                          |                                 |                             |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000059831                      | Requested Amount:           | \$803.89   |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | New Waiver                      | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00     |
| Last Approved Equal Benefits Waiver Request:                             |                                 | Previously Approved Amount: | \$0.00     |
|                                                                          |                                 | Total Requested Amount:     | \$803.89   |
| Document Type:                                                           | Purchase Order                  | Enter Contract ID:          |            |
| Equal Benefits Waiver Justification:                                     | 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) | Enter Requisition ID:       |            |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                   | Enter Purchase Order ID:    | 0001021333 |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21A GPO (DPH Only)      | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |            |
| Select Chapter 21.04 Section:                                            |                                 | Waiver Start Date:          | 2026-03-01 |
| Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:            |                                 | Waiver End Date:            | 2027-01-01 |

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

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

Bloxr Solutions LLC XPF apron large Protective gear from radiation

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

We have made the vendor aware of their status on the system

Cancel Notes:

#### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst: Ruth Santana

CMD Director: Regina Chan

CMD Analyst Decision: Reviewed and Approved

Select the reason for this request: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

CMD Analyst Comments: XPF apron large Protective gear from radiation.

#### CMD Director

CMD Director: Regina Chan

CMD Director Decision: Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

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

#### 131.6(a)(1) (Sole Source – Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this  
agreement as a Sole Source under  
Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as  
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### 131.6(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property)

City Property Status:

Has DPH Commission qualified this  
agreement as a Sole Source under  
Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as  
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

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

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

#### 131.6(a)(1)(Sole Source – Property)

Sole Source – Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this  
agreement as a Sole Source under  
Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as  
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 131.6(b) (Waiver by Treasurer)

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

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

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

#### 131.6(c) (Waiver by PUC)

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

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

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

**131.6(a)(3) (No Compliant Bidders)**

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

**131.6(a)(3)(No Compliant Bidders)**

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk  
Purchasing under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

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

Per Admin Code Section 21A.2(a)

(2) Healthcare GPOs obtain cost savings by pooling their members' purchasing power and negotiating lower prices from their participating vendors. Healthcare GPOs also provide their members with cost savings by conducting a competitive bidding process for some – though not all – of the goods and services offered by their suppliers.

(3) Membership in Healthcare GPOs allows DPH to employ a streamlined process for procuring goods and services, thereby reducing administrative burdens, facilitating improved quality of care, and saving DPH millions of dollars each fiscal year.

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

Per Admin Code Section 21A.2(a)

(2) Healthcare GPOs obtain cost savings by pooling their members' purchasing power and negotiating lower prices from their participating vendors. Healthcare GPOs also provide their members with cost savings by conducting a competitive bidding process for some – though not all – of the goods and services offered by their suppliers.

(3) Membership in Healthcare GPOs allows DPH to employ a streamlined process for procuring goods and services, thereby reducing administrative burdens, facilitating improved quality of care, and saving DPH millions of dollars each fiscal year.

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

To fulfill the Board's desire to obtain the cost savings from using a GPO, pursuant to Chapter 21A.

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

We have made the vendor aware of their status on the system

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

The purpose of Chapter 12B is to ensure equal access to benefits, including health benefits, regardless of one's protected category. The use of a GPO ensures DPH can access the goods and services it needs to provide healthcare to SF residents in a cost-effective and reliable manner, thereby increasing their access to healthcare regardless of their status. In this regard, the use of this Vizient contractor is aligned with the intent of Chapter 12B.

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

Yes

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

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

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

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

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

131.6(a)(4) (Adverse Impact on Services)

Explain the Adverse Impact on Services:

131.6(a)(5) (Cooperative Purchasing)

Select the Admin Code section that agreement is being procured under:  
Confirm the agreement being procured is in the best interest of the City:

Confirm that without a waiver, awarding agency could not enter the agreement:  
Confirm the agreement being procured will significantly lower the City's costs:

131.6(a)(2) (Only One Qualified Bidder)

Confirm only one qualified, responsive bidder or proposer who can perform work:

Confirm supplier not disqualified from doing business with the City at this time:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List  
Table name: sysapproval\_approver  
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004814  
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver         | Approving                     | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Michelle Ruggels | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 |              |          |

Related List Title: Metric List  
Table name: metric\_instance

12 Metrics

| Created             | Definition     | ID                            | Value               | Start               | End                 | Duration   | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------------|
| 2026-03-24 14:21:50 | OCA 12B Metric | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Draft               | 2026-03-24 14:21:49 | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 | 4 Minutes  | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 14:26:50 | OCA 12B Metric | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Dept. Head approval | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 | 0 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 14:26:51 | OCA 12B Metric | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Draft               | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 | 2026-03-24 14:58:59 | 32 Minutes | true                 |

| Created             | Definition           | ID                            | Value                          | Start               | End                 | Duration                 | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 2026-03-24 14:59:00 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval  | 2026-03-24 14:58:59 | 2026-03-25 15:38:31 | 1 Day 39 Minutes         | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 15:38:36 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Awaiting CMD Director Approval | 2026-03-25 15:38:31 | 2026-03-26 18:01:04 | 1 Day 2 Hours 22 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-26 18:01:05 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Completed                      | 2026-03-26 18:01:04 |                     |                          | false                |
| 2026-03-24 14:21:50 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Draft                          | 2026-03-24 14:21:49 | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 | 4 Minutes                | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 14:26:50 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Dept. Head approval            | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 | 0 Seconds                | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 14:26:51 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Draft                          | 2026-03-24 14:26:46 | 2026-03-24 14:58:59 | 32 Minutes               | true                 |
| 2026-03-24 14:59:00 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval  | 2026-03-24 14:58:59 | 2026-03-25 15:38:31 | 1 Day 39 Minutes         | true                 |
| 2026-03-25 15:38:36 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Awaiting CMD Director Approval | 2026-03-25 15:38:31 | 2026-03-26 18:01:04 | 1 Day 2 Hours 22 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-26 18:01:05 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits: CMD12B0004814 | Completed                      | 2026-03-26 18:01:04 |                     |                          | false                |

**Report Title:** Equal Benefits Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2026-04-02 10:12:29 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

Equal Benefits

|                                      |                     |                             |                      |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0004820       | Request Status:             | Cancelled            |
| Requested for:                       | Alejandro Garcia    | State:                      | Cancelled            |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Michelle Ruggels    | Waiver Type:                | 12B Waiver           |
| Opened:                              | 2026-03-27 16:30:05 | Equal Benefits Waiver Type: | Limited (Under 250K) |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department:      | DPH                  |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:            | (628) 206-7456       |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:         |                      |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:       |                      |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:                  | Alejandro Garcia     |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:                 |                      |

Short Description:

S-17380-Uline Laser Labels Bulk Pack - White, 3 1/2 x 5"

|                                                                          |                                    |                             |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000009020                         | Requested Amount:           | \$196.34   |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | New Waiver                         | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00     |
| Last Approved Equal Benefits Waiver Request:                             |                                    | Previously Approved Amount: | \$0.00     |
|                                                                          |                                    | Total Requested Amount:     | \$196.34   |
| Document Type:                                                           | Purchase Order                     | Enter Contract ID:          |            |
| Equal Benefits Waiver Justification:                                     | 131.6(a)(3) (No Compliant Bidders) | Enter Requisition ID:       |            |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                      | Enter Purchase Order ID:    | 0001016860 |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21 Goods and Services      | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |            |
| Select Chapter 21.04 Section:                                            |                                    | Waiver Start Date:          | 2026-02-23 |
| Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:            |                                    | Waiver End Date:            | 2026-12-31 |
| Advertising:                                                             | false                              |                             |            |
| Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :                                    | true                               |                             |            |
| Equipment and Vehicle Lease:                                             | false                              |                             |            |
| On Premise Software and Support:                                         | false                              |                             |            |
| Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:                       | false                              |                             |            |
| Professional and General Services:                                       | false                              |                             |            |
| Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:            | false                              |                             |            |
| Vehicles and Trailers:                                                   | false                              |                             |            |

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



The supplier ULINE. We are requesting a waiver to purchase ULINE LASER LABELS BULK PACK - WHITE, 3 1/2 X 5". This is in relationship to the incident on december 4th at ZSFGH.

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

The supplier was emailed in the previous fiscal year and was unresponsive.

Cancel Notes:

System-initiated bulk cancellation of CMD12B records that were not already in Cancelled or Completed status, performed in accordance with Open for Business (OFB) legislation and as requested and approved by OCA GovOps.

#### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Analyst Decision:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director:

Select the reason for this request:

#### CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

#### 131.6(a)(1) (Sole Source – Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this  
agreement as a Sole Source under  
Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as  
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### 131.6(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property)

City Property Status:

Has DPH Commission qualified this  
agreement as a Sole Source under  
Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as  
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

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

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

#### 131.6(a)(1)(Sole Source – Property)

Sole Source – Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:Has DPH Commission qualified this  
agreement as a Sole Source under  
Chpt 21.42?:Has MTA qualified this agreement as  
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.  
8A.102(b)?:

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

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

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

**12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)**12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)  
Question1:**12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)**

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

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

**131.6(b) (Waiver by Treasurer)**

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

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

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

**131.6(c) (Waiver by PUC)**

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

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

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

### 131.6(a)(3) (No Compliant Bidders)

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

### 131.6(a)(3)(No Compliant Bidders)

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

Not entering into this contract will result in the City, specifically the ZSFGH, safety concerns after the incident at ZSFGH.

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

The unit requesting these ULINE LASER LABELS BULK PACK - WHITE, 3 1/2 X

5"did their research looking at different vendors. The administrative analyst verified which vendors were city-approved.

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

This waiver does not defeat the intent of this chapter because it contributes to the overall service of the ZSFGH, safety.

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

Yes

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk  
Purchasing under Charter Sec.

8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 131.6(a)(4) (Adverse Impact on Services)

Explain the Adverse Impact on Services:

### 131.6(a)(5) (Cooperative Purchasing)

Select the Admin Code section that  
agreement is being procured under:

Confirm that without a waiver,  
awarding agency could not enter the  
agreement:

Confirm the agreement being procured is in the best interest of the City:

Confirm the agreement being procured will significantly lower the City's costs:

131.6(a)(2) (Only One Qualified Bidder)

Confirm only one qualified, responsive bidder or proposer who can perform work:

Confirm supplier not disqualified from doing business with the City at this time:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List  
Table name: sysapproval\_approver  
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004820  
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver         | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Michelle Ruggels | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | 2026-03-30 14:25:01 |              |          |

Related List Title: Metric List  
Table name: metric\_instance

8 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                               | Value                         | Start               | End                 | Duration                   | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 2026-03-30 14:25:05 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | Dept. Head approval           | 2026-03-30 14:25:02 | 2026-03-30 14:25:02 | 0 Seconds                  | true                 |
| 2026-03-30 14:25:05 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | Draft                         | 2026-03-30 14:25:02 | 2026-03-30 14:26:13 | 1 Minute                   | true                 |
| 2026-03-30 14:26:15 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2026-03-30 14:26:13 |                     |                            | false                |
| 2026-03-27 16:30:10 | OCA 12B Metric       | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | Draft                         | 2026-03-27 16:30:06 | 2026-03-30 14:25:02 | 2 Days 21 Hours 54 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-27 16:30:10 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | Draft                         | 2026-03-27 16:30:06 | 2026-03-30 14:25:02 | 2 Days 21 Hours 54 Minutes | true                 |
| 2026-03-30 14:25:05 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | Dept. Head approval           | 2026-03-30 14:25:02 | 2026-03-30 14:25:02 | 0 Seconds                  | true                 |
| 2026-03-30 14:25:05 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | Draft                         | 2026-03-30 14:25:02 | 2026-03-30 14:26:13 | 1 Minute                   | true                 |
| 2026-03-30 14:26:15 | Assigned to Duration | Equal Benefits:<br>CMD12B0004820 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2026-03-30 14:26:13 |                     |                            | false                |

# Item 18

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Issued: March Joint Report Update FY 2026-27 through FY 2029-30  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 3:49:36 PM  
**Attachments:** [March\\_Update\\_FY\\_26-27\\_through\\_FY\\_29-30\\_FINAL.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the Office of the Controller, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 3.6(b), submitting Budget Outlook Update (March 2026 Five-Year Update).

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** San Francisco Controller's Office Reports <controller.reports@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 3:00 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Issued: March Joint Report Update FY 2026-27 through FY 2029-30



San Francisco Administrative Code Section 3.6(b) requires the Mayor, Board of Supervisors Budget Analyst, and Controller to submit regular updates to the City's Five-Year Financial Plan. This report (sometimes referred to as the Joint Report) updates our offices' last projection, which was published in the City's Five-Year Financial Plan Update in December 2025.

Given more recent information and trends, compared to our December 2025 forecast, our offices project smaller shortfalls in FY 2026-27 through FY 2029-30. Despite this improvement, the projected deficit for the upcoming budget is large by historical standards and will require significant actions to balance the budget by the June 1, 2026 deadline. In addition, this report continues to project a significant structural deficit growing to over \$1 billion during the forecast period.

Highlights include:

- The General Fund shortfall for the coming fiscal year (FY 2026-27) is forecast to be \$168.5 million, or \$127.8 million less than our last projection.
- In the upcoming two fiscal years, the period for which the City is required to adopt a balanced budget, our offices now project a \$642.8 million General Fund shortfall, or \$293.8 million less than the \$936.6 million shortfall projected in the December 2025 report.
- The estimated revenue impact of funding changes from H.R.1 is unchanged from the prior projection at a two-year total of \$306.3 million, representing just under half of the total \$642.8 million shortfall.
- Long term structural shortfalls remain, growing to \$1,088.6 million by FY 2029-30, which is \$79.9 million less than the December 2025 projection.
- Heightened levels of uncertainty exist that could materially affect this forecast in coming

years, most notably the economic and fiscal effects of federal policy changes which could constrain federal and state funding to local governments and drive changes to inflation, labor markets, and consumer sentiment that affect the national and local economies.

These updates are the result of improvements in current year fund balance, increased General Fund revenues in FY 2026-27, ongoing Public Health revenue increases, and lower employer contributions for retirement, along with nominal updates to other citywide expenditures.

[View the full report](#)



[Sign up to receive news and updates](#)

[Search all Controller's Office reports](#)



---

This is a send-only email address.

For questions about the report, please contact Michelle Allersma, Director of Budget and Analysis at [michelle.allersma@sfgov.org](mailto:michelle.allersma@sfgov.org).

For press queries, please contact the Controller's Office at [controller@sfgov.org](mailto:controller@sfgov.org).

[Manage](#) your preferences | [Opt Out](#) using TrueRemove™  
Got this as a forward? [Sign up](#) to receive our future emails.  
View this email [online](#).

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

This email was sent to [board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org).  
*To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.*





## CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**TO:** Mayor Daniel Lurie  
President Rafael Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Dan Goncher, Board of Supervisors Budget & Legislative Analyst  
Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Budget Director  
Greg Wagner, Controller

**DATE:** March 31, 2026

**SUBJECT:** **Budget Outlook Update (March Five-Year Update)**

---

### Executive Summary

San Francisco Administrative Code Section 3.6(b) requires the Mayor, Board of Supervisors Budget Analyst, and Controller to submit regular updates to the City's Five-Year Financial Plan. This report (sometimes referred to as the Joint Report) updates our offices' last projection, which was published in the City's Five-Year Financial Plan Update in December 2025.

Given more recent information and trends, compared to our December 2025 forecast, our offices project smaller shortfalls in FY 2026-27 through FY 2029-30. Despite this improvement, the projected deficit for the upcoming budget is large by historical standards and will require significant actions to balance the budget by the June 1, 2026 deadline. In addition, this report continues to project a significant structural deficit growing to over \$1 billion during the forecast period.

- The General Fund shortfall for the coming fiscal year (FY 2026-27) is forecast to be \$168.5 million, or \$127.8 million less than our last projection.
- In the upcoming two fiscal years, the period for which the City is required to adopt a balanced budget, our offices now project a \$642.8 million General Fund shortfall, or \$293.8 million less than the \$936.6 million shortfall projected in the December 2025 report.
- The estimated revenue impact of funding changes from H.R.1 is unchanged from the prior projection at a two-year total of \$306.3 million, representing just under half of the total \$642.8 million shortfall.
- Long term structural shortfalls remain, growing to \$1,088.6 million by FY 2029-30, which is \$79.9 million less than the December 2025 projection.
- Heightened levels of uncertainty exist that could materially affect this forecast in coming years, most notably the economic and fiscal effects of federal policy changes which could constrain

federal and state funding to local governments and drive changes to inflation, labor markets, and consumer sentiment that affect the national and local economies.

These updates are the result of improvements in current year fund balance, increased General Fund revenues in FY 2026-27, ongoing Public Health revenue increases, and lower employer contributions for retirement, along with nominal updates to other citywide expenditures. Table 1 outlines the updated cumulative projected General Fund shortfalls.

**Table 1. Base Case – General Fund-Supported Projected Budgetary Surplus / (Shortfall)**  
(\$ Millions)

|                                        | Projection<br>2026-27 | Projection<br>2027-28 | Projection<br>2028-29 | Projection<br>2029-30 |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>SOURCES Increase / (Decrease)</b>   | <b>445.4</b>          | <b>823.3</b>          | <b>938.1</b>          | <b>902.8</b>          |
| <b>Uses</b>                            |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| Baselines & Reserves                   | (195.0)               | (203.6)               | (236.4)               | (243.1)               |
| Salaries & Benefits                    | (205.7)               | (528.5)               | (688.6)               | (844.3)               |
| Citywide Operating Budget Costs        | (50.2)                | (178.6)               | (239.9)               | (318.9)               |
| Departmental Costs                     | (78.5)                | (165.1)               | (289.0)               | (380.3)               |
| <b>USES Decrease / (Increase)</b>      | <b>(529.4)</b>        | <b>(1,075.8)</b>      | <b>(1,453.9)</b>      | <b>(1,786.6)</b>      |
| Subtotal Surplus / (Shortfall)         | (83.9)                | (252.5)               | (515.8)               | (883.8)               |
| State & Federal Policy Impacts         | (84.5)                | (221.8)               | (226.0)               | (204.8)               |
| <b>Projected Surplus / (Shortfall)</b> | <b>(168.5)</b>        | <b>(474.3)</b>        | <b>(741.7)</b>        | <b>(1,088.6)</b>      |
| <b>Two-Year Deficit</b>                | <b>(642.8)</b>        |                       |                       |                       |

## Changes from the December 2025 Five-Year Financial Plan

Table 2 below outlines the cumulative changes from the December 2025 projections that are reflected in this update; these changes are described in more detail below.

**Table 2: Cumulative Changes to Updated Projected Budgetary Surplus / (Shortfall) (\$ Millions)**

|                                        | Projection<br>2026-27 | Projection<br>2027-28 | Projection<br>2028-29 | Projection<br>2029-30 |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>SOURCES Increase / (Decrease)</b>   | <b>193.0</b>          | <b>125.6</b>          | <b>135.1</b>          | <b>80.8</b>           |
| <b>Uses</b>                            |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| Baselines & Reserves                   | (76.2)                | 16.6                  | 22.6                  | 31.2                  |
| Salaries & Benefits                    | 10.8                  | 23.0                  | 17.3                  | (15.4)                |
| Citywide Operating Budget Costs        | 0.2                   | 0.8                   | (7.5)                 | (16.7)                |
| Departmental Costs                     | -                     | -                     | -                     | -                     |
| <b>USES Decrease / (Increase)</b>      | <b>(65.2)</b>         | <b>40.4</b>           | <b>32.4</b>           | <b>(0.9)</b>          |
| Subtotal Surplus / (Shortfall)         | 127.8                 | 166.0                 | 167.6                 | 79.9                  |
| State & Federal Policy Impacts         | -                     | -                     | -                     | -                     |
| <b>Projected Surplus / (Shortfall)</b> | <b>127.8</b>          | <b>166.0</b>          | <b>167.6</b>          | <b>79.9</b>           |
| <b>Two-Year Deficit</b>                | <b>293.8</b>          |                       |                       |                       |

**SOURCES – Revenue, Fund Balance, and Reserves:** General Fund sources are projected to increase by \$360.9 million in FY 2026-27, \$240.6 million in FY 2027-28, \$110.6 million in FY 2028-29, and decrease by \$14.1 million in FY 2029-30. Compared to the December 2025 report, this represents an increase of \$193.0 million in FY 2026-27, and a cumulative \$80.8 million increase of revenues by FY 2029-30. Key drivers of this change include:

- **Fund Balance:** An additional \$149.1 million of FY 2025-26 fund balance is assumed in this forecast, of which \$89.4 million was reported in the Controller’s Six-Month Budget Status Report and \$59.7 million is due to additional current year tax revenue discussed below. Two-thirds of fund balance is assumed to be used in FY 2027-28 and the remaining third in FY 2028-29, consistent with the December 2025 report.
- **General Fund Tax Revenues:** Net General Fund revenues are improved from the prior projection. Weakness in property tax is partially offset by improvements in hotel, sales, and transfer taxes. Importantly, this forecast updates business taxes for the effects of Prop M (November 2024), given tax year 2025 filing and payment data now available. The most significant revenues are discussed below:
  - o **Property Tax:** Projected property tax revenues are lower throughout the forecast period due to an increase in the projected amount of revenue required to fund Assessment Appeals Board decisions, lower net revenue from supplemental property tax bills, and a correction to previous estimates of the General Fund impact of debt service for potential redevelopment successor agency housing bonds.

Annual secured roll growth continues to be assumed at the Prop 13 maximum allowed rate of inflation of 2%. Compared to prior projections, supplemental and escape tax revenue generated by enrollment of changes in ownership are projected to be \$8 million more in FY 2025-26, \$2 million less in FY 2026-27, \$11 million less in FY 2027-28, \$15 million less in FY 2028-29, and \$2 million less in FY 2029-30. Negative supplementals (i.e., changes in ownership at lower values that trigger partial refunds of taxes paid) for commercial properties are anticipated to significantly offset positive supplemental property tax revenues.

Revenue at risk from assessment appeals is projected using CoStar forecasts of prices for different property types. General Fund revenue required to pay refunds due to Assessment Appeals Board (AAB) decisions is projected to increase by \$56 million in FY 2025-26, \$15 million in FY 2026-27, \$6 million in FY 2027-28, \$17 million in FY 2028-29, and \$33 million in FY 2029-30. While commercial property valuations appear to have bottomed out and seen some recovery, many properties that have not sold since 2020 remain at lower market valuations than their most recent sale price.

Senate Bill 593 (SB-593, 2023) provides legal authority to the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) to issue bonds for replacement housing provided that no taxing entities outside the City experience a related reduction in residual tax increment revenue as a result, meaning debt service for these bonds will be paid 86% by the City’s General Fund and 14% by the City’s special revenue funds for library, open space, and children. The prior forecast incorrectly assumed the same allocation of foregone revenue as for all other OCII debt service; the net General Fund impact of this

correction across the projection period is a \$44 million reduction in property tax revenues.

California Department of Education (CDE) and California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) FY 2025-26 funding level reports published at the end of February 2026, along with revised property tax revenue projections for the schools, resulted in excess ERAF revenues for the City increasing by \$8.6 million in FY 2025-26, and \$8.2 million in FY 2026-27, and decreasing \$3.1 million in FY 2027-28, \$6.7 million in FY 2028-29, and \$7.1 million in FY 2029-30. Excess ERAF can be dramatically affected by changes in local property tax revenue projections and by changes in state law and school funding under Proposition 98. For example, AB 2526, introduced on February 20, 2026, appears to increase special education allocations from ERAF to schools, which would reduce the amount of excess ERAF available to return to the City.

**Business Tax:** In the current fiscal year, FY 2025-26, business tax revenues are expected to exceed the most recent projection in the Six-Month Report by \$42.8 million. In FY 2026-27 business taxes are projected to increase by \$115 million more than the previous projection in the December 2025 Five Year Financial Plan, followed by a \$24.3 million decrease from prior projections in FY 2028-29. This is largely due to timing effects of Proposition M (2024) described in detail below. The report assumes slight improvements to the business tax forecast in FY 2028-29 and FY 2029-30 of \$18.0 million and \$32.2 million, respectively.

Proposition M (2024), first effective for tax year 2025, restructured the City's business taxes by modifying gross receipts calculations and tax rates, increasing the small business exemption, and reorganizing business activity categories. This restructuring created significant uncertainty in the revenue forecast. The filing deadline for 2025 taxes was March 2, 2026, although businesses can file for an extension with a due date of November 30, 2026. To date, an estimated 60% of the City's Gross Receipts tax base has filed. Although full information about Prop M will not be available until after the extension deadline in November 2026, the filings to date provide the first concrete information about the impact of Prop M. Even with the challenges in forecasting revenue with the change to Prop M, actual filed revenue is within approximately 1% of projected revenue.

The previous forecast, however, overestimated the share of the tax base that would file taxes by March 2, which changes the distribution of revenue across fiscal years. Because the tax rates are increasing, taxpayers on average would owe additional taxes when they filed. The forecast assumed that 75% of the tax base would have filed by March 2 and the City would have received the additional taxes with the filings. Since only 60% of the tax base has filed, the City has received less revenue than expected in FY 2025-26. Although this does not affect the total revenue collected over time for a tax year, it does shift revenue collections out of FY 2025-26 and into FY 2026-27. This dynamic, along with other administrative provisions, is the main reason that revenue increases significantly in FY 2026-27 and then decreases in FY 2027-28.

As required by Prop M, the Controller will issue a report by September 1, 2026 with a full discussion of the performance of the new tax system.

Litigation continues to be a factor affecting revenue projections. Several large cases have settled in FY 2025-26, including General Motors, Airbnb, and Microsoft. Because these cases settled for less than what the City held in reserve, the settlements—taken in isolation—increase General Fund revenue by more than \$100 million. The total revenue impact of all litigation, however, must account for other factors. The City has received new gross receipts tax claims, and taxpayers in ongoing matters have expanded their claims to include more tax years. In addition, as explained in previous reports, the current budget reflects the decision to smooth revenue among fiscal years by funding 75% of the estimated liability in FY 2024-25 and the remaining 25% in FY 2025-26, which requires a reserve deposit of more than \$80 million in the current fiscal year. Taken together, the projected reserve for General Fund tax litigation has decreased from \$394 million to \$384 million since the Six-Month Budget Status Report was issued.

- o **Transfer Tax:** The City's real property transfer tax projection grew by \$8.6 million in FY 2025-26 from the Six-Month Report, and \$44.3 million, \$31.4 million, \$17.2 million, and \$1.9 million from the December 2025 Report in FY 2026-27 through FY 2029-30.

Both the prior December 2025 Report and this update project transfer tax revenue to reach approximately \$400 million by FY 2029-30. However, after the historically weak years of FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24, it was unclear if the recovery seen in FY 2024-25 was an outlier or the beginning of a sustained, quick recovery. Based on strong average price, transaction count, and total revenue figures through the first eight months of FY 2025-26, the City is more confident transfer taxes will bounce back from pre-FY 2022-23 levels faster than anticipated in December.

- o **Hotel Tax.** Hotel tax revenues in this projection are higher than the Fall 2025 forecast due to stronger than projected performance in the current year. General Fund Hotel Tax revenue is projected at \$282.8 million in FY 2025-26, \$289.4 million in FY2026-27, \$291.6 million in FY 2027-28, \$300.0 million in FY 2028-29, and \$304.4 million in FY 2029-30. Revenues to date for FY 2025-26 benefitted from strong Moscone Center event attendance and high demand driven by Super Bowl LX, which was held in Santa Clara in early February. Incremental gains in hotel tax revenue after FY 2025-26 are modest, reflecting the absence of large events like the Super Bowl, along with uncertainty about international travel and Moscone Event attendance in later forecast years.

- **Public Health Operating Revenue:** Department of Public Health (DPH) operating revenues, before accounting for recent State and federal policy changes, are expected to increase by \$120.6 million in FY 2026-27, an increase of \$29.5 million from the most recent projection in December 2025. DPH operating revenues are expected to grow by \$51.1 million in FY 2027-28, \$60.8 million in FY 2028-29, and \$26.9 million in FY 2029-30. This is largely due to increased patient revenues at Laguna Honda Hospital and Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital. DPH has identified these increases as part of the current budget process, and the projections align with FY 2025-26 revenues as reported in the recent Controller's Six-Month Report. However, recent policy changes risk offsetting these increases due to new federal policy impacts beginning in FY 2026-27, as outlined in the 'Risks to this Forecast' section below.

- **Use of Reserves:** This update assumes no major changes to the use of reserves from the December 2025 report.

**USES – Baselines and Reserves:** Baseline and reserve costs are projected to increase by \$195.0 million in FY 2026-27, \$8.6 million in FY 2027-28, \$32.8 million in FY 2028-29, and \$6.7 million in FY 2029-30. Compared to the December 2025 report, baseline and reserve spending will increase by \$76.2 million in FY 2026-27. However, these costs will increase less than previously reported in FY 2027-28 through FY 2029-30. This is due to changes in General Fund revenues mentioned above.

- **Baselines:** Most of the City's Charter-mandated baselines (including Municipal Transportation Agency, Library, and the Public Education and Enrichment Fund) are driven by changes in aggregate discretionary revenue (ADR), which typically follows the General Fund revenue projection. Baseline allocations have grown significantly in FY 2026-27, since the last report, following the change in ADR projection. Neither the December 2025 Report nor this Update assume a pause in the growth of any baseline.
- **Deposits to Reserves:** Net increases or decreases in projected General Fund revenues as well as current year spending trigger corresponding changes in General Reserve deposits, which have increased from the December 2025 report. Uses of the General Reserve to fund supplemental appropriations in the current year require equal deposits in the budget year. In the current year to date the Board of Supervisors has approved the use of \$3.5 million of General Reserve for immigrant legal defense, \$0.3 million for parking and transit for Lunar New Year celebrations, and \$4.2 million for street conditions staffing and HRC community initiatives. Additionally, the Six-Month Budget Status Report showed net shortfalls of \$1.2 million at the Public Defender and \$8.5 million at the Sheriff's Department, which may require uses of General Reserve to close. Deposits to the Budget Stabilization Reserve have been updated to reflect current real property transfer tax revenue projections, as 75% of revenue that exceeds the previous five-year average must be deposited. Including the current fiscal year, the total increase in the deposit is \$13.0 million.

**USES – Salaries & Benefits:** Projected salary and benefit costs increase by \$205.7 million in FY 2026-27, \$322.8 million in FY 2027-28, \$160.1 million in FY 2028-29, and \$155.7 million in FY 2029-30. Cumulative salary and benefit costs will decrease compared to the December 2025 report by \$10.8 million in FY 2026-27, \$23.0 million in FY 2027-28, and \$17.3 million in FY 2028-29, largely due to decreases in pension contributions. Costs will increase compared to prior projections by \$15.4 million in FY 2029-30, due to increased projected costs of health benefits and labor contracts due to updated CPI projections.

- **CPI Changes for Labor and Non-Labor Cost Projections:** In years when labor contracts are open, projections continue to assume consumer price index (CPI) increases, which are revised in this update to be 3.35% in FY2026-27, 3.12% in FY 2027-28, 2.94% in FY 2028-29, and 2.86% in FY 2029-30. These changes are based on updates to the average projections of the California Department of Finance SF Area CPI and Moody's SF Metropolitan Statistical Area CPI. CPI assumptions have been updated as follows:

|                      | FY 2026-27 | FY 2027-28 | FY 2028-29 | FY 2029-30 |
|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>December 2025</b> | 3.30%      | 3.04%      | 2.34%      | 2.26%      |
| <b>March 2026</b>    | 3.35%      | 3.12%      | 2.94%      | 2.86%      |
| <b>Difference</b>    | 0.05%      | 0.08%      | 0.60%      | 0.60%      |

- **Retirement Benefits – Employer Contribution Rates:** This projection includes updates to the employer contribution rates for the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS). The decreased costs compared to prior projections are due to an update to the FY 2026-27 employer contribution rate, which decreased from 17.06% in the December 2025 projection, prior to employee cost-sharing, to 16.7%. This decrease in employer contribution rates is mainly the result of the Retirement Board's adoption of a new method of cost amortization of supplemental COLAs in March 2026. The updated method more closely aligns the funding of supplemental COLAs with the investment gains that generated them, using a longer amortization period when asset returns are less than approximately 12% while maintaining a five-year amortization period when asset gains are larger.
- **Health and Dental Benefits for Active Employees and Retired City Employees:** Health costs for active members are higher compared to prior projection due to an increase in projected growth from 9% to 9.5%. This forecast also includes updated health plan enrollments as of February 2026. Key cost increase drivers include policy and regulation shifting cost from government to commercial plans, service price inflation driven by increasing labor costs and high service intensity, specialty prescription and GLP-1 drugs, and high-cost claims. Health costs for retired City employees are also projected to increase slightly throughout the forecast period compared to the prior projections.

**USES – Citywide Operating Costs:** Projected citywide operating costs increase by \$50.2 million in FY 2026-27, \$128.5 million in FY 2027-28, \$61.3 million in FY 2028-29, and \$79.0 million in FY 2029-30. This represents a cumulative increase of \$16.7 million by FY 2029-30 over the previous projection, due to slight decreases to the cost of debt service countered by increases to inflation of multi-year grants.

**USES – Departmental Operating Costs:** Projected departmental costs increase by \$78.5 million in FY 2026-27, \$86.6 million in FY 2027-28, \$123.9 million in FY 2028-29, and \$91.3 million in FY 2029-30. There have been no changes in projected departmental operating costs since the December 2025 report.

## Key Factors that Could Affect the Forecast

Significant uncertainties and outstanding policy choices remain that could affect the City's financial condition over the next five years:

- **Recent forecasts indicate slower GDP growth and elevated levels of uncertainty:** This forecast does not project a recession. In their December 2025 review, the consensus of the Blue Chip panel of economic forecasters was for steady economic growth and a 35% probability that the U.S. will experience a recession by the end of 2026. In 2025 the U.S. experienced strong GDP growth and financial market performance but weak employment growth. Labor supply and demand are now falling in tandem as firms pause due to heightened uncertainty on tariffs and deportations, H-1B visa limitations, threats to Federal Reserve independence, the possibility of an AI stock market correction, and the growing risk of a prolonged oil shock from the US/Israel-Iran war. Concurrent increases in inflation and a weak labor market complicate the Federal Reserve's ability to meet its dual mandate to manage inflation and support employment.



- Impact of Federal funding changes from 2025 H.R. 1:** This report assumes no change from prior projections in the estimated revenue loss from H.R. 1, the federal budget reconciliation bill 1 that was signed into law on July 4, 2025, and includes, among other provisions, the largest set of cuts to Medicaid since inception. H.R. 1 attempts to reduce direct federal funding to hospitals, other health care providers, and State and local governments and create barriers to enrollment to reduce the number of individuals who receive health coverage through Medicaid and other social safety net programs, resulting in reduced reimbursement to service providers. Revenue losses are assumed at \$84.5 million in FY 2026-27, \$221.8 million in FY 2027-28, \$226.0 million in FY 2028-29, and \$204.8 million in FY 2029-30. Projections do not assume the cost of hiring additional staff at the Human Services Agency to process more frequent eligibility redeterminations and review work requirements, or potential state revenue backfill. The Governor's January 2026 budget proposed increasing the State share of CalFresh Administration costs, up to a capped allocation, an increase of \$14.5 million in FY 2026-27 and \$19.3 million annually thereafter, should the state legislature adopt a budget funding this proposal. Significant uncertainty remains about the fiscal impact of H.R. 1 given state and federal implementation decisions yet to be made.
- Fiscal impacts of other federal policy changes:** Since January 20, 2025, the federal administration and federal agencies have sought to eliminate, reduce, or condition federal funding based on policy preferences related to immigration, LGBTQ+ rights, clean energy, and DEI/DEIA activities, among other topics. Federal agencies have terminated, frozen, or conditioned grants and funding that City departments rely on for ongoing programming. The City and other plaintiffs have filed litigation challenging these actions and have successfully obtained court orders blocking many actions. The City Attorney will continue litigating to protect federal funds awarded to or received by the City and will continue to work with the Mayor's Office and City departments to protect the City's interests, but threats to the City's federal funding remain ongoing. The federal government is appealing court losses and implementing new funding cuts and conditions. Given the uncertainty in this area, the Board of Supervisors established the Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve to address significant revenue shortfalls.
- State budget impacts:** The state's FY 2026-27 budget proposal issued in early January included an improved revenue outlook offset by spending increases. The budget assumes strong income tax collections will continue through FY 2026-27 fueled by tech stock exuberance. Despite this growth, both the Governor and the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) anticipate significant ongoing structural deficits exceeding \$20 billion annually, which the proposed budget does not address, and which pose concerns about the sustainability of the state's finances. The growth of structural deficits has led the LAO to issue its most negative forecast of the budget since the pandemic. This report assumes no significant changes in state funding levels.
- Labor negotiations:** This projection assumes approved wage increases in collective bargaining agreements for public safety unions through the end of FY 2025-26, and for all other unions through FY 2026-27. In years with open contracts, the report assumes inflation increases at the average of the California Department of Finance SF Metropolitan Statistical Area CPI and Moody's SF Metropolitan Area CPI. This average CPI has changed since the December 2025 report as noted above. This report does not reflect any contract changes due to ongoing labor negotiations with the Police and Firefighters' union.



- **Retirement contribution rate:** Projections assume the SFERS adopted 7.2% rate of return. FY 2025-26 returns through February 28, 2026, were 8.45%, however, final audited actuarial valuations may vary from the year-to-date return value due to market volatility and the additional time required to get private market valuations. Final results below the 7.2% assumption will result in higher retirement contribution costs during the forecast period.
- **Pending Policy Decisions with Fiscal Impact:** Legislative actions to increase spending, including uses of the General Reserve, without commensurate revenue increases, will increase the shortfalls projected in this report, as will any reductions to tax rates. On February 24, 2026, an ordinance was introduced that would reduce real property transfer tax rates for transactions exceeding \$10 million effective July 1, 2026. The current text of the ordinance would decrease revenue by an estimated \$93.8 million in FY 2026-27, \$96.4 million in FY 2027-28, \$98.8 million in FY 2028-29, and \$101.2 million in FY 2029-30.
- **Ballot measures:** Voters may approve measures in the future that could materially affect the City's financial outlook. At the time of publication, two initiative measures that would modify aspects of the City's gross receipts and overpaid executive taxes have been qualified to appear on the June 2, 2026 ballot. Measure D would increase the overpaid executive tax while Measure C would increase the small business tax exemption and accelerate currently scheduled increases in the overpaid executive tax rates. If both measures receive a majority vote, only the measure with the highest number of votes will be enacted. Neither measure would affect business tax revenue until FY 2027-28 and neither are included in this forecast.

## Conclusion

Given net improvement in local revenues, this update projects a lower General Fund deficit over the next five fiscal years compared to the December 2025 report. Yet the City's significant structural deficits remain, and the projected shortfall will be over \$1 billion by FY 2029-30 absent corrective action. At the same time, state and local governments across the country face heightened policy and revenue uncertainty at the federal level and economic risk from inflation, uncertainty on tariffs and deportations, H-1B visa limitations, threats to Federal Reserve independence, the possibility of an AI stock market correction, and the growing risk of a prolonged oil shock from the US/Israel-Iran war.

## Appendix A: Updated Base Case – General Fund-Supported Sources & Uses FY 2027-30 – INCREMENTAL CHANGE (\$ in millions)

This appendix provides an updated version of Table 2A from the December Five-Year Financial Plan.

| SOURCES Increase/(Decrease)        |                                                               | Change from<br>AAO Budget<br>2026-27 | Projection<br>2026-27 | Projection<br>2027-28 | Projection<br>2028-29 | Projection<br>2029-30 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Fund Balance &amp; Reserves</b> |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 1                                  | Use of Fund Balance - Gain/(Loss)                             | (229.6)                              | (152.7)               | 449.6                 | (224.8)               | (224.8)               |
| 2                                  | Reserves - Use                                                | -                                    | 44.8                  | (70.9)                | -                     | -                     |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Fund Balance &amp; Reserves</b>                   | <b>(229.6)</b>                       | <b>(107.9)</b>        | <b>378.7</b>          | <b>(224.8)</b>        | <b>(224.8)</b>        |
| <b>Revenues</b>                    |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 3                                  | General Fund Taxes, Revenues and Transfers net of items below | 281.7                                | 564.8                 | (60.0)                | 276.3                 | 160.2                 |
| 4                                  | FEMA Revenue                                                  | (1.7)                                | (87.0)                | -                     | -                     | -                     |
| 5                                  | Public Health - One-time Revenues                             | (4.0)                                | (49.6)                | -                     | -                     | -                     |
| 6                                  | Public Health - Operating Revenues                            | 24.2                                 | 120.6                 | 51.1                  | 60.9                  | 26.9                  |
| 7                                  | Federal Policy Impacts                                        | (84.5)                               | (84.5)                | (137.2)               | (4.2)                 | 21.2                  |
| 8                                  | Other General Fund Support                                    | (3.2)                                | 4.6                   | 8.1                   | 2.4                   | 2.4                   |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Revenues</b>                                      | <b>212.5</b>                         | <b>468.8</b>          | <b>(138.0)</b>        | <b>335.4</b>          | <b>210.6</b>          |
|                                    | <b>TOTAL CHANGES TO SOURCES</b>                               | <b>(17.1)</b>                        | <b>360.9</b>          | <b>240.6</b>          | <b>110.6</b>          | <b>(14.1)</b>         |
| <b>USES Decrease/(Increase)</b>    |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| <b>Baselines &amp; Reserves</b>    |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 9                                  | Contributions to Baselines                                    | (66.8)                               | (142.5)               | 2.2                   | (59.2)                | (32.0)                |
| 10                                 | Contributions to Reserves                                     | (26.6)                               | (52.4)                | (10.8)                | 26.4                  | 25.3                  |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Baselines and Reserves</b>                        | <b>(93.4)</b>                        | <b>(195.0)</b>        | <b>(8.6)</b>          | <b>(32.8)</b>         | <b>(6.7)</b>          |
| <b>Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>     |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 11                                 | Previously Negotiated Closed Labor Agreements                 | 0.4                                  | (121.4)               | (147.1)               | -                     | -                     |
| 12                                 | Projected Costs of Open Labor Agreements                      | (6.0)                                | (27.2)                | (114.2)               | (90.7)                | (123.8)               |
| 13                                 | Health & Dental Benefits - Current & Retired Employees        | (7.8)                                | (50.0)                | (54.6)                | (60.5)                | (66.4)                |
| 14                                 | Retirement Benefits - Employer Contribution Rates             | (18.4)                               | (15.7)                | (3.4)                 | (12.9)                | 35.5                  |
| 15                                 | Other Salaries and Benefits Savings/(Costs)                   | (4.4)                                | 8.6                   | (3.5)                 | 4.0                   | (1.0)                 |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>                       | <b>(36.2)</b>                        | <b>(205.7)</b>        | <b>(322.8)</b>        | <b>(160.1)</b>        | <b>(155.7)</b>        |
| <b>Citywide Operating Costs</b>    |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 16                                 | Capital, Equipment, & Technology                              | (1.1)                                | 32.1                  | (33.0)                | (29.9)                | (30.6)                |
| 17                                 | Multiyear Inflation on Nonprofit Grants                       | -                                    | (24.1)                | (25.5)                | (26.2)                | (27.0)                |
| 18                                 | Minimum Compensation Ordinance                                | (0.4)                                | (2.7)                 | (3.1)                 | (2.9)                 | (2.6)                 |
| 19                                 | Debt Service & Real Estate                                    | (10.0)                               | (45.7)                | (51.6)                | 12.5                  | (4.0)                 |
| 20                                 | Sewer, Water, and Power Rates                                 | 0.2                                  | (5.1)                 | (6.3)                 | (6.2)                 | (5.7)                 |
| 21                                 | Workers' Compensation Claims                                  | -                                    | 1.1                   | (2.5)                 | (2.0)                 | (2.0)                 |
| 22                                 | Citywide Technology Operating Costs                           | 1.0                                  | (4.1)                 | (4.1)                 | (3.9)                 | (4.0)                 |
| 23                                 | Other Citywide Costs                                          | (0.5)                                | (1.7)                 | (2.4)                 | (2.7)                 | (3.1)                 |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Citywide Operating Costs</b>                      | <b>(10.8)</b>                        | <b>(50.2)</b>         | <b>(128.5)</b>        | <b>(61.3)</b>         | <b>(79.0)</b>         |
| <b>Departmental Costs</b>          |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 24                                 | City Administrator's Office - Convention Facilities Subsidy   | 1.8                                  | (3.8)                 | (2.1)                 | (3.9)                 | (0.5)                 |
| 25                                 | Elections - Number of Scheduled Elections                     | 0.0                                  | (0.4)                 | (1.2)                 | (2.5)                 | 2.2                   |
| 26                                 | Ethics Commission - Public Financing of Elections             | (0.7)                                | (3.0)                 | 0.2                   | (2.7)                 | 4.2                   |
| 27                                 | Affordable & Permanent Supportive Housing Project Costs       | (1.3)                                | (8.1)                 | (8.0)                 | (5.2)                 | (9.8)                 |
| 28                                 | Homelessness - Expiring Grants for Shelters                   | -                                    | -                     | (17.8)                | (36.3)                | (1.6)                 |
| 29                                 | Human Services Agency - IHSS and Other Benefit Costs          | 1.6                                  | (18.1)                | (22.7)                | (29.7)                | (38.2)                |
| 30                                 | Public Health - Operating Costs                               | (7.1)                                | (50.8)                | (38.1)                | (41.2)                | (44.8)                |
| 31                                 | Downtown Recovery and Activation                              | -                                    | 2.7                   | -                     | -                     | -                     |
| 32                                 | Major Departmental Savings from FY 2025-26/FY 2026-27         | -                                    | 18.1                  | -                     | -                     | -                     |
| 33                                 | All Other Departmental Savings / (Costs)                      | (5.2)                                | (15.2)                | 3.1                   | (2.3)                 | (2.8)                 |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Departmental Costs</b>                            | <b>(11.0)</b>                        | <b>(78.5)</b>         | <b>(86.6)</b>         | <b>(123.9)</b>        | <b>(91.3)</b>         |
|                                    | <b>TOTAL CHANGES TO USES</b>                                  | <b>(151.4)</b>                       | <b>(529.4)</b>        | <b>(546.5)</b>        | <b>(378.0)</b>        | <b>(332.7)</b>        |
|                                    | <b>Projected Surplus/(Shortfall) vs. Prior Year</b>           | <b>(168.5)</b>                       | <b>(168.5)</b>        | <b>(305.8)</b>        | <b>(267.4)</b>        | <b>(346.8)</b>        |
|                                    | <b>Annual Projected Surplus/(Shortfall)</b>                   | <b>(168.5)</b>                       | <b>(168.5)</b>        | <b>(474.3)</b>        | <b>(741.7)</b>        | <b>(1,088.6)</b>      |
|                                    | <b>Two-Year Surplus/(Shortfall)</b>                           |                                      | <b>(642.8)</b>        |                       |                       |                       |

## Appendix B: Updated Base Case – General Fund-Supported Sources & Uses FY 2027-30 – CUMULATIVE CHANGE (\$ in millions)

This appendix provides an updated version of Table 2B from the December Five-Year Financial Plan.

| SOURCES Increase/(Decrease)        |                                                               | Change from<br>AAO Budget<br>2026-27 | Projection<br>2026-27 | Projection<br>2027-28 | Projection<br>2028-29 | Projection<br>2029-30 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Fund Balance &amp; Reserves</b> |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 1                                  | Use of Fund Balance - Gain/(Loss)                             | (229.6)                              | (152.7)               | 296.8                 | 72.0                  | (152.7)               |
| 2                                  | Reserves - Use                                                | -                                    | 44.8                  | (26.1)                | (26.1)                | (26.1)                |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Fund Balance &amp; Reserves</b>                   | <b>(229.6)</b>                       | <b>(107.9)</b>        | <b>270.8</b>          | <b>46.0</b>           | <b>(178.8)</b>        |
| <b>Revenues</b>                    |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 3                                  | General Fund Taxes, Revenues and Transfers net of items below | 281.7                                | 564.8                 | 504.8                 | 781.1                 | 941.3                 |
| 4                                  | FEMA Revenue                                                  | (1.7)                                | (87.0)                | (87.0)                | (87.0)                | (87.0)                |
| 5                                  | Public Health - One-time Revenues                             | (4.0)                                | (49.6)                | (49.6)                | (49.6)                | (49.6)                |
| 6                                  | Public Health - Operating Revenues                            | 24.2                                 | 120.6                 | 171.7                 | 232.6                 | 259.5                 |
| 7                                  | Federal Policy Impacts                                        | (84.5)                               | (84.5)                | (221.8)               | (226.0)               | (204.8)               |
| 8                                  | Other General Fund Support                                    | (3.2)                                | 4.6                   | 12.6                  | 15.1                  | 17.4                  |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Revenues</b>                                      | <b>212.5</b>                         | <b>468.8</b>          | <b>330.8</b>          | <b>666.2</b>          | <b>876.8</b>          |
|                                    | <b>TOTAL CHANGES TO SOURCES</b>                               | <b>(17.1)</b>                        | <b>360.9</b>          | <b>601.5</b>          | <b>712.1</b>          | <b>698.0</b>          |
| <b>USES Decrease/(Increase)</b>    |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| <b>Baselines &amp; Reserves</b>    |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 8                                  | Contributions to Baselines                                    | (66.8)                               | (142.5)               | (140.3)               | (199.5)               | (231.6)               |
| 9                                  | Contributions to Reserves                                     | (26.6)                               | (52.4)                | (63.3)                | (36.8)                | (11.5)                |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Baselines and Reserves</b>                        | <b>(93.4)</b>                        | <b>(195.0)</b>        | <b>(203.6)</b>        | <b>(236.4)</b>        | <b>(243.1)</b>        |
| <b>Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>     |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 10                                 | Previously Negotiated Closed Labor Agreements                 | 0.4                                  | (121.4)               | (268.5)               | (268.5)               | (268.5)               |
| 11                                 | Projected Costs of Open Labor Agreements                      | (6.0)                                | (27.2)                | (141.4)               | (232.1)               | (355.9)               |
| 12                                 | Health & Dental Benefits - Current & Retired Employees        | (7.8)                                | (50.0)                | (104.6)               | (165.1)               | (231.5)               |
| 13                                 | Retirement Benefits - Employer Contribution Rates             | (18.4)                               | (15.7)                | (19.1)                | (32.0)                | 3.5                   |
| 14                                 | Other Salaries and Benefits Savings/(Costs)                   | (4.4)                                | 8.6                   | 5.1                   | 9.1                   | 8.1                   |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>                       | <b>(36.2)</b>                        | <b>(205.7)</b>        | <b>(528.5)</b>        | <b>(688.6)</b>        | <b>(844.3)</b>        |
| <b>Citywide Operating Costs</b>    |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 15                                 | Capital, Equipment, & Technology                              | (1.1)                                | 32.1                  | (0.8)                 | (30.7)                | (61.3)                |
| 16                                 | Multiyear Inflation on Nonprofit Grants                       | -                                    | (24.1)                | (49.6)                | (75.8)                | (102.8)               |
| 17                                 | Minimum Compensation Ordinance                                | (0.4)                                | (2.7)                 | (5.8)                 | (8.7)                 | (11.3)                |
| 19                                 | Debt Service & Real Estate                                    | (10.0)                               | (45.7)                | (97.3)                | (84.9)                | (88.8)                |
| 20                                 | Sewer, Water, and Power Rates                                 | 0.2                                  | (5.1)                 | (11.3)                | (17.6)                | (23.3)                |
| 21                                 | Workers' Compensation Claims                                  | -                                    | 1.1                   | (1.4)                 | (3.4)                 | (5.3)                 |
| 22                                 | Citywide Technology Operating Costs                           | 1.0                                  | (4.1)                 | (8.2)                 | (12.1)                | (16.1)                |
| 23                                 | Other Citywide Costs                                          | (0.5)                                | (1.7)                 | (4.1)                 | (6.8)                 | (9.8)                 |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Citywide Operating Costs</b>                      | <b>(10.8)</b>                        | <b>(50.2)</b>         | <b>(178.6)</b>        | <b>(239.9)</b>        | <b>(318.9)</b>        |
| <b>Departmental Costs</b>          |                                                               |                                      |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| 24                                 | City Administrator's Office - Convention Facilities Subsidy   | 1.8                                  | (3.8)                 | (5.9)                 | (9.8)                 | (10.3)                |
| 25                                 | Elections - Number of Scheduled Elections                     | 0.0                                  | (0.4)                 | (1.6)                 | (4.2)                 | (2.0)                 |
| 26                                 | Ethics Commission - Public Financing of Elections             | (0.7)                                | (3.0)                 | (2.7)                 | (5.5)                 | (1.3)                 |
| 27                                 | Affordable & Permanent Supportive Housing Project Costs       | (1.3)                                | (8.1)                 | (16.0)                | (21.2)                | (31.0)                |
| 28                                 | Homelessness - Expiring Grants for Shelters                   | -                                    | -                     | (17.8)                | (54.1)                | (55.7)                |
| 29                                 | Human Services Agency - IHSS and Other Benefit Costs          | 1.6                                  | (18.1)                | (40.8)                | (70.5)                | (108.7)               |
| 30                                 | Public Health - Operating Costs                               | (7.1)                                | (50.8)                | (88.9)                | (130.1)               | (174.9)               |
| 31                                 | Downtown Recovery and Activation                              | -                                    | 2.7                   | 2.7                   | 2.7                   | 2.7                   |
| 32                                 | Major Departmental Savings from FY 2025-26/FY 2026-27         | -                                    | 18.1                  | 18.1                  | 18.1                  | 18.1                  |
| 33                                 | All Other Departmental Savings / (Costs)                      | (5.2)                                | (15.2)                | (12.1)                | (14.4)                | (17.2)                |
|                                    | <b>Subtotal Departmental Costs</b>                            | <b>(11.0)</b>                        | <b>(78.5)</b>         | <b>(165.1)</b>        | <b>(289.0)</b>        | <b>(380.3)</b>        |
|                                    | <b>TOTAL CHANGES TO USES</b>                                  | <b>(151.4)</b>                       | <b>(529.4)</b>        | <b>(1,075.8)</b>      | <b>(1,453.9)</b>      | <b>(1,786.6)</b>      |
|                                    | <b>Annual Projected Surplus/(Shortfall)</b>                   | <b>(168.5)</b>                       | <b>(168.5)</b>        | <b>(474.3)</b>        | <b>(741.7)</b>        | <b>(1,088.6)</b>      |
|                                    | <b>Two-Year Surplus/(Shortfall)</b>                           |                                      | <b>(642.8)</b>        |                       |                       |                       |

### Appendix C: Updated Base Case – Cumulative Changes to General Fund-Supported Sources & Uses FY 2027-30 Since the December 2025 Five-Year Financial Plan – (\$ in millions)

This appendix shows the changes to Table 2B from the December Five-Year Financial Plan.

|                                                       |                                                               | Projection     | Projection     | Projection     | Projection     |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>SOURCES Increase/(Decrease)</b>                    |                                                               | <b>2026-27</b> | <b>2027-28</b> | <b>2028-29</b> | <b>2029-30</b> |
| <b>Fund Balance &amp; Reserves</b>                    |                                                               |                |                |                |                |
| 1                                                     | Use of Fund Balance - Gain/(Loss)                             | -              | 99.4           | 49.7           | -              |
| 2                                                     | Reserves - Use                                                | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| <b>Subtotal Fund Balance &amp; Reserves</b>           |                                                               | <b>-</b>       | <b>99.4</b>    | <b>49.7</b>    | <b>-</b>       |
| <b>Revenues</b>                                       |                                                               |                |                |                |                |
| 3                                                     | General Fund Taxes, Revenues and Transfers net of items below | 173.7          | (13.9)         | 8.0            | 1.4            |
| 4                                                     | FEMA Revenue                                                  | (1.7)          | (1.7)          | -              | -              |
| 5                                                     | Public Health - One-time Revenues                             | (8.5)          | (8.5)          | (8.5)          | (8.5)          |
| 6                                                     | Public Health - Operating Revenues                            | 29.5           | 50.2           | 85.9           | 87.9           |
| 7                                                     | Federal Policy Impacts                                        | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 8                                                     | Other General Fund Support                                    | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| <b>Subtotal Revenues</b>                              |                                                               | <b>193.0</b>   | <b>26.1</b>    | <b>85.4</b>    | <b>80.8</b>    |
| <b>TOTAL CHANGES TO SOURCES</b>                       |                                                               | <b>193.0</b>   | <b>125.6</b>   | <b>135.1</b>   | <b>80.8</b>    |
| <b>USES Decrease/(Increase)</b>                       |                                                               |                |                |                |                |
| <b>Baselines &amp; Reserves</b>                       |                                                               |                |                |                |                |
| 9                                                     | Contributions to Baselines                                    | (40.2)         | 11.8           | 3.1            | 7.8            |
| 10                                                    | Contributions to Reserves                                     | (36.0)         | 4.8            | 19.5           | 23.4           |
| <b>Subtotal Baselines and Reserves</b>                |                                                               | <b>(76.2)</b>  | <b>16.6</b>    | <b>22.6</b>    | <b>31.2</b>    |
| <b>Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>                        |                                                               |                |                |                |                |
| 11                                                    | Previously Negotiated Closed Labor Agreements                 | 0.4            | (0.4)          | (0.4)          | (0.4)          |
| 12                                                    | Projected Costs of Open Labor Agreements                      | (0.3)          | (0.8)          | (25.1)         | (50.2)         |
| 13                                                    | Health & Dental Benefits - Current & Retired Employees        | 1.4            | (0.9)          | (3.7)          | (6.9)          |
| 14                                                    | Retirement Benefits - Employer Contribution Rates             | 9.3            | 25.1           | 46.7           | 42.5           |
| 15                                                    | Other Salaries and Benefits Savings/(Costs)                   | -              | -              | (0.2)          | (0.4)          |
| <b>Subtotal Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>               |                                                               | <b>10.8</b>    | <b>23.0</b>    | <b>17.3</b>    | <b>(15.4)</b>  |
| <b>Citywide Operating Costs</b>                       |                                                               |                |                |                |                |
| 16                                                    | Capital, Equipment, & Technology                              | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 17                                                    | Multiyear Inflation on Nonprofit Grants                       | -              | -              | (8.7)          | (17.9)         |
| 18                                                    | Minimum Compensation Ordinance                                | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 19                                                    | Debt Service & Real Estate                                    | 0.2            | 0.8            | 1.2            | 1.2            |
| 20                                                    | Sewer, Water, and Power Rates                                 | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 21                                                    | Workers' Compensation Claims                                  | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 22                                                    | Citywide Technology Operating Costs                           | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 23                                                    | Other Citywide Costs                                          | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| <b>Subtotal Citywide Operating Costs</b>              |                                                               | <b>0.2</b>     | <b>0.8</b>     | <b>(7.5)</b>   | <b>(16.7)</b>  |
| <b>Departmental Costs</b>                             |                                                               |                |                |                |                |
| 24                                                    | City Administrator's Office - Convention Facilities Subsidy   | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 25                                                    | Elections - Number of Scheduled Elections                     | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 26                                                    | Ethics Commission - Public Financing of Elections             | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 27                                                    | Affordable & Permanent Supportive Housing Project Costs       | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 28                                                    | Homelessness - Expiring Grants for Shelters                   | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 29                                                    | Human Services Agency - IHSS and Other Benefit Costs          | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 30                                                    | Public Health - Operating Costs                               | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 31                                                    | Downtown Recovery and Activation                              | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 32                                                    | Major Departmental Savings from FY 2025-26/FY 2026-27         | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| 33                                                    | All Other Departmental Savings / (Costs)                      | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| <b>Subtotal Departmental Costs</b>                    |                                                               | <b>-</b>       | <b>-</b>       | <b>-</b>       | <b>-</b>       |
| <b>TOTAL CHANGES TO USES</b>                          |                                                               | <b>(65.2)</b>  | <b>40.4</b>    | <b>32.4</b>    | <b>(0.9)</b>   |
| <b>Change in Annual Projected Surplus/(Shortfall)</b> |                                                               | <b>127.8</b>   | <b>166.0</b>   | <b>167.6</b>   | <b>79.9</b>    |
| <b>Change in Two-Year Surplus/(Shortfall)</b>         |                                                               | <b>293.8</b>   |                |                |                |

## Appendix D: Updated Summary of Projected General Fund Operating Revenues and Transfers in FY 2024-25 through FY 2029-30 (\$ in millions)

This appendix provides an updated version of Table 5 from the December Five-Year Financial Plan.

|                                           | FY 2024-25     | FY 2025-26      | FY 2025-26     | FY 2026-27     | FY 2027-28     | FY 2028-29     | FY 2029-30     |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                           | Year-End       | Original Budget | Projection     | Projection     | Projection     | Projection     | Projection     |
| Property Taxes                            | \$ 2,485.1     | \$ 2,437.0      | \$ 2,451.0     | \$ 2,403.0     | \$ 2,407.0     | \$ 2,465.0     | \$ 2,533.0     |
| Business Taxes                            | 1,120.4        | 1,139.6         | 1,337.6        | 1,572.2        | 1,477.7        | 1,653.0        | 1,708.2        |
| Sales Tax                                 | 188.3          | 189.5           | 201.0          | 201.8          | 207.8          | 215.3          | 222.5          |
| Hotel Room Tax                            | 255.3          | 265.2           | 282.8          | 289.4          | 291.6          | 300.0          | 304.4          |
| Utility Users Tax                         | 111.8          | 116.4           | 120.1          | 124.1          | 128.0          | 131.7          | 135.5          |
| Parking Tax                               | 81.3           | 88.8            | 83.5           | 83.5           | 83.5           | 83.5           | 83.5           |
| Real Property Transfer Tax                | 294.4          | 267.6           | 345.3          | 358.8          | 370.4          | 381.5          | 392.5          |
| Sugar Sweetened Beverage Tax              | 11.4           | 11.6            | 11.4           | 11.4           | 11.4           | 11.4           | 11.4           |
| Stadium Admission Tax                     | 8.9            | 8.6             | 9.9            | 9.9            | 9.9            | 9.9            | 9.9            |
| Access Line Tax                           | 58.1           | 54.5            | 80.0           | 60.7           | 61.1           | 62.3           | 63.4           |
| Cannabis Tax                              | -              | -               | -              | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| <b>Local Tax Revenues</b>                 | <b>4,615.0</b> | <b>4,578.8</b>  | <b>4,922.6</b> | <b>5,114.7</b> | <b>5,048.4</b> | <b>5,313.7</b> | <b>5,464.3</b> |
| Licenses, Permits & Franchises            | 33.9           | 23.1            | 24.2           | 24.6           | 24.6           | 24.6           | 24.6           |
| Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties            | 5.3            | 6.0             | 4.8            | 3.6            | 3.6            | 3.6            | 3.6            |
| Interest & Investment Income              | 171.1          | 151.9           | 175.0          | 164.8          | 153.4          | 144.3          | 135.3          |
| Rents & Concessions                       | 15.8           | 18.5            | 18.7           | 25.3           | 25.3           | 25.3           | 25.3           |
| <b>Licenses, Fines, Interest, Rent</b>    | <b>226.0</b>   | <b>199.5</b>    | <b>222.7</b>   | <b>218.3</b>   | <b>206.9</b>   | <b>197.8</b>   | <b>188.8</b>   |
| Social Service Subventions                | 326.2          | 370.1           | 385.4          | 381.6          | 381.6          | 381.6          | 381.6          |
| Disaster Relief - FEMA                    | 73.9           | 87.0            | 3.7            | -              | -              | -              | -              |
| Other Grants & Subventions                | (5.8)          | 2.1             | 2.1            | 2.6            | 2.6            | 2.6            | 2.6            |
| <b>Federal Subventions</b>                | <b>394.2</b>   | <b>459.1</b>    | <b>391.2</b>   | <b>384.1</b>   | <b>384.1</b>   | <b>384.1</b>   | <b>384.1</b>   |
| Social Service Subventions                | 271.7          | 331.2           | 335.1          | 340.3          | 340.3          | 340.3          | 340.3          |
| Health & Welfare Realignment - Sales Tax  | 246.4          | 231.2           | 236.3          | 239.7          | 249.3          | 260.0          | 270.9          |
| Health & Welfare Realignment - VLF        | 61.1           | 41.5            | 42.3           | 43.0           | 43.6           | 44.4           | 44.5           |
| Health & Welfare Realignment - CalWORKs M | 12.6           | 23.5            | 23.5           | 24.3           | 24.3           | 24.3           | 24.3           |
| Health/Mental Health Subventions          | 159.9          | 117.5           | 117.5          | 122.5          | 122.5          | 122.5          | 122.5          |
| Public Safety Sales Tax                   | 96.1           | 97.2            | 96.3           | 101.2          | 104.2          | 107.4          | 110.7          |
| Motor Vehicle In-Lieu (County & City)     | 2.5            | 1.1             | 1.1            | 1.1            | 1.1            | 1.1            | 1.1            |
| Public Safety Realignment (AB109)         | 52.2           | 53.5            | 53.1           | 54.6           | 56.2           | 58.1           | 60.2           |
| Other Grants & Subventions                | 120.7          | 13.5            | 27.6           | 13.5           | 13.5           | 13.5           | 13.5           |
| <b>State Subventions</b>                  | <b>1,023.4</b> | <b>910.3</b>    | <b>932.8</b>   | <b>940.2</b>   | <b>955.0</b>   | <b>971.7</b>   | <b>988.0</b>   |
| <b>Charges for Services</b>               | <b>354.5</b>   | <b>382.9</b>    | <b>448.0</b>   | <b>386.9</b>   | <b>386.9</b>   | <b>386.9</b>   | <b>386.9</b>   |
| <b>Recovery of General Gov't Costs</b>    | <b>27.7</b>    | <b>22.3</b>     | <b>22.3</b>    | <b>22.3</b>    | <b>22.3</b>    | <b>22.3</b>    | <b>22.3</b>    |
| <b>Other Revenues</b>                     | <b>13.8</b>    | <b>22.3</b>     | <b>15.6</b>    | <b>22.8</b>    | <b>22.8</b>    | <b>22.8</b>    | <b>22.8</b>    |
| <b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>                     | <b>6,654.7</b> | <b>6,575.3</b>  | <b>6,955.1</b> | <b>7,089.3</b> | <b>7,026.5</b> | <b>7,299.3</b> | <b>7,457.2</b> |
| <b>Transfers in to General Fund</b>       |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |
| Airport                                   | 58.5           | 61.3            | 59.9           | 60.8           | 63.6           | 67.4           | 71.4           |
| Commercial Rent Tax Transfer In           | 26.7           | 27.7            | 26.4           | 26.0           | 25.3           | 23.9           | 22.0           |
| Other Transfers                           | 208.9          | 169.6           | 170.8          | 187.7          | 187.7          | 187.7          | 187.7          |
| <b>Total Transfers-In</b>                 | <b>294.0</b>   | <b>258.5</b>    | <b>257.1</b>   | <b>274.5</b>   | <b>276.6</b>   | <b>279.0</b>   | <b>281.1</b>   |
| <b>TOTAL GF Revenues and Transfers-In</b> | <b>6,948.7</b> | <b>6,833.8</b>  | <b>7,212.2</b> | <b>7,363.8</b> | <b>7,303.1</b> | <b>7,578.3</b> | <b>7,738.3</b> |

## Appendix E: Projected Baselines, Set-Asides, Special Purpose Taxes, and Other Mandated Costs, FY 2026-27 through FY 2029-30 (\$ Millions)

This appendix provides an updated version of Table 5A from the December Five-Year Financial Plan.

|                                                                                    | FY 2024-25<br>Actuals | FY 2025-26<br>Budget | FY 2025-26<br>Projection | FY 2026-27<br>Projection | FY 2027-28<br>Projection | FY 2028-29<br>Projection | FY 2029-30<br>Projection |   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <b>General Fund Aggregate Discretionary Revenue (ADR)</b>                          |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
|                                                                                    | <b>4,726.8</b>        | <b>4,660.0</b>       | <b>5,085.1</b>           | <b>5,277.1</b>           | <b>5,203.0</b>           | <b>5,456.7</b>           | <b>5,600.7</b>           |   |
| <b>1 MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY</b>                                           |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Municipal Railway Baseline - 7.0675% ADR - GF Transfer                             | 334.1                 | 329.4                | 359.4                    | 373.0                    | 367.7                    | 385.7                    | 395.8                    | * |
| Parking & Traffic Baseline - 2.5070% ADR - GF Transfer                             | 118.5                 | 116.8                | 127.5                    | 132.3                    | 130.4                    | 136.8                    | 140.4                    | * |
| Population Adjustment - GF Transfer                                                | 89.4                  | 90.5                 | 89.8                     | 90.2                     | 90.8                     | 92.2                     | 93.5                     | * |
| Parking Tax In-Lieu - 80% Parking Tax - GF Transfer                                | 65.0                  | 71.0                 | 66.8                     | 66.8                     | 66.8                     | 66.8                     | 66.8                     | * |
| Traffic Congestion Mitigation Fund - Special Tax (50%)                             | 9.5                   | 10.0                 | 10.0                     | 10.0                     | 10.0                     | 10.0                     | 10.0                     |   |
| <b>Subtotal Municipal Transportation Agency</b>                                    | <b>616.5</b>          | <b>617.7</b>         | <b>653.5</b>             | <b>672.2</b>             | <b>665.8</b>             | <b>691.4</b>             | <b>706.6</b>             |   |
| <b>2 LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND</b>                                                 |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Library Preservation Fund Baseline - 2.2858% ADR - GF Transfer                     | 108.1                 | 106.5                | 116.2                    | 120.6                    | 118.9                    | 124.7                    | 128.0                    | * |
| Library Preservation Fund Property Tax - \$0.025 per \$100 NAV                     | 76.6                  | 79.3                 | 77.8                     | 76.4                     | 76.7                     | 78.6                     | 80.8                     |   |
| <b>Subtotal Library</b>                                                            | <b>184.6</b>          | <b>185.9</b>         | <b>194.0</b>             | <b>197.0</b>             | <b>195.6</b>             | <b>203.4</b>             | <b>208.8</b>             |   |
| <b>3 RECREATION &amp; PARKS</b>                                                    |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Open Space Property Tax - \$0.025 per \$100 NAV                                    | 76.6                  | 79.3                 | 77.8                     | 76.4                     | 76.7                     | 78.6                     | 80.8                     |   |
| Recreation & Parks Baseline MOE Required GF Support                                | 85.2                  | 88.2                 | 88.2                     | 91.5                     | 90.2                     | 94.6                     | 97.1                     | * |
| <b>Subtotal Recreation and Park</b>                                                | <b>161.7</b>          | <b>167.5</b>         | <b>166.0</b>             | <b>167.9</b>             | <b>166.9</b>             | <b>173.2</b>             | <b>177.9</b>             |   |
| <b>CHILDREN'S SERVICES</b>                                                         |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| <b>4 Children &amp; Youth Fund</b>                                                 |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Property Tax - \$0.04 per \$100 NAV                                                | 123.3                 | 126.9                | 124.9                    | 122.3                    | 122.7                    | 125.8                    | 129.3                    |   |
| Children's Services Baseline Requirement - 4.8296% ADR                             | 228.3                 | 225.1                | 245.6                    | 254.9                    | 251.3                    | 263.5                    | 270.5                    | * |
| Transitional Aged Youth Baseline Requirement - 0.5800% ADR                         | 27.4                  | 27.0                 | 29.5                     | 30.6                     | 30.2                     | 31.7                     | 32.5                     | * |
| <b>5 Babies &amp; Families First Fund</b>                                          |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Commercial Rents Tax (85%)                                                         | 152.7                 | 156.7                | 149.6                    | 147.5                    | 143.3                    | 135.5                    | 124.9                    |   |
| Early Care and Education Baseline Requirement                                      | 93.8                  | 93.8                 | 93.8                     | 97.3                     | 96.0                     | 100.7                    | 103.3                    | * |
| <b>6 Public Education Enrichment Fund - 3.0567% ADR</b>                            |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Public Education Enrichment Fund Total - GF Transfer                               | 144.5                 | 142.5                | 155.4                    | 161.3                    | 159.1                    | 166.8                    | 171.2                    | * |
| 1/3 Annual Contribution to Preschool for All                                       | 48.2                  | 47.5                 | 51.8                     | 53.8                     | 53.0                     | 55.6                     | 57.1                     |   |
| 2/3 Annual Contribution to SFUSD                                                   | 96.3                  | 95.0                 | 103.6                    | 107.5                    | 106.0                    | 111.2                    | 114.1                    |   |
| Public Education Services Baseline - 0.2898% ADR - GF (50%) and CYF (50%) Transfer | 13.7                  | 13.5                 | 14.7                     | 15.3                     | 15.1                     | 15.8                     | 16.2                     | * |
| <b>7 Student Success Fund (SFUSD) - GF Transfer</b>                                | 35.0                  | 35.0                 | 35.0                     | 45.0                     | 60.0                     | 62.9                     | 64.6                     | * |
| <b>8 Fair Wages for Educators Fund (SFUSD) - Parcel Tax</b>                        | 53.9                  | 54.0                 | 55.6                     | 57.3                     | 59.0                     | 60.8                     | 62.6                     |   |
| <b>Subtotal Children and Youth Services</b>                                        | <b>872.5</b>          | <b>874.5</b>         | <b>904.2</b>             | <b>931.5</b>             | <b>936.6</b>             | <b>963.4</b>             | <b>975.1</b>             |   |
| <b>HOMELESSNESS &amp; HOUSING</b>                                                  |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| <b>9 Our City, Our Home Fund</b>                                                   |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax                                                    | 296.0                 | 335.9                | 434.0                    | 465.0                    | 445.0                    | 469.0                    | 493.0                    |   |
| Our City, Our Home Baseline Requirement                                            | 215.0                 | 215.0                | 215.0                    | 215.0                    | 215.0                    | 215.0                    | 215.0                    |   |
| <b>10 Housing Trust Fund - GF Transfer</b>                                         | 47.3                  | 48.8                 | 51.7                     | 53.8                     | 53.0                     | 59.3                     | 60.8                     | * |
| <b>11 Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund - GF Transfer</b>                        | -                     | -                    | -                        | 8.3                      | 8.1                      | 8.4                      | 8.6                      | * |
| <b>12 Housing Activation Fund - Empty Homes Tax</b>                                | -                     | -                    | -                        | -                        | -                        | -                        | -                        |   |
| <b>Subtotal Homelessness and Housing</b>                                           | <b>558.3</b>          | <b>599.7</b>         | <b>700.7</b>             | <b>742.0</b>             | <b>721.1</b>             | <b>751.7</b>             | <b>777.4</b>             |   |
| <b>ARTS</b>                                                                        |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Hotel Tax for Arts Fund - Hotel Tax                                                | 32.0                  | 33.0                 | 35.2                     | 36.0                     | 36.3                     | 37.3                     | 37.9                     |   |
| Property Tax - Municipal Symphony - \$0.00125 per \$100 NAV                        | 4.4                   | 4.5                  | 4.5                      | 4.6                      | 4.6                      | 4.7                      | 4.8                      |   |
| <b>Subtotal Arts</b>                                                               | <b>36.4</b>           | <b>37.5</b>          | <b>39.7</b>              | <b>40.6</b>              | <b>40.9</b>              | <b>42.1</b>              | <b>42.7</b>              |   |
| <b>OTHER</b>                                                                       |                       |                      |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |   |
| Small Business Assistance Fund - Commercial Vacancy Tax                            | 2.7                   | 2.0                  | 2.0                      | 1.9                      | 1.8                      | 1.8                      | 1.8                      | * |
| <b>16 Dignity Fund - GF Transfer</b>                                               | 59.1                  | 59.1                 | 59.1                     | 62.1                     | 61.2                     | 64.2                     | 65.9                     | * |
| <b>17 Street Tree Maintenance Fund - GF Transfer</b>                               | 23.0                  | 23.0                 | 23.0                     | 23.9                     | 23.5                     | 24.7                     | 25.3                     | * |
| <b>18 City Services Auditor - 0.2% of Citywide Budget - Work Order</b>             | 26.8                  | 26.3                 | 26.3                     | 27.9                     | 27.9                     | 27.9                     | 27.9                     | * |
| <b>Subtotal Other</b>                                                              | <b>111.7</b>          | <b>110.4</b>         | <b>110.4</b>             | <b>115.7</b>             | <b>114.4</b>             | <b>118.6</b>             | <b>120.9</b>             |   |
| <b>Total Baselines, Set Asides and Special Taxes</b>                               | <b>2,541.7</b>        | <b>2,593.3</b>       | <b>2,768.4</b>           | <b>2,867.0</b>           | <b>2,841.4</b>           | <b>2,943.7</b>           | <b>3,009.4</b>           |   |

Note: Table shows required funding levels. \* Indicates General Fund impact

**Appendix F: Summary of Projected Reserve Balances - FY 2024-25 through FY 2029-30 (\$ in millions)**

This appendix provides an updated version of Table 6 from the December Five-Year Financial Plan.

|                                                        | FY 2024-25        | FY 2025-26     |               |                      | FY 2026-27     |                |                      | FY 2027-28     |               |                      | FY 2028-29    |               |                      | FY 2029-30    |               |                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|
|                                                        | Ending<br>Balance | Deposit        | Use           | Projected<br>Balance | Deposit        | Use            | Projected<br>Balance | Deposit        | Use           | Projected<br>Balance | Deposit       | Use           | Projected<br>Balance | Deposit       | Use           | Projected<br>Balance |
| <b>General Reserve</b>                                 | <b>\$ 136.8</b>   | <b>\$ 27.6</b> | <b>(8.0)</b>  | <b>\$ 156.4</b>      | <b>\$ 38.6</b> | <b>-</b>       | <b>\$ 195.0</b>      | <b>\$ 15.8</b> | <b>-</b>      | <b>\$ 210.8</b>      | <b>\$ 8.2</b> | <b>-</b>      | <b>\$ 219.0</b>      | <b>\$ 4.7</b> | <b>-</b>      | <b>\$ 223.7</b>      |
| Rainy Day Economic Stabilization City Reserve          | 114.5             | -              | -             | 114.5                | -              | -              | 114.5                | -              | -             | 114.5                | -             | -             | 114.5                | -             | -             | 114.5                |
| Budget Stabilization Reserve                           | 390.9             | 14.9           | -             | 405.8                | 40.5           | -              | 446.3                | 73.4           | -             | 519.7                | 54.2          | -             | 573.9                | 31.8          | -             | 605.7                |
| <b>Economic Stabilization Reserves</b>                 | <b>505.4</b>      | <b>14.9</b>    | <b>-</b>      | <b>520.3</b>         | <b>40.5</b>    | <b>-</b>       | <b>560.8</b>         | <b>73.4</b>    | <b>-</b>      | <b>634.3</b>         | <b>54.2</b>   | <b>-</b>      | <b>688.4</b>         | <b>31.8</b>   | <b>-</b>      | <b>720.3</b>         |
| <b>Percent of General Fund Revenues</b>                | <b>7.6%</b>       |                |               | <b>7.5%</b>          |                |                | <b>7.9%</b>          |                |               | <b>9.0%</b>          |               |               | <b>9.4%</b>          |               |               | <b>9.7%</b>          |
| Budget Stabilization One Time Reserve                  | 54.8              | -              | -             | 54.8                 | -              | (54.8)         | -                    | -              | -             | -                    | -             | -             | -                    | -             | -             | -                    |
| Rainy Day Economic Stabilization SFUSD Reserve         | 1.0               | -              | -             | 1.0                  | -              | -              | 1.0                  | -              | -             | 1.0                  | -             | -             | 1.0                  | -             | -             | 1.0                  |
| Federal and State Emergency Grant Disallowance Reserve | 2.1               | -              | (1.1)         | 1.1                  | -              | (1.1)          | -                    | -              | -             | -                    | -             | -             | -                    | -             | -             | -                    |
| Fiscal Cliff Reserve                                   | 40.0              | -              | (25.0)        | 15.0                 | -              | (15.0)         | -                    | -              | -             | -                    | -             | -             | -                    | -             | -             | -                    |
| Federal and State Revenue Risk Reserve                 | 221.6             | 240.8          | (9.1)         | 453.3                | -              | -              | 453.3                | -              | -             | 453.3                | -             | -             | 453.3                | -             | -             | 453.3                |
| Business Tax Stabilization Reserve                     | 29.5              | -              | -             | 29.5                 | -              | -              | 29.5                 | -              | -             | 29.5                 | -             | -             | 29.5                 | -             | -             | 29.5                 |
| Public Health Revenue Management Reserve               | 174.2             | -              | -             | 174.2                | -              | -              | 174.2                | -              | -             | 174.2                | -             | -             | 174.2                | -             | -             | 174.2                |
| Free City College Reserve                              | 0.1               | 8.6            | (8.4)         | 0.3                  | -              | -              | 0.3                  | -              | -             | 0.3                  | -             | -             | 0.3                  | -             | -             | 0.3                  |
| Student Success Fund Reserve                           | 18.1              | -              | -             | 18.1                 | -              | -              | 18.1                 | -              | -             | 18.1                 | -             | -             | 18.1                 | -             | -             | 18.1                 |
| <b>Other Reserves</b>                                  | <b>541.4</b>      | <b>249.4</b>   | <b>(43.6)</b> | <b>747.3</b>         | <b>-</b>       | <b>(70.9)</b>  | <b>676.4</b>         | <b>-</b>       | <b>-</b>      | <b>676.4</b>         | <b>-</b>      | <b>-</b>      | <b>676.4</b>         | <b>-</b>      | <b>-</b>      | <b>676.4</b>         |
| Litigation Reserve                                     | -                 | 11.0           | (11.0)        | -                    | 11.0           | (11.0)         | -                    | 11.0           | (11.0)        | -                    | 11.0          | (11.0)        | -                    | 11.0          | (11.0)        | -                    |
| Salary and Benefits Reserve                            | 9.6               | 22.0           | (31.6)        | -                    | 21.3           | (21.3)         | -                    | 22.0           | (22.0)        | -                    | 22.5          | (22.5)        | -                    | 23.0          | (23.0)        | -                    |
| <b>Annual Operating Reserves</b>                       | <b>9.6</b>        | <b>33.0</b>    | <b>(42.6)</b> | <b>-</b>             | <b>32.3</b>    | <b>(32.3)</b>  | <b>-</b>             | <b>33.0</b>    | <b>(33.0)</b> | <b>-</b>             | <b>33.5</b>   | <b>(33.5)</b> | <b>-</b>             | <b>34.0</b>   | <b>(34.0)</b> | <b>-</b>             |
| <b>TOTAL, General Fund Reserves</b>                    | <b>1,193.2</b>    | <b>325.0</b>   | <b>(94.1)</b> | <b>1,424.0</b>       | <b>111.4</b>   | <b>(103.3)</b> | <b>1,432.2</b>       | <b>122.3</b>   | <b>(33.0)</b> | <b>1,521.5</b>       | <b>95.9</b>   | <b>(33.5)</b> | <b>1,583.8</b>       | <b>70.6</b>   | <b>(34.0)</b> | <b>1,620.4</b>       |

# Item 19

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** CA Fish and Game Commission Notices of Proposed Changes in Regulations for Central Valley and Klamath River Basin Sport Fishing  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 9:40:26 AM  
**Attachments:** [CA Fish and Game Commission Proposed Regulation Changes - Central Valley and Jlamath River Basin Sport Fishing.pdf](#)

---

Good morning Supervisors,

From the CA Fish and Game Comision, submitting Notices of proposed changes in regulations related to Central Valley sport fishing and Klamath River Basin sport fishing.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**



## **TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by Section **200, 205, 265, 270, 315, 316.5, 399 and 2084** of the California Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific Sections **200, 205, 265, 270, 316.5 and 2084** of said Code, proposes to **amend** Sections 7.40(b)(4), (43), (66), and (80), Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to **Central Valley Sport Fishing**

### **Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview**

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

Current regulations in subsections (b)(4), (b)(43), (b)(66), and (b)(80) of Section 7.40 prescribe the 2025 seasons and daily bag and possession limits for Sacramento River fall-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*; SRFC) sport fishing in the American, Feather, Mokelumne, and Sacramento rivers, respectively. Collectively, these four rivers constitute the “Central Valley fishery” for SRFC for purposes of this document. Each year, the Department recommends new Chinook Salmon bag and possession limits for consideration by the Commission to align the fishing limits with up-to-date management goals, as set forth below.

The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) is responsible for adopting recommendations for the management of recreational and commercial ocean salmon fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone (three to 200 miles offshore) off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California. When approved by the Secretary of Commerce, these recommendations are implemented as ocean salmon fishing regulations by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

The PFMC will develop the annual Pacific coast ocean salmon fisheries regulatory options for public review at its March 2026 meeting and will adopt its final regulatory recommendations at its April 2026 meeting based on the PFMC salmon abundance estimates and recommendations for ocean harvest for the coming season. Based on the April 2026 recommendation by PFMC, the Department will recommend specific seasons and bag and possession limit regulations to the Commission at its April 16, 2026, meeting. The Commission will then consider adoption of the Central Valley sport fishing regulations at its May 6, 2026, meeting.

### **Proposed Regulations**

#### **Chinook Salmon Bag and Possession Limits**

The Department recognizes the uncertainty of SRFC in-river harvest projections. Therefore, for the 2026 Central Valley fishery, the Department is presenting four regulatory options for the Commission’s consideration to tailor 2026 Central Valley fishery management to target 2026 in-river fisheries harvest projections. The Commission may adopt these options for each river section independently, or in combination to meet PFMC SRFC management objectives.

- American River, subsections 7.40(b)(4)(B), (C) and (D).

- Feather River, subsection 7.40(b)(43)(D), (E), and (F).
- Mokelumne River, subsection 7.40(b)(66)(A), (B) and (D).
- Sacramento River below Keswick Dam, subsection 7.40(b)(80)(C), (D) and (E).

The following options are provided for Commission consideration:

### **Option 1 – Any Size Chinook Salmon Fishery**

This option is the Department's preferred option if the 2026 SRFC stock abundance forecast is sufficiently high to avoid the need to constrain in-river SRFC harvest.

Bag limit of [0-4] Chinook Salmon.

Possession limit - [0-12] Chinook Salmon.

### **Option 2 – Limited Adult and Grilse Salmon Fishery**

Bag limit of [0-4] Chinook Salmon of which no more than [0-4] fish over 27 inches total length may be retained.

Possession limit - [0-12] Chinook Salmon of which no more than [0-12] fish may be over 27 inches total length.

### **Option 3 – Grilse Salmon Fishery Only**

Bag limit of [0-4] Chinook Salmon less than or equal to 27 inches total length.

Possession limit - [0-12] Chinook Salmon less than or equal to 27 inches total length.

### **Option 4 – No Salmon Fishing in all Central Valley Rivers, Streams, and Tributaries**

No take or possession of Chinook Salmon.

### **Chinook Salmon Fishing Seasons**

The current open fishing seasons for SRFC in the Central Valley are specific to each river and river section and have start and end dates that encompass the migration periods for salmon to upstream spawning habitat in the American, Feather, Sacramento, and Mokelumne rivers. To provide angling opportunity while minimizing the risk of overharvest due to uncertainty of SRFC in-river harvest projections, the Department is presenting a range of dates within that historic range that spans the open fishing season specific to each river section. This will provide the Commission with the flexibility to start the season later or end the season earlier, per section of river or across the valley.

### **Separate Chinook Salmon Seasons from other Sport Fish Species Seasons**

Under existing regulations, the open fishing seasons for Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley are presented in the same row in the regulatory text table as other sport fish species including steelhead trout, Striped Bass, and Shad. The Department's recent change of the Chinook Salmon fishing seasons from a static, uniform date range to a range of dates does not apply to other sportfish species. The existing fishing seasons for other sportfish species will remain unchanged. Therefore, it is necessary to uncouple the fishing seasons for these distinct fisheries throughout the regulatory

text. The separated seasons are indicated in the Proposed Regulatory Language by having Chinook Salmon in a separate row in the table from the other sport fish species including hatchery steelhead and hatchery trout. This change does not alter the season for non-Chinook Salmon sport fish opportunities but rather combines and consolidates the season into one row in the table.

### **Brown Trout Harvest Opportunity in Sections of the Sacramento River**

Non-native Brown Trout have occasionally been caught in the steelhead trout fishery on the Sacramento River, particularly in the reaches below Keswick Dam. Brown Trout are highly piscivorous and are known to prey upon juvenile Chinook Salmon, Coho Salmon and steelhead trout in locations where their presence overlaps, which can suppress native species recovery. The Department is proposing to allow the harvest of Brown Trout in the Sacramento River. This proposed change will reduce predation on juvenile salmon and steelhead and align these regulations with existing regulations for Brown Trout in anadromous waters. The proposed regulations add take for Brown Trout to Section 7.40, subsections (b)(80)(B)(1) and (2) and (C) with a bag limit of 5 fish per day and 10 fish in possession. A harvest of 5 Brown Trout is appropriate given the recent catch and observations reported to the Department.

#### **Benefits of the Proposed Regulations**

The Commission anticipates benefits to the environment in the sustainable management of Central Valley Chinook Salmon resources. Other benefits of the proposed regulations are consistency with federal fishery management goals, and health and welfare of California residents.

#### **Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations**

Article IV, Section 20 of the State Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to regulate sport fishing in waters of the state (Fish and Game Code sections 200, 205, 315 and 316.5). The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the California Code of Regulations and finds no other state agency regulations pertaining to Chinook Salmon sport fishing seasons, bag, and possession limits for Central Valley sport fishing.

### **Public Participation**

#### **Comments Submitted by Mail or Email**

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before **5:00 PM, Thursday, April 23, 2026** at the address given below, or by email to [FGC@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:FGC@fgc.ca.gov). Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before **12:00 noon, Tuesday, May 5, 2026**. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

#### **Meetings**

**NOTICE IS GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the **California Natural Resources Headquarters Building, Second Floor, 715 P Street, Sacramento, California**, which will commence at **8:00 AM on April 15, 2026** and may continue at **8:00 AM on April 16, 2026**. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the **webinar/teleconference** hearing will be posted at [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov) in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling (916) 653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

**NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in **Santa Barbara, California**, which will commence at **8:00 AM on May 6, 2026**. The exact location of this meeting has not yet been determined. As soon as this information is available but not less than ten days before the hearing, a continuation notice will be sent to interested and affected parties providing the exact location. The continuation notice will also be published on the Commission's website. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the **webinar/teleconference** hearing will be posted at [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov) in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling (916) 653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

### **Availability of Documents**

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov). The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above-mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or **David Haug** at [FGC@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:FGC@fgc.ca.gov) or at the preceding address or phone number. **Jonathan Nelson, Anadromous Fisheries Program Manager, Fisheries Branch, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fisheries@wildlife.ca.gov**, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

### **Availability of Modified Text**

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption,

timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 265 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in sections 11343.4, 11346.4, 11346.8 and 11347.1 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

### **Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment**

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed changes are necessary for the continued preservation of the resource, while providing inland sport fishing opportunities and thus, the prevention of adverse economic impacts.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The Commission does not anticipate significant adverse economic impacts but acknowledges the potential for short-term negative impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs within the state. The Commission anticipates no adverse impacts on the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California. The management of an ongoing Chinook Salmon sport fishery with annual variations in the bag and possession limits and/or the implementation of a size limit is not anticipated to significantly impact the volume of business activity.

The reduction of up to 24 jobs from the historical baseline with Option 2, 47 jobs for Option 3, and 119 jobs for Option 4 is not expected to eliminate businesses because projected reduction in fishing days is expected to be partially offset by opportunities to fish for grilse Chinook salmon and other species for Option 2 and 3 and continued opportunities for other salmonid (steelhead/ Rainbow trout) and non-salmonid species for Option 4. Additionally, all options represent a net gain in angler days from the 2025 season and could potentially result in gains of 55-174 jobs based on the selected option (see Table 1 below).

The Commission anticipates general benefits to the health and welfare of California residents through responsibly managed outdoor recreational opportunities. Providing opportunities for a Chinook Salmon sport fishery also encourages consumption of a nutritious food. The Commission anticipates benefits to the environment by the sustainable management of Chinook salmon resources in the Central Valley.

The Commission does not anticipate any benefits to worker safety.

Other benefits of the proposed regulations are concurrence with federal fishery management goals and promotion of businesses that rely on Central Valley sport fishing.

(c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

(d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None.

(e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None.

(f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None.

(g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

(i) Business Reporting Requirements:

The proposed action does not impose a business reporting requirement.

### **Effect on Small Business**

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

## **Consideration of Alternatives**

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: **March 10, 2026**

Melissa Miller-Henson  
Executive Director

## **TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission**

### **Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by Section **200, 205, 265, 270, 315, 316.5, 399 and 2084** of the California Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific Sections **200, 205, 265, 270, 316.5 and 2084** of said Code, proposes to **amend** Section 7.40(b)(50), Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to **Klamath River Basin Sport Fishing**

#### **Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview**

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

The Klamath River Basin, which consists of the Klamath River and Trinity River systems, is managed for fall-run Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) through a cooperative system of state, federal, and tribal management agencies. Salmonid regulations are designed to meet natural and hatchery escapement needs for salmonid stocks, while providing equitable harvest opportunities for ocean sport, ocean commercial, river sport, and tribal fisheries.

The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) is responsible for adopting recommendations for the management of sport and commercial ocean salmon fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone (three to 200 miles offshore) off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California. When approved by the Secretary of Commerce, these recommendations are implemented as ocean salmon fishing regulations by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) adopts regulations for the ocean salmon sport (inside three miles) and the Klamath River Basin (in-river) sport fisheries which are consistent with federal fishery management goals.

Tribal entities within the Klamath River Basin maintain fishing rights for ceremonial, subsistence, and commercial fisheries that are managed consistent with federal fishery management goals. Tribal fishing regulations are promulgated by individual tribal governments.

#### *Klamath River Fall-Run Chinook Salmon*

Adult Klamath River fall-run Chinook Salmon (KRFC) harvest allocations and natural spawning escapement goals are established by PFMC. The KRFC harvest allocation between tribal and non-tribal fisheries is based on court decisions and allocation agreements between the various fishery representatives.

#### *PFMC Overfishing Review*

KRFC stocks have been designated as “overfished” by PFMC. This designation is the result of not meeting conservation objectives for these stocks. Management objectives and criteria for KRFC are defined in the PFMC Salmon Fishery Management Plan (FMP). The threshold for overfished status of KRFC is a three-year geometric mean less than or equal to 30,525 natural area adult spawners. This overfished-threshold was met for KRFC during the 2015-2017 period. The 30,525 KRFC natural area adult spawners is considered the minimum stock size threshold, per the FMP. The KRFC adult natural area spawning escapement for 2024 was 24,032 natural area adult spawners, which is below



the one-year conservation threshold of 40,700 natural area adult spawners. The most recent three-year geometric mean of 27,962 is still less than the required 40,700 natural area adult spawners conservation threshold, therefore the KRFC are still considered as an “overfished” stock.

Accordingly, the FMP outlines a process for preparing a “rebuilding plan” that includes assessment of the factors that led to the decline of the stock, including fishing, environmental factors, model errors, etc. The rebuilding plan includes recommendations to address conservation of KRFC, with the goal of achieving rebuilt status. Rebuilt status requires meeting a three-year geometric mean of 40,700 adult natural area KRFC spawner escapement. The plan developed by representatives of NMFS, PFMC, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department), and tribal entities, was submitted to PFMC in February 2019, adopted by PFMC in June 2019, and submitted to NMFS in August 2019. Forthcoming recommendations from the rebuilding plan may alter how KRFC are managed in the future, including changing the in-river allocation number, and/or allocating less than the normal target number.

#### *Klamath River Spring Chinook Salmon*

The Klamath River Basin also supports Klamath River spring Chinook Salmon (KRSC). Naturally produced KRSC are both temporally and spatially separated from KRFC in most cases. Presently, KRSC stocks are not managed or allocated by PFMC. This in-river sport fishery is managed by general basin seasons, daily bag limit, and possession limit regulations. KRSC harvest is monitored on the Klamath River below the Highway 96 bridge at Weitchpec to the mouth of the Klamath River by creel survey. The upper Trinity River, upstream of Junction City, is monitored using tag returns from anglers.

#### *KRFC Allocation Management*

The PFMC allocation for the Klamath River Basin sport harvest is normally a minimum of 15 percent of the non-tribal PFMC harvest allocation of KRFC. Preseason stock projections of 2026 adult KRFC abundance will not be available from PFMC until March 2026. The 2026 basin allocation will be recommended by PFMC in April 2026. That allocation will inform the quota that the Department proposes to the Commission for adoption as a quota for the in-river sport harvest at the Commission’s May 2026 teleconference meeting.

The Commission may adopt a KRFC in-river sport harvest quota that is different than the quota proposed by the Department or the PFMC 2026 allocation for that fishery. Commission modifications need to meet biological and fishery allocation goals specified in law or established in the FMP.

The annual KRFC in-river sport harvest quota is specified in subsection 7.40(b)(50)(D)1. The quota is split among four geographic areas with a subquota for each area, expressed as a percentage of the total in-river quota, specified in subsection 7.40(b)(50)(D)2. For angler convenience, the subquotas, expressed as the number of fish, are listed for the affected river segments in subsection 7.40(b)(50)(E).

The in-river sport subquota percentages are as follows:

1. Main stem Klamath River from the California-Oregon border to the Highway 96 bridge at Weitchpec -- 17 percent of the in-river sport quota;

2. Main stem Klamath River downstream of the Highway 96 bridge at Weitchpec to the mouth of the Pacific Ocean -- 50 percent of the in-river sport quota;

The spit area (within 100 yards of the channel through the sand spit formed at the Klamath River mouth) closes to all fishing after 15 percent of the total Klamath River Basin quota has been taken downstream of the Highway 101 bridge.

3. Main stem Trinity River downstream of the Old Lewiston Bridge to the Highway 299 West bridge at Cedar Flat -- 16.5 percent of the in-river sport quota; and

4. Main stem Trinity River downstream of the Denny Road bridge at Hawkins Bar to the confluence with the Klamath River -- 16.5 percent of the in-river sport fishery quota.

These geographic areas are based upon the historical distribution of angler effort to ensure equitable harvest of adult KRFC in the Klamath River and Trinity River. The subquota system requires the Department to monitor or assess angler harvest of adult KRFC in each geographic area. All areas are monitored on a real time basis, except for the Klamath River upstream of Weitchpec and in the Trinity River. Due to funding and personnel reductions, the Department does not currently conduct real time harvest monitoring in the Klamath River upstream of the Weitchpec and in the Trinity River.

The Department has developed Harvest Predictor Models (HPM), which incorporate historic creel survey data from the Klamath River downstream of Iron Gate Dam to the confluence with the Pacific Ocean, and the Trinity River downstream of Lewiston Dam to the confluence with the Klamath River. Each HPM is driven by the positive relationship between KRFC harvested in the respective lower and upper subquota areas of the Klamath River and the Trinity River. The HPMs will be used by the Department to implement fishing closures to ensure that anglers do not exceed established subquota targets. Using this method, the upper Klamath River subquota area generally closes between 28-30 days after the lower Klamath River subquota is reached. Similarly, the upper Trinity River subquota area generally closes 45 days after the lower Klamath River subquota has been met. The Department also takes into consideration several other factors when implementing closure dates for subquota areas, including angler effort, KRFC run timing, weir counts, and ongoing recreational creel surveys performed by the Hoopa Valley Tribe in the lower Trinity River below Willow Creek.

### *Sport Fishery Management*

The KRFC in-river sport harvest quota is divided into geographic areas, and harvest is monitored under real time subquota management. The KRSC in-river sport harvest is managed by general season, daily bag limit, and possession limit regulations.

The Department presently differentiates the two stocks by the following sport fish season in each sub-area:

### Klamath River

July 1 through August 14 – General Season KRSC.

For purposes of clarity, daily bag and possession limits apply to that section of the Klamath River downstream of the Highway 96 bridge at Weitchpec to the mouth.

August 15 to December 31 – KRFC quota management.

### Trinity River

July 1 through August 31 – General Season KRSC.

For purposes of clarity, daily bag and possession limits apply to that section of the Trinity River downstream of the Old Lewiston Bridge to the confluence with the South Fork Trinity River.

September 1 through December 31 – KRFC quota management.

Current regulations in subsections 7.40(b)(50)(E)2.a. through 2.e. specify bag limits for KRFC and KRSC stocks in the Klamath River. Current regulations in subsections 7.40(b)(50)(E)6.b., e., and f. specify bag limits for KRFC and KRSC stocks in the Trinity River. Current regulations in subsections 7.40(b)(50)(C)2.a. and 2.b. specify KRSC and KRFC possession limits, respectively.

### Proposed Changes

#### *KRFC Adult Stocks (Sport Fishery Quota Management)*

Quota: For public notice requirements, the Department recommends the Commission consider a quota range of 0–67,600 adult KRFC in the Klamath River Basin for the in-river sport fishery. This recommended range encompasses the historical range of the Klamath River Basin allocations and allows the PFMC and the Commission to make adjustments during the 2026 regulatory cycle.

Subquotas: The proposed subquotas for KRFC stocks are as follows:

1. Main stem Klamath River from the California-Oregon border to the Highway 96 bridge at Weitchpec -- 17 percent of the total quota equates to [0-11,492];
2. Main stem Klamath River downstream of the Highway 96 bridge at Weitchpec to the mouth of the Pacific Ocean -- 50 percent of the total quota equates to [0-33,800];
3. Main stem Trinity River downstream of the Old Lewiston Bridge to the Highway 299 West bridge at Cedar Flat -- 16.5 percent of the total quota equates to [0-11,154]; and
4. Main stem Trinity River downstream of the Denny Road bridge at Hawkins Bar to the confluence with the Klamath River -- 16.5 percent of the total quota equates to [0-11,154].

Seasons:

- Klamath River - August 15 through December 31
- Trinity River - September 1 through December 31

#### KRFC Option 1: Bag and Possession Limits

Because the PFMC recommendations are not known at this time, ranges are shown in [brackets] below of bag and possession limits which encompass historical quotas. All are proposed for the 2026 KRFC fishery in the Klamath and Trinity rivers.

- Bag Limit - [0-4] Chinook Salmon – of which no more than [0-4] fish over [20-24] inches total length may be retained until the subquota is met, then 0 fish over [20-24] inches total length.

- Possession limit - [0-12] Chinook Salmon of which no more than [0-4] fish over [20-24] inches total length may be retained when the take of salmon over [20-24] inches total length is allowed.

The final KRFC bag and possession limits will align with the final federal regulations to meet biological and fishery allocation goals specified in law or established in the FMP.

As in previous years, no retention of adult KRFC is proposed once the subquota has been met.

### **Size Limits**

KRFC are managed based on adult quotas which is the maximum number of adult fish (age three and older) that can be harvested. In 2023, the Department moved away from the fixed standing cutoff size between grilse and adult Chinook Salmon of 23 inches total length to using a range between 20 to 24 inches total length as an annual option for cutoff size. This allows for annual variation in size cutoffs, as informed by previous year(s) data to manage the harvest of the adult KRFC quota more effectively. The Department is currently conducting a post season assessment of KRFC length and age data which will be used to help determine the proposed 2026 size cutoff. The 2026 proposed adult cutoff will be presented at the April 2026 Commission meeting.

### **KRFC Option 2: Fishery Closure**

This option would close salmon fishing in the Klamath River Basin as specified by river reach(es) in subsection 7.40(b)(50) to provide protection to KRFC should a reduction in the stock be indicated by PFMC abundance projections. In any year, should the PFMC recommend a complete or near complete closure of the ocean recreational salmon fishery and/or an allocation of 0 (zero) adult KRFC to the in-river fishery, this option would give the Department flexibility to respond to and support any federal action. This option prohibits all methods of targeting KRFC including catch and release fishing.

### ***KRSC Sport Fishery***

KRSC stocks are not managed or allocated by PFMC. This in-river sport fishery is managed by general basin seasons, daily bag limit, and possession limit regulations. The KRSC sport fishery has been incorporated into the annual Klamath sport fish rulemaking process to allow for adaptive management of stock status and the need to compensate for large-scale changes in fishery effort.

Seasons:

- Klamath River – July 1 through August 14
- Trinity River – July 1 through August 31

### **KRSC Option 1 Bag and Possession Limits**

Ranges are shown in [brackets] below of bag and possession limits which encompass historical ranges. All are proposed for the 2026 KRSC fishery in the Klamath and Trinity rivers.

- Bag Limit - [0-1] Chinook Salmon
- Possession limit - [0-2] Chinook Salmon.

### KRSC Option 2: Fishery Closure

This option would close salmon fishing in the Klamath River Basin as specified by river reach(es) in subsection 7.40(b)(50) to provide protection to KRSC should the Department be concerned with stock status or predicts a large shift in effort due to widespread salmon closures in other areas of the state. In any year, should the PFMC recommend a complete or near complete closure of the ocean recreational salmon fishery and/or an allocation of 0 (zero) adult KRFC to the in-river fishery, this option would give the Department flexibility to respond to potential effort shift. This option prohibits all methods of targeting KRSC including catch and release fishing.

### Other Changes for Clarity

Language referencing the size of an adult fish is removed from subsection (50)(E)2.e. in the second column as the size is already included in the following column as a range in the options provided. This change is necessary for consistency and clarity. Also, in subsections (50)(C)2., (50)(D)2.b., and (50)(E)2.e the words “to the mouth” have been added to clarify the lower boundary of this stretch of the Klamath River to be the mouth of the river as it meets the ocean.

### **Benefit of the Regulations**

The benefits of the proposed regulations are conformance with federal fishery management goals, sustainable management of Klamath River Basin fish resources, health and welfare of California residents, and promotion of businesses that rely on salmon sport fishing in the Klamath River Basin.

### **Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations**

Article IV, Section 20 of the State Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated authority to the Commission to promulgate sport fishing regulations (Fish and Game Code sections 200, 205, 315, and 316.5). The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. Commission staff has searched the California Code of Regulations and has found no other state regulations related to sport fishing in the Klamath River Basin.

### **Public Participation**

#### **Comments Submitted by Mail or Email**

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before **5:00 PM, Thursday, April 23, 2026** at the address given below, or by email to [FGC@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:FGC@fgc.ca.gov). Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received before **12:00 noon, Tuesday, May 5, 2026**. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, PO Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

### **Meetings**

**NOTICE IS GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the **California Natural Resources Headquarters Building, Second Floor, 715 P Street, Sacramento, California**, which will commence at **8:00 AM on April 15, 2026** and may continue at **8:00 AM on April 16, 2026**. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the **webinar/teleconference** hearing will be posted at [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov) in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling (916) 653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

**NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in **Santa Barbara, California**, which will commence at **8:00 AM on May 6, 2026**. The exact location of this meeting has not yet been determined. As soon as this information is available but not less than ten days before the hearing, a continuation notice will be sent to interested and affected parties providing the exact location. The continuation notice will also be published on the Commission's website. The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom videoconference platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them, but the meeting will continue with in-person attendees. Instructions for participation in the **webinar/teleconference** hearing will be posted at [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov) in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling (916) 653-4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

### **Availability of Documents**

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov). The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above-mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or **David Haug** at [FGC@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:FGC@fgc.ca.gov) or at the preceding address or phone number. **Jonathan Nelson, Anadromous Fisheries Program Manager, Fisheries Branch, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fisheries@wildlife.ca.gov**, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

### **Availability of Modified Text**

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption,

timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 265 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in sections 11343.4, 11346.4, 11346.8 and 11347.1 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

### **Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment**

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed regulation will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulations are projected to range from minor to no impact on the net revenues to local businesses servicing sport fishermen. Additionally, the in-river harvest is almost exclusively for KRFC, therefore no significant impacts are anticipated from the proposed changes to the KRSC regulations. If the 2026 KRFC quota is reduced, visitor spending may correspondingly be reduced, and in the absence of alternative visitor activities, the drop in spending could induce some business contraction, but this would match the conditions of the current closure that has persisted since 2023. If the 2026 KRFC quota remains similar to the KRFC quotas allocated in previous years, then local economic impacts are expected to be beneficial as anglers return to the fishery. Neither scenario is expected to directly affect the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

An estimated 30-50 businesses that serve sport fishing activities are expected to be directly and/or indirectly affected depending on the final KRFC quota. The impacts range from no impact (Projection 1 under the Economic Impact Assessment (EIA), see STD. 399) to small adverse impacts (Projection 3, EIA, see STD. 399).

Depending on the final KRFC quota, the Commission anticipates the potential for some impact on the creation or elimination of jobs in California. The potential adverse employment impacts range from no impact to the loss of 14 jobs. Under all alternatives, due to the limited time period of this regulation's impact, the Commission anticipates no impact on the creation of new

businesses, the elimination of existing businesses, or the expansion of businesses in California.

For all of the proposed scenarios, the possibility of growth of businesses to serve alternative recreational activities exists. Adverse impacts to jobs and/or businesses would be less if fishing of other species and grilse KRFC is permitted, than under a complete closure to all fishing. The impacted businesses are generally small businesses employing few individuals and, like all small businesses, are subject to failure for a variety of causes. Additionally, the long-term intent of the proposed regulatory action is to increase sustainability in fishable salmon stocks and, consequently, promote the long-term viability of these same small businesses. Finally, the in-river harvest is almost exclusively for KRFC, therefore no significant impacts are anticipated from the proposed changes to the KRSC regulations.

The proposed regulations will benefit the health and welfare of California residents and the state's environment by responsibly managing KRFC and KRSC populations and facilitating outdoor recreational opportunities associated with them now and in the future. The regulations are not expected to affect worker safety.

(c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

(d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None.

(e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None.

(f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None.

(g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

(i) Business Reporting Requirements:

The proposed action does not impose a business reporting requirement.



## **Effect on Small Business**

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

## **Consideration of Alternatives**

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: **March 10, 2026**

Melissa Miller-Henson  
Executive Director

**From:** [California Fish and Game Commission](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Notices of Proposed Changes in Regulations for Central Valley and Klamath River Basin Sport Fishing  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 8:46:36 AM

---

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

[View as a webpage / share](#)

LittleMcKee



**California Fish and Game Commission**  
*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870*

## **Notices of Proposed Changes in Regulations**

Greetings,

Notices of proposed changes in regulations related to Central Valley sport fishing and Klamath River Basin sport fishing have been posted to the Commission's website. The notices and associated documents can be accessed at <https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2026-New-and-Proposed> under "Fishing".

Sincerely,

David Haug  
**California Fish and Game Commission**

[Click here to visit our regulations page](#)

**Not signed up to receive our informative emails?**

[Sign Up](#)

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

[California Fish and Game Commission](#)  
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:  
[Manage Subscriptions](#) | [Help](#)

---

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: California Fish and Game Commission meeting agenda  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 10:09:30 AM  
**Attachments:** [FGC\\_Mtg\\_2026\\_Apr\\_15-16\\_Agenda\\_Final\\_032726.pdf](#)

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached and below communication from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting an agenda for the April 15-16, 2026 meeting.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** California Fish and Game Commission <[fgc@public.govdelivery.com](mailto:fgc@public.govdelivery.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:17 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** California Fish and Game Commission meeting agenda

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

[View as a webpage / share](#)

Image of California Redwoods

**California Fish and Game Commission**  
*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870*

## **April Meeting Agenda**

Greetings,

The California Fish and Game Commission will meet in person in Sacramento on April 15-16, 2026.

Members of the public are welcome to attend in person to observe or provide public comment. The Commission plans to offer Zoom webinar and phone options. Instructions on how to participate will be posted to the Commission website prior to the meeting.

While the Commission will make a reasonable effort to ensure remote access is available, it cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of those options.

Please refer to the agenda for important meeting information and deadlines.

Melissa Miller-Henson  
Executive Director  
**California Fish and Game Commission**

[Click Here for Meeting Agenda](#)

**Not signed up to receive our informative emails?**

[Sign Up](#)

Do not reply to this message. [FGC@public.govdelivery.com](mailto:FGC@public.govdelivery.com) is for outgoing messages only.

[California Fish and Game Commission](#)  
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:  
[Manage Subscriptions](#) | [Help](#)

---

This email was sent to [board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

**-Commissioners**  
**Eric Sklar**, President  
Saint Helena

**Darius Anderson**, Vice President  
Kenwood

**Jacque Hostler-Carmesin**, Member  
McKinleyville

**Samantha Murray**, Member  
La Jolla

**Erika Zavaleta**, Member  
Santa Cruz

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Gavin Newsom, Governor

## **Fish and Game Commission**



*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation  
Since 1870*

**Melissa A. Miller-Henson**  
**Executive Director**  
P.O. Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090  
(916) 653-4899  
[fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov)  
[www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov)

### **Meeting Agenda April 15-16, 2026**

**California Natural Resources Headquarters Building  
715 P Street, Second Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814**

Join us in person in Sacramento to provide public comment or observe the meeting.

#### **Options for Remote Public Comment via Zoom or Phone**

To join the meeting remotely via Zoom (video and audio), click directly on the meeting link at <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89998047571>. You can access detailed instructions for joining by phone or Zoom by clicking [here](#) or visit the Commission meetings page at [fgc.ca.gov/meetings](http://fgc.ca.gov/meetings); for instructions on how to join by phone (audio only), refer to Option 3.

The Commission will make a reasonable effort to provide the public additional opportunities to observe or provide comment in the meeting through the Zoom webinar platform by computer, mobile device, or telephone connections. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the remote connection options. Should technical issues affect remote attendee access or webinar quality, an attempt will be made to resolve them; however, the meeting will continue with in-person attendees.

#### **Option for Remote Observation Without Public Comment**

To watch or listen only on the day of the meeting visit <http://www.fgc.ca.gov> (link is on the right side of the page). The Commission will make a reasonable effort to live-stream the meeting to allow the public to observe the meeting from a remote location without providing comments. However, the Commission cannot guarantee the accessibility or functionality of the webcast.

- Notes:**
- (1) See important meeting deadlines and procedures, including written public comment deadlines, starting on page 11.**
  - (2) Unless otherwise indicated, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife is identified as Department.**
  - (3) All section and subsection references are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), unless otherwise noted.**
  - (4) The Tribal Committee is scheduled to meet on April 14, 2026 – please see agenda at [www.fgc.ca.gov/meetings/2026](http://www.fgc.ca.gov/meetings/2026) for more information.**

April 15, 2026; 8:30 AM

---

## Call to Order and Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

---

### 1. Consider Approving Agenda and Order of Items

---

## Bin 2 Marine Protected Area (MPA) Petitions

---

### 2. Evaluations and Recommendations for Non-Tribally Led or Co-Led Petitions\*

Receive and discuss Department presentation of its [evaluations](#) and recommendations for the ten [bin 2 MPA petitions](#) that are not tribally led or co-led (petitions 2023-14MPA, 2023-15MPA\_AM, 2023-16MPA, 2023-18MPA, 2023-23MPA\_AM, 2023-24MPA\_AM, 2023-27MPA\_AM, 2023-32MPA, 2023-33MPA\_AM, and 2023-34MPA).

(Pursuant to Section 662)

*\* Evaluations and recommendations for the other five bin 2 MPA petitions that are tribally led and co-led (2023-19MPA, 2023-20MPA, 2023-21MPA, 2023-28MPA\_AM, and 2023-29MPA\_AM) will be completed and presented at a later date.*

***The total amount of time allocated for public comment on this agenda item will be limited to no more than 60 minutes to limit the entire agenda item to approximately 4 hours in length, including presentation, commissioner questions, public comment, and discussion.***

---

## General Public Comment

---

### 3. General Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Receive public comment regarding topics within the Commission's authority that are not included on the agenda.

Note: The Commission may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this item, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (sections 11125 and 11125.7(a), Government Code).

---

## Discussion and Action Items

---

### 4. Commission Executive Director and Department Reports

Receive updates on items of note since the previous Commission meeting.

(A) ***Commission executive director***

(B) ***Department director and Law Enforcement Division***

### 5. Regulation Change Petitions (Marine)

(Pursuant to Section 662)

(A) ***Petitions for action today***

Consider whether to grant, deny, or refer for additional review, petitions for regulation change received at previous meetings. Petitions granted today will be added to the Commission's rulemaking calendar for development and future consideration.

I. *Petition 2025-14: Request to reduce Pismo clam bag limit*

II. *Petition 2025-19: Request to amend recreational crab trap buoy*



*regulations to reduce gear loss and whale entanglement risk*

(B) ***New petitions***

Receive new petitions for regulation change.

*Consideration of new petitions (whether to grant, deny, or refer petitions for additional review) is expected to be scheduled for the June 17-18, 2026 Commission meeting.*

(C) ***Referred petitions***

Receive public comments on petitions previously referred by the Commission to staff, legal counsel, a Commission committee, and/or the Department for review and consideration.

*MPA petition evaluations and recommendations will be heard under Agenda Item 2. MPA petitions are scheduled for presentation and public discussion at regional MPA petition Commission meetings in April and May 2026 (for more details, see [fgc.ca.gov/meetings/2026](https://fgc.ca.gov/meetings/2026)).*

6. **Non-Regulatory Requests from Previous Meetings (Marine)**

Consider and potentially act on non-regulatory requests (requests for action that do not require a regulation change) received from members of the public at previous meetings.

7. **Committee and Department Reports**

(A) ***Tribal Committee***

Receive summary and consider approving recommendations from the April 14, 2026 Committee meeting, including any recommendations related to tribally led or co-led MPA petitions. Discuss referred topics and consider revisions to topics and timing.

(B) ***Marine Resources Committee***

Receive summary and consider approving recommendations from the March 12, 2026 Committee meeting. Discuss referred topics and consider revisions to topics and timing.

(C) ***Department Marine Region***

Receive updates on items of note since the previous Commission meeting.

**Recess**

---

## Call to Order and Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

---

### Consent Items

---

Note: Items on the consent calendar are expected to be routine and non-controversial. After any public comment, the Commission will consider approving items on the consent calendar in a single vote without discussion. The presiding commissioner may choose to remove any item from the consent calendar and allow a separate discussion and potential action on that item in response to a request by a Commission member, staff, or an interested person.

**8. Initial Private Lands Wildlife Habitat Enhancement and Management Area (PLM) Plans and Licenses (consent)**

Consider approving initial PLM plans and 2026-2030 licenses for:  
(Pursuant to Section 601)

- |                                                                   |                                                                    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (A) Monterey County<br>I. Porter Estate Co.<br>Bradley Ranch Inc. | (B) Monterey and San Benito counties<br>I. Gabilan Cattle Co Ranch |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|

**9. Five-Year PLMs (consent)**

Consider approving five-year PLM plans and 2026-2030 licenses for:  
(Pursuant to Section 601)

- |                                                                |                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| (A) Humboldt and Trinity counties<br>I. Wilkinson Hunting Club | II. Indian Valley Cattle Company (IVCC) – Lombardo Ranch       |
| (B) Mendocino County<br>I. R-R Ranch<br>II. Shamrock Ranch     | III. Peachtree Ranch<br>IV. Sky Rose Ranch                     |
| (C) Merced County<br>I. DeFrancesco & Eaton Ranch              | (E) San Benito County<br>I. Lone Ranch<br>II. Rancho La Cuesta |
| (D) Monterey County<br>I. Camp 5 Outfitters – Roth Ranch       | (F) Tehama County<br>I. R Wild Horse Ranch                     |

**10. Annual PLMs (consent)**

Consider approving annual PLM plans for:  
(Pursuant to Section 601)

- |                                                                                                          |                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (A) Del Norte County<br>I. Smith River PLM                                                               | V. Rainbow Ridge PLM                                                                            |
| (B) Humboldt County<br>I. Big Lagoon<br>II. Diamond C Outfitters<br>III. Hunter Ranch<br>IV. Klamath PLM | VI. Redwood House Ranch<br>VII. Stover Ranch<br>VIII. Wiggins Ranch<br>IX. Miller-Eriksen Ranch |

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>(C) Kern and Los Angeles counties</p> <p>I. Tejon Ranch</p> <p>(D) Kern and San Luis Obispo counties</p> <p>I. Temblor Ranch</p> <p>(E) Kings, Fresno, and Monterey counties</p> <p>I. Van Boxtel Ranch</p> <p>(F) Mendocino County</p> <p>I. Ackerman-South Daugherty WMA</p> <p>II. Amann Ranch</p> <p>III. Bridges Ranch</p> <p>IV. Capistran Ranch</p> <p>V. Carley Ranch</p> <p>VI. Eden Valley Ranch</p> <p>VII. Four Pines Ranch</p> <p>VIII. Miller-Eriksen Ranch</p> <p>IX. Pennacchio Ranch</p> <p>X. Schneider Ranch</p> <p>XI. Seven Springs Ranch</p> <p>XII. Six Point Ranch</p> <p>XIII. Spring Valley Ranch</p> <p>XIV. Summer Camp Ranch</p> <p>(G) Merced County</p> <p>I. Stevinson Ranch</p> <p>(H) Monterey County</p> <p>I. Alexander Ranch</p> <p>II. Bardin Ranch</p> <p>III. Gabilan-Silacci Ranch</p> <p>IV. Hartnell Ranch</p> <p>V. San Bartolome Ranch</p> <p>VI. Work Ranch</p> | <p>(I) Monterey and San Benito counties</p> <p>I. Morisoli Ranch</p> <p>(J) San Benito County</p> <p>I. Lewis Ranch</p> <p>II. Pine Mountain Ranch</p> <p>III. Trincherro Ranch</p> <p>(K) San Luis Obispo County</p> <p>I. Avenales Ranch</p> <p>II. Carnaza Ranch</p> <p>III. Chimney Rock Ranch</p> <p>IV. Clark &amp; White Ranch</p> <p>V. D Rafter L Ranch</p> <p>VI. Elk Run Ranch LLC</p> <p>VII. Hearst Ranch</p> <p>VIII. Parrish Pozo Ranch</p> <p>(L) Santa Clara County</p> <p>I. Coon Creek Ranch</p> <p>(M) Shasta County</p> <p>I. Stackhouse Ranch</p> <p>(N) Stanislaus County</p> <p>I. Rooster Comb Ranch</p> <p>(O) Tehama County</p> <p>I. 3D Ranch</p> <p>II. Bell Ranch</p> <p>(P) Trinity County</p> <p>I. Stewart Ranch</p> <p>II. Travis Ranch</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 11. Bighorn Sheep Hunting (consent)

Consider adopting proposed amendments to regulations for bighorn sheep hunting and taking final action under the California Environmental Quality Act.  
(Amend Section 362)

**12. Pronghorn Antelope Hunting (consent)**

Consider adopting proposed amendments to regulations for pronghorn antelope hunting and taking final action under the California Environmental Quality Act.  
(Amend Section 363)

**13. Elk Hunting (consent)**

Consider adopting proposed amendments to regulations for elk and taking final action under the California Environmental Quality Act.  
(Amend sections 353, 364, 364.1, 555 and 555.1)

**14. Bear Lake Buckwheat (consent)**

Consider ratifying findings for the decision to list Bear Lake buckwheat (*Eriogonum microtheca* var. *lacus-ursi*) as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.  
(Pursuant to subdivision 2075.5(e)(2), California Fish and Game Code)

---

**Discussion and Action Items**

---

**15. Committee and Department Reports**

(A) **Wildlife Resources Committee**

Discuss referred topics and consider revisions to topics and timing. Consider approving draft agenda topics for the next committee meeting on May 14, 2026.

(B) **Department Wildlife and Fisheries Division, and Department Ecosystem Conservation Division**

Receive updates from Department divisions on items of note since the previous Commission meeting.

**16. Bendire's Thrasher and LeConte's Thrasher**

Consider and potentially act on the petition, the Department's evaluation report, and comments received to determine whether listing Bendire's thrasher (*Toxostoma bendirei*) and LeConte's thrasher (*Toxostoma lecontei*) as threatened or endangered species under CESA may be warranted.  
(Pursuant to sections 2074 and 2074.2, California Fish and Game Code)

**17. Western Spadefoot**

Consider and potentially act on the petition, the Department's evaluation report, and comments received to determine whether listing the northern and southern populations of western spadefoot (*Spea hammondi*) as threatened and endangered species, respectively, under CESA may be warranted.  
(Pursuant to sections 2074 and 2074.2, California Fish and Game Code)

**18. Clear Lake Hitch**

Receive and discuss presentation from the Department with an update on Clear Lake hitch, including outcomes from the February 25, 2026 leadership summit.

**19. Sport Fishing (Annual)**

(A) **Central Valley**

Discuss proposed amendments to Central Valley sport fishing regulations.  
(Amend subsections 7.40(b)(4), (b)(43), (b)(66) and (b)(80))

(B) **Klamath River Basin**

Discuss proposed amendments to Klamath River Basin sport fishing regulations related to Chinook salmon.  
(Amend subsection 7.40(b)(50))

**20. Sport Fishing 2026 (Inland and Marine)**

Consider authorizing publication of notice of intent to amend sport fishing regulations.  
(Amend sections 1.62, 1.73, 1.74, 2.10, 2.11, 4.20, 5.00, 5.65, 5.85, 5.88, 6.34, 6.35, 7.00, 7.40, 7.50, 8.00, 8.10, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, 28.35, 230, 701)

**21. Waterfowl Hunting**

Consider adopting proposed amendments to regulations for waterfowl hunting and taking final action under the California Environmental Quality Act.  
(Amend Section 502)

**22. Black Bear Hunting**

Consider adopting proposed amendments to regulations for black bear hunting and taking final action under the California Environmental Quality Act.  
(Amend sections 365, 366 and 708.12)

**23. Regulation Change Petitions (Wildlife and Inland Fisheries)**

(Pursuant to Section 662)

(A) ***Petitions for action today***

Consider whether to grant, deny, or refer for additional review, petitions for regulation change received at previous meetings. Petitions granted today will be added to the rulemaking calendar for development and future consideration.

- I. *Petition 2021-006: Request to revise the deer tag fee structure*
- II. *Petition 2024-011: Request to amend sport fishing regulations to provide additional protection for coastal rainbow trout in Middle Piru Creek*
- III. *Petition 2025-12: Request to modify regulations for the Napa-Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area to allow bicycle use on roads and levees during waterfowl season*
- IV. *Petition 2025-20: Request to change Santa Barbara muzzleloading rifle/archery buck hunt to either-sex deer hunt*

(B) ***New petitions***

Receive new petitions for regulation change.

*Consideration of new petitions (whether to grant, deny, or refer for additional review) is currently scheduled for the June 17-18, 2026 Commission meeting.*

(C) ***Referred petitions***

Receive comments on petitions previously referred by the Commission to staff, legal counsel, a Commission committee, or the Department for review and recommendation.

*Commission action on any referred petition will be scheduled for consideration once a recommendation is received.*

- 24. Non-Regulatory Requests from Previous Meetings (Wildlife and Inland Fisheries)**  
Consider and potentially act on non-regulatory requests (requests for action that do not require a regulation change) received from members of the public at previous meetings.
- 25. Commission Administrative Items**
- (A) ***Legislative report***  
Receive updates on state and federal legislation and regulatory activity, and consider providing direction to staff on potential actions.
  - (B) ***Rulemaking timetable updates***  
Review and consider approving changes to the perpetual timetable for anticipated regulatory actions.
  - (C) ***Future meetings and new business***  
Review logistics and approve draft agenda items for the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting (June 17-18). Consider any changes to previously approved meeting dates or locations, and introduce any new business for inclusion on a future meeting agenda.
    - I. Consider approving the proposed change to the December 2026 Commission meeting date from December 16-17 to December 15-16 (Tuesday/Wednesday), and proposed change to the December 2026 Tribal Committee meeting from December 15 to December 14 (Monday)
- 26. General Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**  
Receive public comment regarding topics within the Commission's authority that are not included on either day of the April 15-16, 2026 agenda.  
Note: The Commission may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this item, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting (Section 11125 and subdivision 11125.7(a), California Government Code).

**Adjourn**

## Public Receipt of Documents

This section of the agenda highlights reports or other significant documents received by the Commission since the previous meeting. Any Commission discussion or action on these documents will be noticed and placed on the agenda of a future meeting.

Since February 12, 2026, the Commission has received three documents to highlight for the public:

1. Department's evaluation report on the petition to list the southern resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) as an endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act. Consideration of whether the petitioned action may be warranted is scheduled for June 2026. Additional information about the petition is available on the Commission's CESA page under "Active Petitions" at <https://fgc.ca.gov/CESA>.
2. A petition from the Center of Biological Diversity to list Mount Pinos sooty grouse (*Dendragapus fuliginosus howardi*) as a threatened or endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act. Additional information about the petition is available at <https://fgc.ca.gov/CESA> under "Active Petitions."
3. A restricted species permit application from The Scintillon Institute to possess transgenic zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) and the Department's recommendation. (Pursuant to subdivision 15007(e), California Fish and Game Code, and subsection 671.1(a)(8)(H), Title 14, CCR)

## **Executive Session**

(Not open to the public)

At a convenient time during the regular agenda of its April 15-16, 2026 meeting, the Commission will recess from the public portion of the agenda and conduct a closed session on the agenda items below. The Commission is authorized to discuss these matters in a closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126, subdivisions (a)(1), (c)(3), and (e)(1), and Fish and Game Code Section 309. After closed session, the Commission will reconvene in public session, which may include announcements about actions taken during closed session.

- (A) Pending litigation to which the Commission is a party
  - I. Bitts v. California Fish and Game Commission (challenge to suspension of Dungeness crab vessel permit).
  - II. United Water Conservation District v. California Fish and Game Commission (challenge to final Southern California steelhead CESA listing decision).
  - III. The Ballona Wetlands Land Trust v. California Fish and Game Commission and California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (challenge to decisions related to public uses on an ecological reserve)
  - IV. Borba et al. v. Merced Co, Merced Irrigation Dist., California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, and California Fish and Game Commission (complaint for damages related to flooding)
  - V. Perez-Ramirez et al. v. County of Merced, City of Merced, Merced Irrigation Dist., California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, and California Fish and Game Commission (complaint for damages related to flooding)
  - VI. Glenn et al. v. County of Merced, City of Merced, Merced Irrigation Dist., California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, and California Fish and Game Commission (complaint for damages related to flooding)
- (B) Possible litigation involving the Commission
- (C) Staffing – Potential executive director performance review
- (D) Deliberation and action on license and permit items



## California Fish and Game Commission Meeting Schedule

**Note:** As meeting dates and locations can change, please visit [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov) for the most current list of meeting dates and locations. All Commission meetings will include a webinar/teleconference option for attendance, and every effort will be made to ensure that committee meetings include the same.

| Meeting Date       | Commission Meeting                                                                                                                                                                           | Committee Meeting                                                                                                                   |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| April 21, 2026     | San Mateo Elks Lodge<br>229 W. 20th Avenue<br>San Mateo, CA 94403<br>Topic: Marine protected area petitions                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                     |
| May 5-6, 2026      | Hilton Garden Inn Santa Barbara/Goleta<br>6878 Hollister Ave<br>Goleta, CA 93117<br>Topics: Marine protected area petitions, and Central Valley and Klamath River Basin annual sport fishing |                                                                                                                                     |
| May 14, 2026       |                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>Wildlife Resources</b><br>Natural Resources Headquarters Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 |
| May 19, 2026       | Holiday Inn Express<br>35 Via Pico Plaza<br>San Clemente, CA 92672<br>Topic: Marine protected area petitions                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                     |
| June 17-18, 2026   | Natural Resources Headquarters Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                     |
| July 16, 2026      |                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>Marine Resources</b><br>Natural Resources Headquarters Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814   |
| August 11, 2026    |                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>Tribal</b><br>Natural Resources Headquarters Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814             |
| August 12-13, 2026 | Natural Resources Headquarters Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                     |

| Meeting Date         | Commission Meeting                                                                                        | Committee Meeting                                                                                                                      |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| September 10, 2026   |                                                                                                           | <b>Wildlife Resources</b><br>Natural Resources Headquarters<br>Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 |
| October 14-15, 2026  | Natural Resources Headquarters<br>Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 |                                                                                                                                        |
| November 12, 2026    |                                                                                                           | <b>Marine Resources</b><br>Natural Resources Headquarters<br>Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814   |
| December 15, 2026    |                                                                                                           | <b>Tribal</b><br>Natural Resources Headquarters<br>Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814             |
| December 16-17, 2026 | Natural Resources Headquarters<br>Building<br>715 P Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 |                                                                                                                                        |

## **Other Meetings of Interest**

Meetings listed here are organizations for which the Commission: (1) is a member, or (2) takes action based upon regulations developed by that organization.

### **Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies**

- September 13-16, 2026 – Lancaster, PA

### **Pacific Fishery Management Council**

- June 11-16, 2026 – Spokane, WA
- September 17-22, 2026 – Vancouver, WA
- November 13-18, 2026 – Garden Grove, CA
- December 31, 2026 – Location TBD

### **Pacific Flyway Council**

- August or September 2026 – Date and location TBD

### **Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies**

- June 1-5, 2026 – Boise, ID

### **Wildlife Conservation Board**

- May 28, 2026 – Sacramento, CA
- August 27, 2026 – Sacramento, CA
- November 19, 2026 – Sacramento, CA

# Important Commission Meeting Procedures Information

## Welcome to a Meeting of the California Fish and Game Commission

This year marks the 157th year of operation of the Commission in partnership with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Our goal is the preservation of our heritage and conservation of our natural resources through informed decision making; Commission meetings are vital in achieving that goal and we provide this information to be as effective and efficient toward that end. Welcome, and please let us know if you have any questions.

## Persons with Disabilities

Persons with disabilities needing reasonable accommodation to participate in public meetings or other Commission activities are invited to contact the Department's Civil Rights Office (CRO) at [civilrights@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:civilrights@wildlife.ca.gov). Accommodation requests for facility and/or meeting accessibility and requests for American Sign Language interpreters should be submitted at least two weeks prior to the event. Requests for real-time captioners should be submitted at least four weeks prior to the event. These timeframes are to help ensure that the requested accommodation is met. If a request for an accommodation has been submitted but is no longer needed, please contact the CRO immediately.

## Stay Informed

To receive meeting agendas and regulatory notices about those subjects of interest to you, visit the Commission's website, [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov), to sign up on our electronic mailing lists.

## Submitting Written Comments

The public is encouraged to comment on any agenda item. Submit written comments by one of the following methods: E-mail to [fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov); mail to California Fish and Game Commission, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090; deliver to California Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814 (you must call at least one business day in advance to arrange delivery). Materials provided to the Commission may be made available to the general public.

## Comment Deadlines

The **Comment Deadline** for this meeting is **5:00 p.m. on April 2, 2026**. Written comments received at the Commission office by this deadline will be made available to Commissioners prior to the meeting.

The **Supplemental Comment Deadline** for this meeting is **noon on April 10, 2026**. Comments received by this deadline will be made available to Commissioners at the meeting.

After these deadlines, written comments may be delivered in person to the meeting. Please bring 12 copies of written comments to the meeting and give them to the designated staff member just prior to speaking.

## Petitions for Regulation Change

Any person requesting that the Commission adopt, amend, or repeal a regulation must complete and submit form FGC 1, *Petition to the California Fish and Game Commission for Regulation Change* (as required by Section 662, Title 14, CCR), available at <https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/Petition-for-Regulation-Change>. To be received by the

Commission at this meeting, petition forms must be received by the **Supplemental Comment Deadline** or delivered in person at the meeting during the regulation change petitions agenda item. Petitions received at this meeting will be scheduled for consideration at the next regularly scheduled business meeting, unless the petition is rejected under staff review pursuant to subsection 662(b), Title 14, CCR.

### Non-Regulatory Requests

All non-regulatory requests follow a two-meeting cycle to ensure proper review and thorough consideration of each item. All requests submitted by the **Supplemental Comment Deadline** (or heard during general public comment at the meeting) will be scheduled for receipt at this meeting and scheduled for consideration at the next regularly scheduled business meeting.

### Speaking at the Meeting

**To speak on an agenda item in-person**, please complete a “speaker card” and provide it to the designated staff member before the agenda item is announced. Please complete one speaker card per item. Cards will be available near the entrance of the meeting room.

**To speak on an agenda item via Zoom or phone**, please “raise” your hand either through the Zoom function or by pressing \*9 once on your phone when prompted at the beginning of the agenda item.

1. In-person speakers will be identified in groups; please line up when your name is called. Speakers on Zoom or phone will be identified by your Zoom display name or the last three digits of your phone number; listen closely for when your name or number is called.
2. When addressing the Commission, please give your name and the name of any organization you represent, and provide your comments on the item under consideration.
3. If there are several speakers with the same concerns, you are encouraged to appoint a spokesperson and avoid repetitive testimony.
4. The presiding commissioner will allot between one and three minutes per speaker per agenda item, subject to several exceptions:
  - a. The presiding commissioner may allow up to five minutes for an individual speaker if a minimum of three individuals who are present when the agenda item is called have ceded their time to the designated spokesperson, and the individuals ceding time forfeit their right to speak to the agenda item.
  - b. In-person participants ceding their time shall complete a speaker card and approach the staff table with the spokesperson so that staff may confirm the presence of those ceding their time. Persons participating via Zoom or phone and ceding their time to another speaker must notify the Commission at [fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov) prior to the start of the agenda item, including to whom they are ceding their time, and must be present during the agenda item.
  - c. Individuals may receive advance approval for additional time to speak if such requests are received by email or delivery to the Commission office by the **Supplemental Comment Deadline**. The president or designee will approve or deny the request no later than 5:00 p.m. two days prior to the meeting.
  - d. An individual requiring an interpreter is entitled to at least twice the allotted speaking time pursuant to Government Code Section 11125.7(c).

- e. An individual may receive additional time to speak to an agenda item at the request of any commissioner.

***Agenda items may be heard in any order and on either day pursuant to the discretion of the presiding commissioner.***

### **Visual Presentations/Materials**

All electronic presentations must be submitted by the ***Supplemental Comment Deadline*** and approved by the Commission executive director before the meeting.

1. Electronic presentations must be provided by email to [fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov). If the presentation file is too large to send via email, contact staff to identify an alternative method for submitting the file.
2. All electronic formats must be Windows PC compatible.
3. If presenting at the in-person meeting location, it is recommended that you bring a print copy of your presentation in case of technical difficulties.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CDFW Announces Rules for Pacific Halibut Recreational Fishing  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 8:01:05 AM

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see below communication from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a news release regarding the 2026 California recreational Pacific halibut fishery and automatic conformance of state regulations to federal regulations.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** California Fish and Game Commission <[fgc@public.govdelivery.com](mailto:fgc@public.govdelivery.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 30, 2026 8:16 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** CDFW Announces Rules for Pacific Halibut Recreational Fishing

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

[View as a webpage / share](#)

Muir Woods

**California Fish and Game Commission**  
*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870*

[Click here to visit our regulations page](#)

## **CDFW Announces Rules for Pacific halibut**

Greetings,

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has issued a news release regarding the 2026 California recreational Pacific halibut fishery and automatic conformance of state regulations to federal regulations. The news release may be viewed at <https://wildlife.ca.gov/News>

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena  
Regulatory Analyst  
**California Fish and Game Commission**

**Not signed up to receive our informative emails?**

[Sign Up](#)



---

Do not reply to this message. [FGC@public.govdelivery.com](mailto:FGC@public.govdelivery.com) is for outgoing messages only.

[California Fish and Game Commission](#)  
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:  
[Manage Subscriptions](#) | [Help](#)

---

This email was sent to [board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: ICYMI, new Commission president and vice president  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 12:05:35 PM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from the California Fish and Game Commission, announcing new leadership.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** California Fish and Game Commission <[fgc@public.govdelivery.com](mailto:fgc@public.govdelivery.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:53 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** ICYMI, new Commission president and vice president

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

MuirWoods FGC



**California Fish and Game Commission**  
*Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870*

**New Commission President and Vice President**

Greetings,

During its February 2026 meeting, the Commission elected Commissioner Eric Sklar as its president and Commissioner Darius Anderson as its vice president; they are expected to remain in their roles until the next election, which is normally held each year during the February Commission meeting.

Assignments to the committees remain unchanged, with commissioners Sklar and Murray co-chairs of the Marine Resources Committee, commissioners Zavaleta and Anderson co-chairs of the Wildlife Resources Committee, and Commissioner Hostler-Carmesin chair of the Tribal Committee (with another commissioner joining meetings when possible).

Sincerely,

Melissa Miller-Henson  
Executive Director  
**California Fish and Game Commission**

**Not signed up to receive our informative emails?**

**Sign Up**

Do not reply to this message. [FGC@public.govdelivery.com](mailto:FGC@public.govdelivery.com) is for outgoing messages only.

[California Fish and Game Commission](#)

715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:

[Manage Subscriptions](#) | [Help](#)

---

This email was sent to [board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

# Item 20

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** CPUC Verizon Wireless projects - 4 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 1:57:53 PM  
**Attachments:** [4 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 4 letters, from the California Public Utilities Commission, pursuant to General Order No. 159A, regarding various projects.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [CPUC Team](#)  
**To:** [GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** [westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com](mailto:westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com); [CPC.Wireless](#); [Administrator, City \(ADM\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [vanessa.denike@verizon.com](mailto:vanessa.denike@verizon.com)  
**Subject:** CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Francisco-SFO0008SF - A-401442  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:19:03 AM  
**Attachments:** [CPUC\\_3451.pdf](#)

---

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

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) see attachment. This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.



Mar 27, 2026

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov

RE: Notification Letter for SFO0008SF - A  
San Francisco, CA /GTE Mobilnet California LP

---

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ( "CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Verizon Wireless

Felipe Martinez  
Coordinator RE & Compliance - West Territory  
1515 Woodfield Road, #1400  
Schaumburg, IL 60173  
WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com



| JURISDICTION          | PLANNING MANAGER       | CITY MANAGER                 | CITY CLERK                     | DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BOARD | COUNTY        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| City of San Francisco | CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org | city.administrator@sfgov.org | Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org |                          | San Francisco |

| VZW Legal Entity           |                        | Site Name        |                  | Site Address                           |                  | Tower Design        | Size of Building or NA |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| GTE Mobilnet California LP |                        | SFO0008SF - A    |                  | 333 MARKET ST, San Francisco , CA94105 |                  | Stealth structure   | Stealth structure      |
| Site Latitude              | Site Longitude         | PS Location Code | Tower Appearance | Tower Height (in feet)                 | Type of Approval | Approval Issue Date |                        |
| 37°47'31.294"N             | 122°23'52.07"W NAD(83) | 401442           | 15               | 18.7                                   | Permitting       | 10/06/2025          |                        |

Project Description: - small cell equipment located on a city asset.



**From:** [CPUC Team](#)  
**To:** [GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** [westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com](mailto:westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com); [CPC.Wireless](#); [Administrator, City \(ADM\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [vanessa.denike@verizon.com](mailto:vanessa.denike@verizon.com)  
**Subject:** CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Francisco-SF LM PH3 SC 131 - A-302041  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:19:25 AM  
**Attachments:** [CPUC\\_3452.pdf](#)

---

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

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) see attachment. This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.



Mar 27, 2026

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov

RE: Notification Letter for SF LM PH3 SC 131 - A  
San Francisco, CA /GTE Mobilnet California LP

---

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ( "CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Verizon Wireless

Felipe Martinez  
Coordinator RE & Compliance - West Territory  
1515 Woodfield Road, #1400  
Schaumburg, IL 60173  
WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com



| JURISDICTION          | PLANNING MANAGER       | CITY MANAGER                 | CITY CLERK                     | DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BOARD | COUNTY        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| City of San Francisco | CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org | city.administrator@sfgov.org | Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org |                          | San Francisco |

| VZW Legal Entity           |                        | Site Name            |                  | Site Address                                    |                  | Tower Design                              | Size of Building or NA                    |
|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| GTE Mobilnet California LP |                        | SF LM PH3 SC 131 - A |                  | 325 China Basin Street, San Francisco , CA94158 |                  | Public Lighting Structure (free standing) | Public Lighting Structure (free standing) |
| Site Latitude              | Site Longitude         | PS Location Code     | Tower Appearance | Tower Height (in feet)                          | Type of Approval | Approval Issue Date                       |                                           |
| 37°46'19.899"N             | 122°23'14.95"W NAD(83) | 302041               | 23               | 26.5                                            | Permitting       | 09/17/2024                                |                                           |

Project Description: - small cell equipment located on a city asset.

**From:** [CPUC Team](#)  
**To:** [GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** [westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com](mailto:westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com); [CPC.Wireless](#); [Administrator, City \(ADM\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [vanessa.denike@verizon.com](mailto:vanessa.denike@verizon.com)  
**Subject:** CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Francisco-SF LM PH2 SC 82 - A-301997  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:19:36 AM  
**Attachments:** [CPUC\\_3454.pdf](#)

---

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

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) see attachment. This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.



Mar 27, 2026

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov

RE: Notification Letter for SF LM PH2 SC 82 - A  
San Francisco, CA /GTE Mobilnet California LP

---

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ( "CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Verizon Wireless

Felipe Martinez  
Coordinator RE & Compliance - West Territory  
1515 Woodfield Road, #1400  
Schaumburg, IL 60173  
WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com



| JURISDICTION          | PLANNING MANAGER       | CITY MANAGER                 | CITY CLERK                     | DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BOARD | COUNTY        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| City of San Francisco | CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org | city.administrator@sfgov.org | Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org |                          | San Francisco |

| VZW Legal Entity           | Site Name           | Site Address                         | Tower Design                              | Size of Building or NA                    |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| GTE Mobilnet California LP | SF LM PH2 SC 82 - A | 385 7th St., San Francisco , CA94103 | Public Lighting Structure (free standing) | Public Lighting Structure (free standing) |

| Site Latitude  | Site Longitude          | PS Location Code | Tower Appearance | Tower Height (in feet) | Type of Approval | Approval Issue Date |
|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 37°46'33.032"N | 122°24'23.552"W NAD(83) | 301997           | 31               | 27.25                  | Permitting       | 01/29/2025          |

Project Description: - small cell equipmeent on a city asset.

**From:** [CPUC Team](#)  
**To:** [GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** [westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com](mailto:westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com); [CPC.Wireless](#); [Administrator, City \(ADM\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [vanessa.denike@verizon.com](mailto:vanessa.denike@verizon.com)  
**Subject:** CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Francisco-SF LM PH1 SC 52 - A-297886  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:20:39 AM  
**Attachments:** [CPUC\\_3453.pdf](#)

---

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

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) see attachment. This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.



Mar 27, 2026

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov

RE: Notification Letter for SF LM PH1 SC 52 - A  
San Francisco, CA /GTE Mobilnet California LP

---

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ( "CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Verizon Wireless

Felipe Martinez  
Coordinator RE & Compliance - West Territory  
1515 Woodfield Road, #1400  
Schaumburg, IL 60173  
WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com





| JURISDICTION          | PLANNING MANAGER       | CITY MANAGER                 | CITY CLERK                     | DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BOARD | COUNTY        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| City of San Francisco | CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org | city.administrator@sfgov.org | Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org |                          | San Francisco |

| VZW Legal Entity           |                 | Site Name           |                  | Site Address                           |                  | Tower Design        | Size of Building or NA |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| GTE Mobilnet California LP |                 | SF LM PH1 SC 52 - A |                  | 121 Spear St., San Francisco , CA94103 |                  | Pole Utility        | Pole Utility           |
| Site Latitude              | Site Longitude  | PS Location Code    | Tower Appearance | Tower Height (in feet)                 | Type of Approval | Approval Issue Date |                        |
| 37°47'30.581"N             | 122°23'35.049"W | 297886              | null             | 28.83                                  | Permitting       | 09/17/2024          |                        |

Project Description: - small cell equipment located on a city asset.

# Item 21

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** ICE incident at SFO - 11 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 2:05:15 PM  
**Attachments:** [ICE 11 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 11 letters, from members of the public, regarding an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) incident at the San Francisco International Airport.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [Laura G](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#); [MONS@sfgov.org](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Cityattorney](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#)  
**Subject:** ICE Arrest at SFO March 22 2026  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 8:11:34 AM

---

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

Dear Daniel Lurie, David Chiu, Brooke Jenkins, Paul Miyamoto, Board of Supervisors, and all other representatives,

I am writing to you today as a concerned constituent residing in the 94131 zip code. I am deeply troubled by recent reports regarding the cooperation between the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) at San Francisco International Airport (SFO), specifically involving the violent detention of a woman and her child.

These actions raise serious questions about San Francisco's commitment to its status as a sanctuary city. It is distressing to see our local resources potentially being used to support federal operations that rely on racial profiling and bypass due process. Such activities bring a sense of terror to our immigrant communities and undermine the safety of all residents.

As someone who will be traveling through SFO this coming weekend, I am personally alarmed by the prospect of witnessing these aggressive enforcement actions. Beyond my concern for my neighbors, I am fearful of the potential for additional violence against witnesses and the inhumane treatment of vulnerable population including minors, the elderly, and those with medical needs, who are being taken to substandard facilities.

Filing my state taxes just days before this incident, I am horrified by the possibility that public funds are being used to facilitate these attacks on the immigrant community. I urge you to take immediate action to ensure that San Francisco strictly honors its sanctuary policies and ceases all local law enforcement cooperation with ICE. Our city must remain a safe haven that protects the human rights and dignity of all its people.

I look forward to hearing how your office intends to address these grave concerns and restore accountability to our city's law enforcement practices.

Sincerely,

Laura G.  
Now Valley Resident  
SEIU 1021 Union Member

**From:** [Emily Speltz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Show San Francisco's Humanity  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 12:27:30 PM

---

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

Last night plain clothes officers violently detained a woman in front of her crying daughter. Lurie claims he was not aware of their presence, yet SFPD officers still showed up to protect DHS rather than the people themselves. The state of California has [sanctuary policies](#) that preclude local law enforcement from assisting in detaining or arresting persons for immigration purposes. SFPD is neither protecting public safety nor upholding sanctuary law, failing to meet its purported goals and doing the public a disservice.

In related news, a deaf was child kidnapped with his mother and brother while at a routine asylum check in in San Francisco. Imagine being a kid, unable to hear or communicate, kidnapped and forced to live in waiting in a foreign country. We are setting him up for failure and suffering, he must be so confused and scared.

How can we allow this cruelty to persist in our city? The city is capable of better, and the public expects better of its government. Please show some courage and accountability to do better.

-- Emily Speltz

**From:** [Carrie Leung](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Resident concerned about SF's Sanctuary City Status  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 1:04:44 PM

---

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

Hi,

I'm a resident of SF and has lived here for close to twenty years.

Recently I saw on the news that a mom and her two kids were abducted from an ICE check in at SF and quickly sent to Colombia. Her family was waiting but apparently given no information and they didn't even allow for her deaf son (one of her two children) to get hearing aids. That is abhorrent. Representative Eric Swalwell has made a statement and is calling on Congress to return the mother and her two children. The school where one of the children attends in Hayward AS WELL as the superintendent of public instruction has also wrote letters to the government to help this family. Why are you all silent? This is SF and she was taken from SF? Why are you not using your voices and your power?

And then to follow THAT up with SFPD standing around forming a protective circle around the DHS agents yesterday at SFO???? You're cutting our muni lines, our funding for the environment, health services, but ten SFPD is allowed to mill around protecting DHS and get paid? Do you think this is "not helping" DHS because I think most of the residents will not agree and will be equally enraged that as we told teachers there is no money for their healthcare and raises, we are blowing it for paying cops to do nothing. SF is a sanctuary city - grow a backbone and make sure of that. Bilal Mahmoud, you are my supervisor, and as you sponsor this ICE free zone bill, I expect you will also support SF's sanctuary city policies and ensure our money is spent on things that are BENEFICIAL to us.

--

-Carrie

**From:** [Cyrus Hall](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Clear SFPD collaboration with DHS/ICE at SFO  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 1:14:16 PM

---

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

San Francisco deserves a clear answer why SFPD is clearly assisting DHS officers who refuse to identify themselves (likely ICE) at SFO. SFO is part of San Francisco, and we've been told repeatedly that SFPD will not assist ICE. And yet the video makes it clear: without SFPD, these DHS agents would likely have been unable to complete an detention/arrest that is as likely illegal as legal. SFPD's presence clearly \_is\_ assisting in ICE's mission.

SFPD needs to actually behave as the public is being told they will: no assistance for ICE. If ICE needs more agents to "do their job" of ripping families apart and destroying the fabric of America, that isn't SFPD's problem to solve. That's ICE problem to solve. The BOS and Mayor need to make it very clear the city and SFPD won't spend the the city's money enabling ICE.

[https://www.reddit.com/r/sanfrancisco/comments/1s1ajau/ice\\_at\\_sfo/](https://www.reddit.com/r/sanfrancisco/comments/1s1ajau/ice_at_sfo/)

Cyrus Hall  
District 7

**From:** [Cyrus Hall](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Clear SFPD collaboration with DHS/ICE at SFO  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 1:36:08 PM

---

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

I will add the initial statement from Mayor Lurie about this incident is not acceptable: officers "were not involved in the incident." Forming a barrier to allow the operation to take place \_is\_ being involved in the incident. Acting like forming a protective barrier is simply standing by and neutrally monitoring is to redefine "not involved" to mean "did not actively arrest." That is not aligned with the legal understanding of state or local sanctuary laws.

<https://missionlocal.org/2026/03/arrest-at-sfo-sparks-concerns-ice/>

The balance between protecting the people ICE may be illegally arresting and protecting an ICE operation is clear here: SFPD choose to protect the ICE action. That does not reflect the law or values of this city. The Mayor needs to be standing up, not hiding from what is happening in our country, and that means aligning SFPD with the residents who they represent and work for. With everything we know about ICE, it's fair to assume that SFPD failed to protect the actual victims here, and instead aided in their victimization.

Cyrus Hall  
District 7

On Mon, Mar 23, 2026 at 1:13 PM Cyrus Hall <[cyrusphall@gmail.com](mailto:cyrusphall@gmail.com)> wrote:

San Francisco deserves a clear answer why SFPD is clearly assisting DHS officers who refuse to identify themselves (likely ICE) at SFO. SFO is part of San Francisco, and we've been told repeatedly that SFPD will not assist ICE. And yet the video makes it clear: without SFPD, these DHS agents would likely have been unable to complete an detention/arrest that is as likely illegal as legal. SFPD's presence clearly \_is\_ assisting in ICE's mission.

SFPD needs to actually behave as the public is being told they will: no assistance for ICE. If ICE needs more agents to "do their job" of ripping families apart and destroying the fabric of America, that isn't SFPD's problem to solve. That's ICE problem to solve. The BOS and Mayor need to make it very clear the city and SFPD won't spend the the city's money enabling ICE.

[https://www.reddit.com/r/sanfrancisco/comments/1s1ajau/ice\\_at\\_sfo/](https://www.reddit.com/r/sanfrancisco/comments/1s1ajau/ice_at_sfo/)

Cyrus Hall  
District 7

**From:** [Jade Catalano](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mayor, MYR \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Concern Regarding Unidentified Detentions and agents in San Francisco  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 4:02:55 PM

---

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

Dear Representatives,

I am writing to raise a serious public safety and civil rights concern regarding an incident that is circling social in San Francisco involving individuals detaining someone without clearly identifying themselves.

I have also previously contacted y'all regarding seeing a group of men who didn't identify themselves standing outside of buildings in duboce triangle.

Based on the circumstances, it is possible these individuals were federal agents, potentially ICE. No matter what law enforcement they may or may not have been it is completely unclear because the lack of clear identification, which is deeply concerning and creates confusion, fear, and risk for the public.

Situations like this raise important questions about:  
accountability and identification requirements for federal agents  
protections against unlawful detention or impersonation  
the impact on community trust and safety  
What are we doing as a city and state?

I am requesting:  
clarification on current identification requirements for federal agents operating in local communities  
whether this type of incident is being reviewed or tracked  
any steps being taken to ensure transparency and accountability in enforcement actions

Video reference:  
<https://www.instagram.com/reel/DWPcTbliSyx>

I appreciate your leadership on civil liberties and ask that this issue be taken seriously.

Thank you for your time and attention.  
Constituent of San Francisco District 5  
Jade



**From:** [Jennifer Waggoner](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [CMS, SFDPA \(DPA\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Senator Wiener](#); [Jeff.Sparks@sen.ca.gov](mailto:Jeff.Sparks@sen.ca.gov)  
**Subject:** March 22 why was SFPD at SFO assisting immigration agents - Protect Sanctuary!  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 4:52:48 PM

---

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

Hello, SF Government officials.

I have lived in San Francisco more than two decades, own a small business here, and am active in my community. I'm writing because I'm so concerned about SFPD being present at SFO on March 22 for federal immigration enforcement. The statements put out by the Mayor, SFO, and SFPD are deeply concerning and unsatisfactory.

**SFPD's Department General Order (DGO) 5.20 prohibits assisting ICE.** SFPD's August 2025 Department Notice 25-089 contradicted DGO 5.15 by allowing officers to assist ICE by "maintaining a perimeter" and "directing traffic." The notice should never have been allowed. Many other cities have excellent examples of how Sanctuary is protected by local law enforcement - not undermined. I know that numerous community groups and city commissions have provided you with examples of how police policy could be written in alignment with Sanctuary and DGO 5.20.

- I ask you to investigate why SFPD was there, what they did, and what happened to the people involved. Please publicly share the investigation findings, such as in a Police Commission meeting open session, Board of Supervisors meeting, or Mayoral town hall.
- I also ask that you share how you will prevent the misuse of City resources and undermining of Sanctuary in the future, particularly by ending SFPD's assistance to federal immigration enforcement through maintaining a perimeter and directing traffic.

Thank you for your attention to this.

With respect,

Jennifer A. Waggoner  
Castro resident  
Small business owner

**From:** [Bridget](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please reply - please post  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 6:17:02 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisor's

According to the City and County of San Francisco's official website:

"City employees aren't allowed to help Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) enforce immigration law except in very limited circumstances or when required by federal or state law."

Yet these words ring hollow today. This promise is being broken — not just quietly, but in full public view. Jackie Fielder is the only one I have seen consistently speaking out against ICE.

The recent abductions of community members — including a Bay Area mother taken in SoMa and, most recently, another family targeted at San Francisco International Airport — show how far we have strayed from the city's sanctuary values. These actions are not isolated; they are symptomatic of a system that is failing to protect the very residents it claims to stand with.

Last year, we stood together at the immigration courts to stop an ICE raid in its tracks and defend our immigrant neighbors from abduction. We vowed it would never happen again. But now, it has — and our city's silence only deepens the wound. Isn't Joseph's life, and the safety of every family torn apart by these raids, worth protecting too?

Sources:

San Francisco Chronicle - <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/ice-arrest-columbia-mom-kids-21960043.php> Bring home, Joseph!

Los Angeles Times

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2026-03-18/deported-deaf-boy-6-could-die-in-colombia-without-medical-attention> Have you no heart? Speak up, speak out, don't side with fascists!

East Bay Times - <https://www.eastbaytimes.com/2026/03/19/hes-really-struggling-advocates-voice-concern-about-deported-6-year-old-deaf-hayward-boy/>

Mission Local - <https://missionlocal.org/2025/06/no-kings-one-day-after-giant->

[protests-s-f-demonstrators-are-back/](#) more evidence of local PD's working with ICE

The city's own Sanctuary Ordinance clearly prohibits employees from:

- Helping ICE with investigations, detentions, or arrests for civil immigration violations.
- Asking about anyone's immigration status on city forms or applications.
- Restricting city services or benefits based on immigration status.
- Providing personal or release information to ICE.
- Holding people for ICE after they are cleared for release.

Despite these clear laws, the San Francisco Police Department and other city agencies continue to look the other way—or worse, cooperate. Officials claim publicly that SFPD does not assist ICE, but I have seen otherwise.

I work in San Francisco, pay business taxes, and I am deeply angered that this is what our tax dollars are used to uphold. I have witnessed these betrayals with my own eyes. Our city must do more than issue statements—it must act, enforce its policies, and hold accountable those who betray them.

I demand answers. I demand justice. And I will not stay silent.

Sincerely,

**Bridget Bertrand** (any pronouns with love)

Expressive Arts Facilitator, Mindfulness Instruction, and Therapist

650-539-4325

[bridget@bridgetbertrand.com](mailto:bridget@bridgetbertrand.com)

[www.bridgetbertrand.com](http://www.bridgetbertrand.com)

**Office:** Flood Building, 870 Market Street, Room 953, San Francisco, CA 94102

Parking: 123 O'Farrell St (enter via 71 Ellis St)

**Also sending this message to the Mayor**

**From:** [Elizabeth MacLeod](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** STOP SFPD from aiding ICE  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 1:18:02 PM

---

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

To all Supervisors: recent arrests by ICE have shown agents to be protected by SFPD officers—this must not happen!

Keep SF a true Sanctuary City!

Beth Macleod

SF resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Lisa King](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** SFPD shielding ICE violates Sanctuary  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 7:38:10 PM

---

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

Dear BoS:

My name is Lisa King. I am a constituent, and my zip code is 94134. I am a member of Showing Up For Racial Justice San Francisco Chapter.

I'm writing because I'm deeply concerned about the March 22 video from SFO showing SFPD officers blocking community members from filming or interacting with unbadged supposed ICE agents who tackled and detained a woman while her child watched in distress. Videos showed SFPD officers apparently forming a wall to shield the ICE agents from public attention. This undermines San Francisco's sanctuary city laws and our community's trust.

Please count this as a complaint that your constituents will need your position on this matter to be public and will also be voiced to the Mayor's office, the Police Chief's office, Department of Police Accountability, and the Police Commission. Sanctuary here will not be infringed.

SFPD will uphold human rights and our laws in the city of St. Francis.  
Lisa King

**From:** [Colin Williams](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [CMS, SFDPA \(DPA\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)  
**Subject:** March 22 at SFO  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 1:17:03 PM

---

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

Good Afternoon,

My name is Colin Williams. I am a constituent, and my zip code is 94133. I am a member of SURJ SF. I live and work in San Francisco.

I am calling because I am deeply concerned about the March 22 SFO videos showing SFPD officers assisting ICE agents by blocking community members from filming or interacting with unbadged ICE agents who tackled and detained a mother while her child watched in distress. Several videos also show SFPD assisting in transporting the mother and child by following ICE through the terminal. These actions by SFPD clearly violate our city and state sanctuary laws and undermine our community's trust.

--

Colin Williams  
504.261.6905

Check out my new rock orchestra at <https://www.renegadeorchestra.com/>

# Item 22

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: File No. 251162 Spay/Nueter - 4 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 2:17:55 PM  
**Attachments:** [251162 4 letters.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 2:16 PM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative\_aides@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** File No. 251162 Spay/Nueter - 4 letters

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 4 letters, from members of the public, regarding:

File No. 251162 - Ordinance amending the Health Code to require that every dog in San Francisco, with certain exceptions, be spayed, neutered, or chemically sterilized, rather than requiring such procedures only for pit bulls; to establish a process and fee for applying for an unaltered dog permit, and a process for granting, denying, or revoking such permit, with a hearing following a denial or revocation; to regulate the transfer, sale, and breeding of unaltered dogs; and to establish penalties and conditions of impoundment for violations of the mandatory spay, neuter, or chemical sterilization requirements.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office*

*does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*



**From:** [shannon.green](#)  
**To:** [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [crayton@sfgov.org](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Concerns Regarding Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Policy - File#251162  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 1:18:12 PM

---

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express serious concern regarding the proposed mandatory spay/neuter policy under consideration in San Francisco. While I fully support and advocate for responsible pet ownership, awareness and humane animal welfare initiatives, this proposal raises significant practical, ethical, and economic concerns that warrant careful reconsideration.

Mandatory spay/neuter laws have not demonstrated effectiveness in addressing the root causes of animal overpopulation. Shelter overcrowding is driven primarily by stray and unowned animals, animal surrendered do to housing concerns and the cost associated with Veterinary care, not by responsible owners or preservation breeders. This proposal does little to meaningfully reduce that population and instead risks misdirecting resources away from more impactful solutions.

In addition, the cost of veterinary care in San Francisco is already extraordinarily high, with spay/neuter procedures often reaching levels that are financially burdensome for many residents. Mandating such procedures without addressing affordability places an inequitable strain on responsible pet owners, particularly those who may not qualify for limited low-cost programs yet still cannot reasonably absorb these expenses. This approach risks penalizing compliance rather than encouraging it, and may ultimately lead to unintended consequences, including reduced veterinary care or avoidance of licensing altogether.

A more effective and humane approach would be to fully fund and expand access to low-cost spay/neuter services and lowering Veterinary costs while increasing public awareness of these programs. Ensuring accessibility—rather than imposing mandates—has proven to be a more successful strategy in encouraging compliance and improving community outcomes.

Additionally, this policy imposes unnecessary financial and logistical burdens on responsible dog owners and ethical breeders who already adhere to high standards of care. Rather than penalizing these individuals, the City would be better served by prioritizing comprehensive public education around responsible dog stewardship—equipping owners with the knowledge and resources to make informed, humane decisions—while also working to meaningfully reduce the cost of veterinary care across San Francisco. Expanding affordable access to veterinary services, including spay/neuter, and increasing awareness of available programs would drive far more effective and equitable outcomes than broad mandates, while still supporting the City's animal welfare goals.

The proposed exemption for competition dogs is overly narrow and fails to account for many responsible owners who maintain intact dogs for legitimate purposes outside of formal competition including the ongoing studies showing major health benefits associated with keeping dogs intact. This exclusion unfairly targets a broad segment of conscientious owners without justification.

Finally, the use of the term “guardian” in place of “owner” raises serious legal concerns. “Guardian” is a term traditionally reserved for human legal relationships, and its application to animal ownership may unintentionally undermine the legal status of dogs as property. This shift could restrict the ability of owners, veterinarians, and agencies to make necessary decisions for animal care, while also opening the door to increased litigation and higher costs associated with pet ownership.

In summary, I respectfully urge the City to reconsider this policy and instead focus on proven, balanced solutions: enforce existing laws, expand affordable spay/neuter and Veterinary access, and invest in public education. These approaches will more effectively address animal welfare concerns without placing undue burdens on responsible members of the community.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,  
Shannon G.

**From:** [Jackel](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Crayton@sfgov.org](mailto:Crayton@sfgov.org); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** File No. 251162; San Francisco proposed spay/neuter ordinance  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 1:57:07 PM

---

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

Hello! I'm writing to share my thoughts and opinions on File No. 251162; proposed spay/neuter ordinance.

This is a terrible idea that does nothing to address pet overpopulation, while placing a noxious burden on responsible pet owners who are themselves likely to be helping to solve, not creating these problems.

I am a bay area local, graduate of USF School of Law, and frequent visitor, with my dogs, to the city of SF. I love this city dearly. I breed my dogs and exhibit them in conformation, tracking, scent work, obedience, field sports and agility. I have spent my life studying and working my borzois and collies.

Whether or not to alter a dog is a complex personal question that depends on the dog's temperament, intended use, health status (including complex hormonal and endocrine issues), training level or goal and value or lack as a breeding animal. There are many reasons this serious medical procedure might be helpful or harmful. This is a private decision to be made by an owner who is ideally well advised by their vet, breeder or trainer. There is no need for legislative involvement.

Providing free spay/neuter to low income pet owners, outreach into stray populations and especially ensuring that the city offers sufficient pet friendly low income housing would be excellent ways to use municipal funds to help at-risk pets and their handlers.

I stand behind all of the AKC's points below:

- Mandatory spay/neuter laws have not proven an effective solution to animal control concerns — this proposal does not address the stray population, which is the primary driver of shelter overcrowding.
- 
- A better solution is to fully fund low-cost spay/neuter programs and ensure the public is aware of available services.
- 
- Mandatory spay/neuter laws impose significant costs on responsible owners and breeders. The city should instead enforce existing animal control laws, expand low-cost spay/neuter access, and fund public education on responsible dog ownership.
- 
- The competition dog exemption is narrowly defined and will exclude many responsible dog owners who simply choose to keep their dogs intact.
- 
- The term “guardian” is a legal term used by courts to protect people and is not appropriate when referring to dogs. The use of this term may reduce the legal classification and value of

dogs as property, which would restrict the rights of owners, veterinarians, and government agencies to protect and care for dogs. It could also provide the basis for a vast increase in the number of frivolous and expensive lawsuits being filed, which would result in higher costs for pet care.

As an attorney, I particularly agree that 'guardian' should not be used as a legal or municipal term for the owner or handler of a dog. I prefer 'owner, and/or handler.'

Thanks for your time and attention.

Summer Jackson

**From:** [Jan Dykema](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** file number 251162  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 7:59:02 PM

---

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

Why pass laws you cannot enforce? Offer free spay neuter along with free rabies vax for all dogs ( and cats). Rabies is a HUMAN health hazard especially among poor people and homeless. Can you imagine a rabies outbreak in a homeless camp? Do something that will help, not something that never has helped anywhere it has been passed. Homeless people and poor people have no \$\$ to make sure their pets do not procreate.. and arresting them and taking their pets is heartless. So a \$186.00 "permit" will not apply to them, their dogs will be taken and then the shelters will be even more crowded.. Use your heads. DO NOT PASS  
Jan Dykema

**From:** [vcd3tervs@att.net](mailto:vcd3tervs@att.net)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on File No. 251162 - Mandatory Spay/Neuter  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:40:37 AM

---

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

While I am not a SF resident, I am writing to oppose the mandatory/spay neuter in SF (File No. 251162). This will not solve the problem of overcrowded shelters and will prevent responsible breeders in SF from being able to affordably breed a litter (if they can at all), as well as create burdens for the average pet owner. It creates burdensome and overreaching regulations. People need to have a source for their pets, and the best source is the responsible small breeder that can properly socialize the puppies and educate their puppy buyers and assure that the puppy is a good match for the new owner's lifestyle.

What is needed is affordable voluntary spay/neuter clinics. It cost me over \$1000 dollars to have my dog spayed last summer when her conformation show career was over. This is beyond the reach of most families struggling with the high cost of living in the Bay Area.

I also oppose the use of the term "guardian" when used for dog ownership. The use of this term may reduce the legal classification and value of dogs as property, which would restrict the rights of owners, veterinarians, and government agencies to protect and care for dogs. It could also provide the basis for a vast increase in the number of frivolous and expensive lawsuits being filed, which would result in higher costs for pet care.

I am worried what this will do to the future of dog shows in San Francisco and to the show dogs that live there, as well as pets that people do not choose to breed but who do not want to have them spayed or neutered for health or personal reasons.

Regards,

Linda Knowles

San Jose, CA

**Elsa** (Belgian Tervuren) - Safari Living The Adventure VCD3 UDX BN VER RE TDU2 MXB MJB MFS  
T2B2 SWM SCME SHDE TKI, GCH-Br AAD (bn 3/20/20)

# Item 23

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 15 Marina Blvd - 71 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 2:25:37 PM  
**Attachments:** [15 Marina Blvd 71 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 71 letters, from members of the public, regarding a proposed housing development at 15 Marina Boulevard.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [Gabrielle Lavelle](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 7:55:38 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

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

From your constituent Gabrielle Lavelle

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to



determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Gabrielle Lavelle

---

**From:** [Perez](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 6:12:40 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Eloisa                                                        |
| Last Name      | Perez                                                         |
| Email Address  | cp.eloisa@gmail.com                                           |
| Street Address | 1490 Francisco St.                                            |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Christian](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 10:29:28 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Becky                                                         |
| Last Name      | Christian                                                     |
| Email Address  | beckyfchristian@gmail.com                                     |
| Street Address | 2550 Lyon Street                                              |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Holcomb](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:06:33 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Carol                                                         |
| Last Name      | Holcomb                                                       |
| Email Address  | ceholcomb@mindspring.com                                      |
| Street Address | 1440 Francisco St                                             |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Hux](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 8:56:34 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Jeremy                                                        |
| Last Name      | Hux                                                           |
| Email Address  | Jeremy_hux@sbcglobal.net                                      |
| Street Address | 27 Rico Way                                                   |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,



You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Gellen](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 3:22:27 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Martin                                                        |
| Last Name      | Gellen                                                        |
| Email Address  | martingellen@mac.com                                          |
| Street Address | 3248 Baker Street                                             |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.

I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.

While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).

Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Prus](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 9:53:45 AM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Jacek                                                         |
| Last Name      | Prus                                                          |
| Email Address  | jacekprus1@gmail.com                                          |
| Street Address | 1585 beach St.                                                |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Dennehy](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 1:42:30 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Catherine                                                     |
| Last Name      | Dennehy                                                       |
| Email Address  | cathi.dennehy@ucsf.edu                                        |
| Street Address | 3615 Divisadero St                                            |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Jacqueline Rosenberg](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 2:23:27 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email jacq.a.rose@gmail.com

From your constituent Jacqueline Rosenberg

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to



determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Jacqueline Rosenberg

---

**From:** [Eleanor Mount](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 2:23:33 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email eleanormount1@gmail.com

From your constituent Eleanor Mount

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Eleanor Mount

---

**From:** [Goodwin](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 2:57:31 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                                              |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Katelyn                                                                      |
| Last Name      | Goodwin                                                                      |
| Email Address  | <a href="mailto:katelyn.m.goodwin@gmail.com">katelyn.m.goodwin@gmail.com</a> |
| Street Address | 1435 Bay St, Apt 24 San Francisco, CA 94123                                  |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project                |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.

I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.

While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).

Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Heniser](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 3:19:45 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Stacy                                                         |
| Last Name      | Heniser                                                       |
| Email Address  | sheniser@comcast.net                                          |
| Street Address | 3426 Divisadero St.                                           |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.

I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.

While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).

Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Erigero](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 3:28:34 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | David                                                         |
| Last Name      | Erigero                                                       |
| Email Address  | erigerod@yahoo.com                                            |
| Street Address | 3426 Divisadero Street                                        |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,



You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Bury](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 6:02:32 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Brendan                                                       |
| Last Name      | Bury                                                          |
| Email Address  | bury88@me.com                                                 |
| Street Address | 2200 Beach Street                                             |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Smith](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 3:00:52 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Erin                                                          |
| Last Name      | Smith                                                         |
| Email Address  | erin.c.v.smith@gmail.com                                      |
| Street Address | 2046 Jefferson St                                             |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Hochschild](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 3:55:38 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Frances                                                       |
| Last Name      | Hochschild                                                    |
| Email Address  | fhochschild@yahoo.com                                         |
| Street Address | 2517 Broadway St                                              |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** S  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 6:20:42 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Jules                                                         |
| Last Name      | S                                                             |
| Email Address  | juliee340@gmail.com                                           |
| Street Address | 1365 Chestnut St                                              |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,



You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Besson](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 6:22:36 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Brooks                                                        |
| Last Name      | Besson                                                        |
| Email Address  | bbesson123@gmail.com                                          |
| Street Address | 1585 Beach St apt 104                                         |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Michele Furlong](#)  
**To:** [Docs, SF \(LIB\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Notice of Board Meeting - Monday, April 27, 2026  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 6:26:46 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)  
[MOWSFOpenBoardMeetingApril2026.pdf](#)

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

This message was sent securely using Zix®

To Whom It May Concern,

Attached is a notice of public access for our upcoming April 27, 2026, Board Meeting for Meals On Wheels of San Francisco.

Please let me know if you have any questions or there is something else, I should be providing.

All of our Board meetings are actually open meetings.

Kind Regards, Michele



**Michele Furlong**

**Executive Assistant to Jennifer Steele, CEO**

**D:** 415-343-1287 | **C:** 415-640-3840 | [mfurlong@mowsf.org](mailto:mfurlong@mowsf.org)

[MOWSF.org](http://MOWSF.org) | 2142 Jerrold Ave, San Francisco, CA 94124



**We've Moved! Our NEW HQ:** 2142 Jerrold Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94124

This message was secured by Zix®.

**From:** [Lutz](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 6:30:41 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                                |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Hannah                                                         |
| Last Name      | Lutz                                                           |
| Email Address  | <a href="mailto:hannahlutz@gmail.com">hannahlutz@gmail.com</a> |
| Street Address | 1468 La Playa Street                                           |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project  |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.

I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.

While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).

Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Liebowitz](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 8:42:34 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Julia                                                         |
| Last Name      | Liebowitz                                                     |
| Email Address  | juliahliebowitz@gmail.com                                     |
| Street Address | 1585 beach street                                             |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.

I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.

While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).

Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.



**From:** [Beresford](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 10:22:34 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Masae                                                         |
| Last Name      | Beresford                                                     |
| Email Address  | masaem@ix.netcom.com                                          |
| Street Address | 1500 Francisco st #10                                         |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Wayland](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 8:31:54 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Sarah                                                         |
| Last Name      | Wayland                                                       |
| Email Address  | sarahrwayland@gmail.com                                       |
| Street Address | 353 25th Ave                                                  |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Thompson](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 3:17:36 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Laura                                                         |
| Last Name      | Thompson                                                      |
| Email Address  | thoml68@yahoo.com                                             |
| Street Address | 3724 Webster St, San Francisco CA 94123, United States        |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Mauk](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 9:14:42 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Sawyer                                                        |
| Last Name      | Mauk                                                          |
| Email Address  | sawyerfmauk@gmail.com                                         |
| Street Address | 67 Casa Way                                                   |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.



**From:** [Dibachi](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 7:19:49 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Faye                                                          |
| Last Name      | Dibachi                                                       |
| Email Address  | faye@teamdibachi.com                                          |
| Street Address | 26 Retiro Way San Francisco, Ca 94123                         |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Cucalon](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 8:34:42 AM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Mardi                                                         |
| Last Name      | Cucalon                                                       |
| Email Address  | mardicuc@aol.com                                              |
| Street Address | 1827 Vallejo st                                               |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.

I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.

While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).

Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Flanagan](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 8:46:48 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Sheelagh                                                      |
| Last Name      | Flanagan                                                      |
| Email Address  | sheelagh127@me.com                                            |
| Street Address | 127 Retiro Way                                                |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Parodi](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:55:20 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Betty                                                         |
| Last Name      | Parodi                                                        |
| Email Address  | dooney@pacbell.net                                            |
| Street Address | 3530 Broderick St.                                            |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.



**From:** [Arthur Craig](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 10:14:26 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email arthur.ray.craig@gmail.com

From your constituent Arthur Craig

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Arthur Craig

---

**From:** [Wessinger](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 11:04:44 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Minott                                                        |
| Last Name      | Wessinger                                                     |
| Email Address  | minott@mckenziefsf.com                                        |
| Street Address | Marina Blvd.                                                  |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Baijal](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 11:41:33 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Karishma                                                      |
| Last Name      | Baijal                                                        |
| Email Address  | karishma.baijal@gmail.com                                     |
| Street Address | 260 avila street                                              |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Kaus Koll](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 11:46:30 AM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Diana                                                         |
| Last Name      | Kaus Koll                                                     |
| Email Address  | dianakoll@gmail.com                                           |
| Street Address | 17 Avila Street                                               |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.



**From:** [Rosewall-Godley](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 11:59:50 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Aimee                                                         |
| Last Name      | Rosewall-Godley                                               |
| Email Address  | arosewall@hotmail.com                                         |
| Street Address | 265 Avila Street                                              |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Kendrick Ma](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 12:01:27 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email kendrickma.24@gmail.com

From your constituent Kendrick Ma

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Kendrick Ma

---

**From:** [Ostler](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 12:11:28 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Vanessa                                                       |
| Last Name      | Ostler                                                        |
| Email Address  | askelandvanessa@gmail.com                                     |
| Street Address | 237 Avila Street, San Francisco, CA 94123                     |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Crickets](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](#); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 12:40:37 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Jimmeny                                                       |
| Last Name      | Crickets                                                      |
| Email Address  | jcricketa@gmail.com                                           |
| Street Address | 1694 green street                                             |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.



**From:** [Ochinca](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](#); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 1:33:52 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Olga                                                          |
| Last Name      | Ochinca                                                       |
| Email Address  | Ochinca@gmail.com                                             |
| Street Address | 243 Avila street                                              |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.

I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.

While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).

Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Hornik](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 1:43:28 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Leigh                                                         |
| Last Name      | Hornik                                                        |
| Email Address  | leighsellis@yahoo.com                                         |
| Street Address | 15 Avila Street San Francisco CA 94123                        |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Hinh Tran](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Approve the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 2:52:27 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email [hinh.d.tran@gmail.com](mailto:hinh.d.tran@gmail.com)

From your constituent [Hinh Tran](#)

Subject Approve the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the  
Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to approve  
the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. No to  
NIMBYs!

Thank you.

Hinh Tran

---

**From:** [Shri Apte](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 3:17:41 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email [shriram.apte@gmail.com](mailto:shriram.apte@gmail.com)

From your constituent **Shri Apte**

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Shri Apte

---

**From:** [Adam Wong](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 3:25:30 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email [adamsulli Wong@gmail.com](mailto:adamsulli Wong@gmail.com)

From your constituent Adam Wong

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to allow the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. to move forward through the proper review process. This project is not an assault on San Francisco's legislative process or the safety of its residents. Rather, it is an opportunity for the City to show that it can accommodate new housing and growth while still applying clear legal and safety standards.

The following reasons support allowing this proposal to proceed:

### Respect for the Planning Process and Legislative Framework

The fact that the developer has been working on this project for years does not suggest bad faith. Large projects often require long lead times, and preparing a proposal over an extended period is consistent with the realities of development in San Francisco. That timing does not, by itself, prove any attempt to circumvent the public process. If the application was filed in accordance with the rules in effect at the time, it deserves to be evaluated fairly under those rules.

### Confidence in Modern Safety Standards

The Marina district does present geotechnical challenges, but those challenges are well known and



are addressed through modern engineering, seismic review, and building code requirements. The existence of liquefaction risk does not mean that development must stop altogether. It means projects should be carefully designed, studied, and built to meet the applicable safety standards. If this tower can satisfy those standards, it should not be rejected based on fear alone.

**Support for Housing and Predictable Governance**  
San Francisco cannot claim to support housing production while rejecting proposals simply because they are larger than some neighbors would prefer. Allowing this project to move forward would not undermine local democracy. It would demonstrate that the City respects lawful applications, applies its rules consistently, and provides a predictable environment for planning and investment. That kind of consistency is essential if San Francisco is serious about addressing its housing needs.

We respect the concerns that have been raised, but concern alone should not become a veto. The City should ensure that this proposal is reviewed thoroughly, objectively, and in accordance with the law. If it meets the required standards, it should be allowed to proceed.

Thanks so much! Available for further discussion.

Adam Wong

---

**From:** [Ng](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 3:28:33 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | May                                                           |
| Last Name      | Ng                                                            |
| Email Address  | ngmay2000@yahoo.com                                           |
| Street Address | 3717 Webster St                                               |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Ben M](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Wildly support the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 3:34:29 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email [mathes.ben@gmail.com](mailto:mathes.ben@gmail.com)

From your constituent Ben M

Subject Wildly support the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to APPROVE the new housing. And do not listen to these clowns that hold up protest signs saying “marina is for everybody” while trying to block housing for anybody.

Ben M

---

**From:** [Khalsa](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 3:47:37 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | SatKartar                                                     |
| Last Name      | Khalsa                                                        |
| Email Address  | satkartar.khalsa@gmail.com                                    |
| Street Address | 333 Avila Street                                              |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Jane Wisdom](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 3:55:26 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email wisdom.jane@yahoo.com

From your constituent Jane Wisdom

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Jane Wisdom

---



**From:** [Trey Marshall](#)  
**To:** [Emmett Moore](#)  
**Cc:** [zeke.montejano@equityhealth.org](#); [Critchfield, Jeffrey \(UCSF\)](#); [Lin, Helen \(UCSF\)](#); [Drew Vang](#); [Thompson, Dante \(UCSF\)](#); [apruitt@alrp.org](#); [contact.center@calcivilrights.ca.gov](#); [accommodations@calcivilrights.ca.gov](#); [DBICUSTOMERSERVICE\\_DBI \(DBI\)](#); [DBIHIDComplaints@sfgov.org](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [SDA-Sheriff Department Oversight Board](#); [CON\\_OCOH \(CON\)](#); [CON\\_Treasury Oversight Committee \(CON\)](#); [Badasow, Bridget \(HOM\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [bob@greystar.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Compliance, Compliance \(UCSF\)](#); [QIU, Name Missing \(UCSF\)](#); [Whistleblower, Name Missing \(UCSF\)](#); [Name Missing, OPHD \(UCSF\)](#); [lisa.buchanan@hhs.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Move-In Costs for Treyon Marshall  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 4:03:39 PM  
**Attachments:** [aim\\_share\\_thumbnail.png](#)  
[Adobe Scan Nov 15, 2025.pdf](#)  
[Adobe Scan Feb 18, 2026 \(5\).pdf](#)  
[Adobe Scan Jun 23, 2025.pdf](#)  
[DOS 12312025 - ZSFGH - HEAD INJURY - TREYON MARSHALL.pdf](#)  
[DOS 12042025, TOE INJURY BOOT BILL, BROWN MARSHALL, TREYON.pdf](#)  
[Tower 737 Condominium Rentals Apartments in San Francisco, CA RENTCafe 2.pdf](#)  
[TREYON MARSHALL WELLS FARGO JANUARY 2026.pdf](#)  
[savings\\_account\\_daily\\_statement\\_v1.0.0\\_20260302\\_567650.pdf](#)  
[savings\\_account\\_daily\\_statement\\_v1.0.0\\_20260228\\_584958.pdf](#)

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

April 1, 2026 @ 1430

From: TREYON MARSHALL  
DOB: 5/11/1985

To: EMMETT MOORE @ AEF

CC:

1. Dr. Jeff Critchfield @ ZSFGH
2. Helen Lin @ Ward 86/Global Health
3. Dante Thompson @ Weill Neuroscience
4. Andrew Vang @ Brilliant Corners
5. Allison Pruitt @ AIDS Legal Referral Panel, Housing Division (government program)
6. ERAP Team (government program) @ Eviction Defense Collaborative
7. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CIVIL RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
8. SAN FRANCISCO RENT BOARD
9. CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING INSPECTOR
10. Zeke Montejano @ Equity Health
11. UCSF
12. Bob, President of Greystar

(mandated reporters: please report that I'm being defrauded, endangered, and taken advantage of. Please ask for the video of what happened to me in the ER, causing my TBI, but being labeled as "Agitation" on a false medical report. That false report is causing malpractice, every time I'm seen. It's not fair, and this is hurting me.)

Hello,

I would like to provide you with additional information that may be able to support my request for a two-bedroom, if possible. I am needing my next place to truly be considered permanent.

I have already been under more than one bout of "grave disability" since moving to San Francisco in August of 2013. I currently receive IHSS in-home support, and have times when I need someone to be on-call 24-hours per day, even if I don't have full-time hours to provide. The best way that I can do my job, especially with the additional struggles that come along with caring for someone with PTSD, ADHD, and a TBI, is to make sure that I am respectful of the personal space of people who come to my house. Unlike many people, it is extraordinarily difficult to share a small space with me. Burnout occurs fast, and is common, so I often go for long periods of time in unhealthy isolation. It is shocking to people, given my demographic and exterior, that I spend most of the last 8-10 years completely alone, except for one or two years in my last apartment. I had a 1300 square foot, two-story one-bedroom apartment, with 3 walk-in closets and 3 double-door closets. My unit also had a dining room with a chandelier, a travertine fireplace, a 2.5 story solarium (wall of glass + glass ceiling), and the bedroom with about 16 x 17, upstairs. It was a "penthouse townhouse" with subterranean parking, a pool on the 4th floor mezzanine, an equipped gym with powerful air conditioning on the 3rd floor, and it was at the side of one of only two 24-hour neighborhoods in town, with stores available anytime of the day or night, like in New York City.

I would have to say that it was one of the top 10 best apartments for the price in the Bay Area. I'm sure that's difficult, but it was definitely in the top 100, for sure. My apartment was \$1949, due to a COVID-19 phase opening with Rent Control. There were other units in San Francisco, but they've all been rented, and I'm sure that's permanently.

IT IS THEREFORE VERY SERIOUS THAT I NOT ASSUME THAT I CAN FIND ANOTHER DEAL, LIKE I DID DURING COVID-19. I'm sad to hear so many people care so little about losing a permanent home like that, within my budget.

I had a Reasonable Accommodation Letter given to my apartments, asking to not be locked-out so much. They responded by dismantling the locking and closing mechanisms, to prevent the door from closing accidentally. Greystar even showed me the work afterwards, and confirmed that the door would not close, nor automatically lock. I was very shocked when I walked-Out one morning and the door did exactly that again. It wasn't on purpose, by me, and I wasn't acting negligently. My door wasn't supposed to be ABLE to close or lock behind me. It did, and without clothes on, I had to get back in, quickly. I find myself to have acted reasonably, and I need the fact that the door was actually substantially-improved to be taken into account. I was able to break through it because it was actually a bathroom door, in my opinion. They replaced the door with a much more expensive solid wood door, while charging me for it. I find that the misrepresentation of my conduct, reporting a balance that reflects their upgrades, and two false imprisonments, to be abusive, defaming, and obstructing. I find that the discarding of my entire life savings, which was my tangible high-quality housewares, electronics, and furnishings. They also blocked me from receiving my IHSS services, and caused my life and health to go into rapid decline. Without having the space to appropriately host my caretakers, or at least by changing the dynamics so much to a very intimate space, I've caused myself to lose people with whom I had great rapport. I need to live in a world that I feel is fair, so that I'm not overwhelmed in my resentment, because I already have an Embitterment Disorder from previous wrongs done to me. I need some support in advocating for as much as possible, if I ask for it, even beyond the standard protocols. Everything about my scenario builds on my emotionally and mentally disabling conditions. I need assistance helping me to get PRN on-call full-time, for IHSS, because of my PTSD, untreated

ADHD, Binge Eating Disorder, medication adherence, medication side effects, “dissociative fugue”, sleepwalking, and narcolepsy with cataplexy, if not on stimulants. I also have the TBI, spinal fractures, wrist problem, and Edema problems also. I should qualify for full-time. I need help getting all of this established. I’m asking you to; so it shouldn’t be that difficult. Please just show me what needs to be done; and my current caretaker and I have to do it.

Please advocate for a Fair Market Replacement for my unit. I value it at \$6800/mo, so this will be interesting, as I’m right. I would accept unit #109 at IsleHouse at \$1949, for life, as a reasonable replacement. My furniture’s Fair Market Replacement Value is approximately \$35,000. I also need to make up for the credit and criminal record defamation. Please assist me with this.

My phone number is 415.417.9876

My old address was:

888 OFarrell Street #WEST1201  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94109

My new address:


2048 Polk Street #315  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109.

Someone, during hate crimes, has been trying to get me constructively evicted from this “temporary unit” according to my careteam. I’m very thankful for the place, and I don’t like seeming unappreciative. I just have to advocate for myself, demand that my rights are always acknowledged, adhered to, or made up for at equal or greater value than the offenses and encroachments, and continue trying. I don’t want to seem ungrateful, nor put-down the achievements of others, as we are all happy to have roofs over our heads. I know I am.

Thank You, Emmett!

TREYON MARSHALL

Here is some supportive documentation concerning extra bedrooms in San Francisco:



Here is documentation, although an update may be available, upon request, to confirm my concern for mobility, recurrent head trauma (danger to myself), fear of going outdoors alone, and injuries that occur while going to or from medical and/or pharmacy:

Here is some documentation about my bills, as well as that I’m an established person who’s working on my credit, because I need to take care of myself and my disabilities.

Please get the footage from Greystar, to reverse my eviction. It’s a wrongful eviction.

On Mar 31, 2026, at 12:50 AM, Trey Marshall <treymarshall.private@icloud.com> wrote:

Thank You, Emmett. I appreciate the assistance. I receive IHSS Support in my home, but my temporary place, that I've been in for almost 15 months now, is a SRO. It's very inappropriate, for me, to have someone in my bedroom the entire time. I need for that individual to need to be here more often, on-call.

I hope that she responds soon, so I can get into a one or two bedroom.

Would your group be able to assist with a Reasonable Accommodation necessary to obtain the two-bedroom that I really need?

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 30, 2026, at 11:42 AM, Moore, Emmett <[emmett.moore@prcsf.org](mailto:emmett.moore@prcsf.org)> wrote:

Hello. I have sent Helen an encrypted email for confidentiality to request h. Thanks.

Emmett

<image001.png>

**Emmett Moore**  
Client Services Coordinator/Housing Navigator  
Pronouns: He/Him/His ([what's this?](#))  
170 9<sup>th</sup> Street, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Office: 415-777-0333  
Direct 415-972-0858  
Facsimile: 415-864-4042  
[prcsf.org](http://prcsf.org)

**This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the PHI contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.**

---

**From:** Trey Marshall <[treymarshall.private@icloud.com](mailto:treymarshall.private@icloud.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 10:57 AM  
**To:** Moore, Emmett <[emmett.moore@prcsf.org](mailto:emmett.moore@prcsf.org)>; helen.lin@ucsf.edu  
**Subject:** Re: Move-In Costs for Treyon Marshall

Can you contact Helen Lin at Ward 86?

She is who I can have this arranged through.

I'm adding her as a recipient to this thread, now.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 18, 2026, at 11:46 AM, Moore, Emmett <[emmett.moore@prcsf.org](mailto:emmett.moore@prcsf.org)> wrote:

Yes, if you have a Social Worker that can communicate with us that would be ideal. The ER/Urgent care would not be feasible.

Emmett

<image001.png>

**Emmett Moore**  
Client Services Coordinator/Housing Navigator  
Pronouns: He/Him/His ([what's this?](#))  
170 9<sup>th</sup> Street, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Office: 415-777-0333  
Direct 415-972-0858  
Facsimile: 415-864-4042  
[prcsf.org](http://prcsf.org)

**This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the PHI contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.**

---

**From:** Trey Marshall <[treymarshall.private@icloud.com](mailto:treymarshall.private@icloud.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 10:54 AM  
**To:** Moore, Emmett <[emmett.moore@prcsf.org](mailto:emmett.moore@prcsf.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: Move-In Costs for Treyon Marshall

Can I forward your information and this thread to them, or a social worker? Who else can handle this task? Can an emergency room/urgent care do it?

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 18, 2026, at 10:33 AM, Moore, Emmett <[emmett.moore@prcsf.org](mailto:emmett.moore@prcsf.org)> wrote:

Greetings. Please have the attorney reach out to us on your behalf.

Thank you,

Emmett

<image001.png>

**Emmett Moore**  
Client Services Coordinator/Housing Navigator  
Pronouns: He/Him/His ([what's this?](#))  
170 9<sup>th</sup> Street, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Office: 415-777-0333  
Direct 415-972-0858  
Facsimile: 415-864-4042  
[prcsf.org](http://prcsf.org)

**This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the PHI contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.**

---

**From:** Trey Marshall <[treymarshall.private@icloud.com](mailto:treymarshall.private@icloud.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 9:53 AM  
**To:** Moore, Emmett <[emmett.moore@prcsf.org](mailto:emmett.moore@prcsf.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: Move-In Costs for Treyon Marshall

How does an attorney make the referral? I have LegalZoom.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 16, 2026, at 4:08 PM, Moore, Emmett <[emmett.moore@prcsf.org](mailto:emmett.moore@prcsf.org)> wrote:

Hello Rey. I am sorry to hear about your situation. If you do not have a case manager at SFGH or San Francisco Community Health Center, please obtain one and have them send us a referral on your behalf to seek assistance at this time.

Emmett

<image001.png>

**Emmett Moore**  
Client Services Coordinator/Housing Navigator  
Pronouns: He/Him/His ([what's this?](#))  
170 9<sup>th</sup> Street, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Office: 415-777-0333  
Direct 415-972-0858  
Facsimile: 415-864-4042  
[prcsf.org](http://prcsf.org)

**This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender and destroy the e-mail immediately. Disclosure of the PHI contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.**

---

**From:** Trey Marshall <[treymarshall.private@icloud.com](mailto:treymarshall.private@icloud.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 16, 2026 3:03 PM  
**To:** Moore, Emmett <[emmett.moore@prcsf.org](mailto:emmett.moore@prcsf.org)>  
**Subject:** Move-In Costs for Treyon Marshall

March 16, 2026

From: TREYON MARSHALL (preferred name: Rey, for privacy reasons)

DOB: 5/11/1985

A "Disabling AIDS" LOD was given to PRC in 2019, I believe, due to a traumatic brain injury causing my body to shut-down. Despite almost losing my life, due to "grave disability", like the event that caused the TBI, which led my body to an AIDS diagnosis, more than HIV on its own could ever do, I've been able to bounce back from stable and quality housing.

There was a closing-mechanism disassembled on my entry door of my apartment, as well as a locking function that was disengaged, during a work order by the management company of my building, Greystar. They didn't realize this when they perceived the property damage at the time to be vandalism. It was not, and the work order cleared me. They didn't evict me, but instead threw my belongings away after I was removed on a day that no eviction was scheduled to take place. I paid the rent that month, and they accepted that rent that they charged, according to that ledger. Now I'm needing to move to a different unit with the Greystar company, because it was definitely illegal to remove me from my place and throw away all of the belongings that I paid for. I was also under a "stipulated agreement" that was established and followed as long as I was enrolled in a 3rd party payee service, which I was, and there is a charge on my credit for back pay right now.

Here's what I need:

- \$2600 for my past due rent.
- \$900 for my deposit on the new place, as mine is not available anymore.
- assistance with my Geico renters insurance, for the costs of the items stolen from my home and "loss of use"
- a Reasonable Accommodation Letter for me to have a second bedroom for a live-in caretaker, that's not going to be staying with me often, but because they are expected to 8 days per month, they'll need to not be in my bedroom, nor the common area. I am trying to be OSHA-compliant.

I have a recent head trauma, new upper-back injury (whiplash), a TBI, and a problem with dissociative fugue and night terrors from that sometimes. The unit that I'm attaining has no neighbors bordering it, which is irreplaceable in my situation, is smaller than my previous unit, but acceptable to me for having the second bedroom, and in a new part of town, which I need for safety and mental health concerns. I was also told, in person, from inside the unit below the one I'm applying for, that they would accept my Section 8 or subsidy for this unit. I'm approved, but need a check sent to them for my move-in costs on this unit that's impossible to pass-up, especially with the agreement to accept the subsidy.

Please let me know if you can fast-track this process, as I need to pay the upfront costs ASAP.

The \$900 is to Greystar at:

Isle House (for Rey Marshall)  
39 Bruton Street  
San Francisco, CA 94130

The \$2600 is past due now. The check needs to be made to Trinity Property Management, for TREYON MARSHALL at their normal address.

I also owe Axis Property Management \$2400, for Unit 315/321, which can be sent to:

Axis Property Management  
2048 Polk Street  
San Francisco, CA 94109

Thank You,  
TREYON MARSHALL

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Daniel Owens](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Support the Safeway Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 4:09:51 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email daniel@visionblvd.org

From your constituent Daniel Owens

Subject I Support the Safeway Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to approve the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is great and I want it built pronto.

The following reasons provide City Hall to approve this proposal:

1. It's beautiful (love the architectural design)
2. It's bountiful (so many much-needed homes).
3. It's beneficial (SF has had a dire housing shortage for about a half century and we need developments like this all over the city).

If this was proposed on my block, I would immediately voice my support without hesitation.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill to get the job done, and get this sucker built. Do it!

Thanks, bro's

Daniel Owens

Daniel Owens





**From:** [Sid Tiwari](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 4:13:35 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email sigmasid@gmail.com

From your constituent Sid Tiwari

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Sid Tiwari

---

**From:** [COREY O'NEAL](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I APPROVE of the 25-Story Proposal at 15 Marina Blvd  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 4:52:31 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email corey.oneal@gmail.com

From your constituent COREY O'NEAL

Subject I APPROVE of the 25-Story Proposal at 15 Marina Blvd

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to APPROVE the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. We need more of grocery store or mixed use projects like these all across the city: Ocean Beach, Golden Gate Park, Twin Peaks, NOPA, West Portal, Richmond. We need 7 of these! To start!

The pushback to project is terribly sad and predictable. We should be removing barriers that prevent families from being able to live and stay in San Francisco.

Thank you.

COREY O'NEAL

---

**From:** [lovely](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 6:04:27 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | mary                                                          |
| Last Name      | lovely                                                        |
| Email Address  | mary.p.lovely@gmail.com                                       |
| Street Address | 315 Avila St                                                  |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Wall](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 6:46:41 PM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                                |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Katy                                                           |
| Last Name      | Wall                                                           |
| Email Address  | <a href="mailto:katywall@comcast.net">katywall@comcast.net</a> |
| Street Address | 242 Avila St                                                   |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project  |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.

I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.

While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).

Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Barbara J Dwyer](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 8:29:36 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

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

From your constituent [Barbara J Dwyer](#)

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to



determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Barbara J Dwyer

---

**From:** [Sarah Ramos](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:23:25 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email smramos24@gmail.com

From your constituent Sarah Ramos

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Sarah Ramos

---

**From:** [iles](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:36:27 PM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | jennifer                                                      |
| Last Name      | iles                                                          |
| Email Address  | xuxu1052@gmail.com                                            |
| Street Address | 236 Avila Street                                              |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Sean Golden](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:36:28 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email [spg1988@aol.com](mailto:spg1988@aol.com)

From your constituent Sean Golden

Subject Support the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to support the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project would add badly needed housing supply and make the Marina for everyone.

Thank you.

Sean Golden

---

**From:** [A Kulkarni](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:43:23 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email kulkarni71@gmail.com

From your constituent A Kulkarni

Subject Support the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor & Board of Supervisors:

I urge you all to exercise your full power to  
SUPPORT the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina  
Blvd. This project is NOT an "outlier"; it is a direct  
need of the people of San Francisco & people that  
want to live in SF but can't because of the cost.  
Thanks!!

Thank you.

A Kulkarni

---

**From:** [Lizzie Siegle](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 10:36:43 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email [lizzie.siegle@gmail.com](mailto:lizzie.siegle@gmail.com)

From your constituent Lizzie Siegle

Subject Support the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to support the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is the start of something beautiful; it is a direct welcoming to more San Franciscans. It's saying, "yes, we want our kids and more people to be able to live here."

Quite honestly, I am ashamed of the people who are against this. They want to limit people from living here. They are old, out of touch boomers. If we were NYC with Zohran, he would want more people to be able to afford to live here. Building more housing increases supply to meet demand.

More people are good, not bad.

Thank you.

Lizzie Siegle

---





**From:** [Aakash Japi](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 12:36:27 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email aakashjapi@gmail.com

From your constituent Aakash Japi

Subject Support the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to approve the 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. SF needs bold housing now. Height limits shouldn't override our housing crisis. Trust the engineers on safety and let this city build.

Thank you.

Aakash Japi

---

**From:** [Mark Fabela](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 1:38:26 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email markdfabela@yahoo.com

From your constituent Mark Fabela

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Mark Fabela

---

**From:** [Beckham](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 8:17:36 AM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                                          |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Lindsay                                                                  |
| Last Name      | Beckham                                                                  |
| Email Address  | <a href="mailto:lindsay.beckham@gmail.com">lindsay.beckham@gmail.com</a> |
| Street Address | 207 Avila Street                                                         |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project            |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

**From:** [Kozesnik](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 8:51:27 AM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Jessica                                                       |
| Last Name      | Kozesnik                                                      |
| Email Address  | jessicakozesnik@gmail.com                                     |
| Street Address | 1585 Beach Street                                             |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.



**From:** [Larry Quantz](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 10:49:34 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email [jkj2000@yahoo.com](mailto:jkj2000@yahoo.com)

From your constituent Larry Quantz

Subject Oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Larry Quantz

---

**From:** [David Chacon](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support the 25-Story Proposal!  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 10:54:45 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email david.chacon.design@gmail.com

From your constituent David Chacon

Subject Support the 25-Story Proposal!

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to support the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd! NIMBYism is an unfortunate hurdle to progress. San Francisco cannot move forward if nothing changes. The whole city can't be a museum.

Thank you.

David Chacon

---

**From:** [Mitch Conquer](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** SUPPORT the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:04:21 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email mitchconquer@gmail.com

From your constituent Mitch Conquer

Subject SUPPORT the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to reject the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a direct assault on the integrity of San Francisco's legislative process and the safety of its residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to strike down this proposal:

1. A Breach of Public Trust and Legislative Intent  
The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms a deliberate attempt to circumvent the public process. While our community and this Board worked in good faith to attempt compromises within the Family Zoning Plan, the developer waited in the wings to subvert those 40-foot height limits just hours after the Board of Supervisors voted as a whole to pass the plan.
2. Unresolved Public Safety Risks - The Marina district is a high-hazard liquefaction zone. Proposing a structure of this unprecedented scale on unstable landfill is a matter of public safety, not just "neighborhood character." We request an immediate, independent seismic and geotechnical audit to

determine if this "beast" meets the strict Objective Safety Standards required by the state, which cannot be waived by SB 330. A 25-story scale creates a risk that no amount of engineering can fix, as it would interfere with emergency evacuation routes for the entire district during a disaster.

3. Defense of Local Democracy - By allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively rendering the Board's recent vote on the Family Zoning Plan meaningless. We ask that the City Attorney review the vesting status of this application to ensure the developer is not illegally bypassing the local laws that were active at the time of their filing.

We stand with Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that pushback to become a formal, legal stand. Do not let "streamlining" become a mandate for dangerous, undemocratic development.

Thank you.

Mitch Conquer

---

**From:** [Mitch Conquer](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Don't oppose the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:11:43 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email mitchconquer@gmail.com

From your constituent Mitch Conquer

Subject Don't oppose the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

Please support the building of the Marina Safeway redevelopment. We desperately need all types of housing in San Francisco. Especially in high-resource areas like the Marina.

Aesthetics and vague, shifting objections have held sway in SF for decades and it's why our population is shrinking, our schools are running out of money and people can't afford to live here.

Thanks and let's please build for the inclusive, welcoming San Francisco we all want!

Mitch Conquer

---

**From:** [David Chacon](#)  
**To:** [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the 25-Story Proposal  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:12:38 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, Mayor, and Planning Commission

Email davidjosechacon@proton.me

From your constituent David Chacon

Subject I support the 25-Story Proposal

Message: Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to accept the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a bold step forward in the integrity of San Francisco's dedication to being a welcoming city to current and future residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to accept this proposal:

1. Breach of Public and Professional Trust - The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms how long and exhausting the process to build in San Francisco is. While our community and this Board worked in good faith, striking this down now would be a clear signal that San Francisco is a bad-faith partner and not to be trusted going forward.

2. Defense of Democracy - By not allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively going against the will of our democratically elected representatives in Sacramento who have passed bills like SB330 (driven forward by local Senator Scott Wiener). This will make San Francisco a target of lawsuits by State Attorney General Rob Bonta and

will cost San Francisco's citizens unnecessary legal fees for a court case San Francisco will ultimately lose.

We stand against Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask that acceptance be formalized as a legal stand. Let "streamlining" become a mandate for progress in San Francisco. San Francisco cannot be a museum forever.

Thank you.

David Chacon



**From:** [Asa Strout](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [McGarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** In Support of 15 Marina Blvd  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:18:58 AM

---

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to accept the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a bold step forward on the integrity of San Francisco's dedication to being a welcoming city to current and future residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to accept this proposal:

1. To deny this would be a Breach of Public and Professional Trust. The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms how long and exhausting the process to build in San Francisco is. While our community and this Board worked in good faith striking this down now would be a clear signal that San Francisco is a bad faith partner and not to be trusted going forward.

2. Defense of Democracy - By not allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively going against the will of our democratically elected representatives in Sacramento who have passed bills like SB330 (driven forward by local Senator Scott Wiener). This will make San Francisco a target of lawsuits by State Attorney General Rob Bonta and cost the citizens of San Francisco unnecessary legal fees for a court case San Francisco will ultimately lose.

We stand against Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask for that acceptance to become a formal, legal stand. Let "streamlining" become a mandate for progress in San Francisco.

Thank you,

Asa Strout

**From:** [David](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [SauterStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Campbell, Amy \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [So, Lydia \(CPC\)](#); [Braun, Derek \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Mcgarry, Sean \(CPC\)](#); [Williams, Gilbert A \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Support the 25-story Safeway Residential Project  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:23:35 AM

---

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission:

I urge you to exercise your full authority to accept the proposed 25-story tower at 15 Marina Blvd. This project is not merely an "outlier"; it is a bold step forward in the integrity of San Francisco's dedication to being a welcoming city to current and future residents.

The following reasons provide City Hall to accept this proposal:

1. Breach of Public and Professional Trust - The developer recently stated they have been "working on this project for years." This admission confirms how long and exhausting the process to build in San Francisco is. While our community and this Board worked in good faith, striking this down now would be a clear signal that San Francisco is a bad-faith partner and not to be trusted going forward.

2. Defense of Democracy - By not allowing this project to move forward, the City is effectively going against the will of our democratically elected representatives in Sacramento who have passed bills like SB330 (driven forward by local Senator Scott Wiener). This will make San Francisco a target of lawsuits by State Attorney General Rob Bonta and will cost San Francisco's citizens unnecessary legal fees for a court case San Francisco will ultimately lose.

We stand against Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sherrill in their initial pushback. We now ask that acceptance be formalized as a legal stand. Let "streamlining" become a mandate for progress in San Francisco. San Francisco cannot be a museum forever.

Thank you.

**From:** [Kalashnikova](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:33:48 AM

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



## YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Veronika                                                      |
| Last Name      | Kalashnikova                                                  |
| Email Address  | veravasina@gmail.com                                          |
| Street Address | 3641 Webster St                                               |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

### Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal, Richmond, San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,  
Veronika Kalashnikova



**From:** [Hyland](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [investor-relations@albertsons.com](mailto:investor-relations@albertsons.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [media@albertsons.com](mailto:media@albertsons.com); [PIC, PLN \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:49:31 AM

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



**YES, IT CAN REALLY HAPPEN . . .**

|                |                                                               |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| First Name     | Galina                                                        |
| Last Name      | Hyland                                                        |
| Email Address  | galina.hyland@lugg.com                                        |
| Street Address | 56 Cervantes Blvd #3 San Francisco, CA 94123                  |
| Email Subject  | Request to Reconsider the Scale of the Marina Safeway Project |

Email Message Body

Dear City Leaders and Project Sponsors,  
This message is directed to the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, Albertsons/Safeway, Scott Weiner, Catherine Stefani and Align Real Estate regarding the proposed Marina Safeway redevelopment.  
I'm writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Marina Safeway site.  
While many of us support adding housing in San Francisco, the current Marina Safeway proposal — including two towers of 20 and 25-stories — is far out of scale with the Marina and with other of Safeway/Align's planned redevelopments (Bernal,Richmond,San Mateo).  
Just because something can be built under current rules does not mean it should be. A project in the range of 6-8 stories could still deliver substantial housing while respecting the surrounding neighborhood and the people who live there. Residents are being urged to boycott Safeway stores until a more balanced plan is developed. We hope Safeway, Align, city and state officials will reconsider the scale of this project and work toward a proposal that better reflects the community you serve.

Sincerely,

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.

# Item 24

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Dean of Arts Madeline Mueller — Board of Trustee of City College of San Francisco  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 2:56:55 PM

---

Good afternoon Supervisors,

Please see below communication from Derek Lac regarding various topics.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Derek Lac <global.nine.one.one@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 1:49 PM  
**To:** mmueller@ccsf.edu; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; fgago@theclinic.org  
**Subject:** Dean of Arts Madeline Mueller — Board of Trustee of City College of San Francisco

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

Dear all,

A message to the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie, Dean of Arts of City College of San Francisco,

I am all in. As of March 24 11:00pm, I had the dean of arts department of CCSF Madeline Mueller sign a statement of intent. We have reached an agreement that I will take charge of the 30 month deal to get the new building funded for the arts department of CCSF. I will be attending the Board of Trustee of CCSF every other Thursday @ 5.

It is with heavy heart to hear that my dear friend and beloved classical guitar teacher Lawrence Ferrera has passed away. Madeline Mueller said that his dying wish is not to let

the news out. Although the team at arts of CCSF will respect his wish, Madeline Mueller and I will go ahead and start a Lawrence Ferrera fund. Lawrence Ferrera has taught classical guitar in San Francisco Conservatory of Music, San Francisco State, and San Francisco City College for many decades simultaneously. Phew. The daily runs back-and-forth.

In the short-run I have a curfew to report to my shelter by. 4:00 pm. Rest assure I have the energy to carry this forward.

This May 16th is my fiancée IU Lee Jin-Eun South Korean Top Solo Artist's birthday. Tickets is \$216 at Stanford Stadium. Pretty steep, so I won't hold anything accountable for not attending.

Also, I heading to Phase X. This phase I will put effort to design Warren Buffett. Coke Bottle for 28 Alliance International. I will be doing the national anthem for a sports team of Patrick Bet-David's choice. Hello world.

Derek Lac  
Regards,

CEO of Project Melo  
Chief Software Architect of xAI  
Ambassador of Nintendo



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** File No. 251247 Fire Sprinklers - 27 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 4:34:39 PM  
**Attachments:** [251247 Fire Sprinklers 27 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 27 letters, from members of the public, regarding:

File No. 251247 - Ordinance repealing the existing San Francisco Fire Code in its entirety and enacting a new San Francisco Fire Code consisting of the 2025 California Fire Code and portions of the 2024 International Fire Code, together with amendments specific to San Francisco, including provisions for fees for permits, inspections, and various City services, with an operative date of January 1, 2026; adopting findings of local conditions pursuant to California Health and Safety Code, Section 17958.7; directing the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to forward San Francisco's amendments to the California Building Standards Commission and State Fire Marshal; and making environmental findings.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 2:31:42 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Mark Marcinik

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 11:45:15 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Karen Redding

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 5:07:32 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Josefina Brooks

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 6:29:50 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Patricia Berkowitz

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 8:45:01 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Bradford Adams

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 11:16:26 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Steve Ochoa

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 11:47:51 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

penny allen



**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 7:42:36 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Brent Bolinder

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 7:42:46 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Max Lico

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 1:03:40 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Kristi Hoerauf

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 1:17:47 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Linda C Harrison

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 10:27:51 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Philippa Mitchell

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 10:30:00 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Susie Smith

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 10:33:42 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Bill Berry

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 11:07:16 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Christine Lopatowski



**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 11:30:27 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Grant Jones

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 12:39:33 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Kristina Springer

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 12:40:14 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

R. Lee Patterson

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 9:30:36 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Scott Rose

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 1:33:46 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Angela Villanueva

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 2:31:28 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Franklin Rawlings

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 4:53:07 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

veronique fleming

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 3:19:27 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Melissa Howard



**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 7:43:57 PM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Todd Dick

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 8:21:10 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Robb Fleischer

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:01:31 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Pam Parker Murphy

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Smart, Measured Reforms to the Sprinkler Retrofit Mandate  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:54:03 AM

---

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

We respectfully urge the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a clear and measured approach to San Francisco's high-rise sprinkler retrofit requirement for buildings.

While we support effective, reasonable fire-safety measures, this one-size-fits-all mandate fails to account for critical differences among buildings and has unintended consequences that threaten housing stability and affordability for thousands of San Franciscans. The high financial costs (as high as \$300K per condo) and construction work needed to implement the sprinkler retrofit could un-necessarily displace thousands of residents.

We respectfully request that you:

- Expand the proposed Technical Advisory Committee's mandate to examine the feasibility of the sprinkler retrofit mandate on impacted buildings and recommend full exemptions or more technically/financially feasible alternatives for implementation.
- Delay implementation and enforcement of the sprinkler retrofit mandate until the Technical Advisory Committee officially releases its findings.

Fire safety and housing affordability must advance together. Without reforms, the sprinkler retrofit mandate risks displacing thousands of residents while imposing costs that far exceed any realistic possibility for many buildings.

Signed

Gerald Moore

# Item 26

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** File No. 251117 Autonomous Vehicles - 3 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 4:41:11 PM  
**Attachments:** [251117 3 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 251117 - Resolution urging the California State Legislature and the Governor of California to allow local communities the right to vote on whether autonomous vehicles can operate in their counties.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [IZZY K-A](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Let us decide on Waymos  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 9:31:27 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

In the wake of the December power-outage in which Waymos gridlocked traffic citywide, the Alphabet Inc. subsidiary continues to refuse transparency.

With traffic lights down, the confused robotaxis blocked roadways across SF, causing long lines of drivers and impeding emergency vehicles. Yet, Waymo still will not release even the most basic details, such as the size of their deployed fleet and the locations of remote-control call centers, to local and federal agencies.

In 2024, California state lawmakers put forward legislation that would have let cities regulate autonomous vehicles, but the bill was pulled when the Assembly Transportation committee attempted to alter the bill. District 9 Supervisor Jackie Fielder has urged the state to revive the bill and put it before the people to vote on; however, District 3 Supervisor Daniel Sauter and District 2 Supervisor Stephen Sherrill, her fellow Government Audit & Oversight Committee members, are resisting this push.

Please support Supervisor Fielder's resolution calling on state legislators to allow our city to have more control over our streets.

IZZY K-A  
izzykrom@gmail.com  
433 Fillmore  
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [jason.munderloh](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Let us decide on Waymos  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 2:32:22 PM

---

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

In the wake of the December power-outage in which Waymos gridlocked traffic citywide, the Alphabet Inc. subsidiary continues to refuse transparency.

With traffic lights down, the confused robotaxis blocked roadways across SF, causing long lines of drivers and impeding emergency vehicles. Yet, Waymo still will not release even the most basic details, such as the size of their deployed fleet and the locations of remote-control call centers, to local and federal agencies.

In 2024, California state lawmakers put forward legislation that would have let cities regulate autonomous vehicles, but the bill was pulled when the Assembly Transportation committee attempted to alter the bill. District 9 Supervisor Jackie Fielder has urged the state to revive the bill and put it before the people to vote on; however, District 3 Supervisor Daniel Sauter and District 2 Supervisor Stephen Sherrill, her fellow Government Audit & Oversight Committee members, are resisting this push.

Please support Supervisor Fielder's resolution calling on state legislators to allow our city to have more control over our streets.

jason.munderloh  
jasonmunderloh@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [Darnell Granberry](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Let us decide on Waymos  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 1:18:27 AM

---

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

In the wake of the December power-outage in which Waymos gridlocked traffic citywide, the Alphabet Inc. subsidiary continues to refuse transparency.

With traffic lights down, the confused robotaxis blocked roadways across SF, causing long lines of drivers and impeding emergency vehicles. Yet, Waymo still will not release even the most basic details, such as the size of their deployed fleet and the locations of remote-control call centers, to local and federal agencies.

In 2024, California state lawmakers put forward legislation that would have let cities regulate autonomous vehicles, but the bill was pulled when the Assembly Transportation committee attempted to alter the bill. District 9 Supervisor Jackie Fielder has urged the state to revive the bill and put it before the people to vote on; however, District 3 Supervisor Daniel Sauter and District 2 Supervisor Stephen Sherrill, her fellow Government Audit & Oversight Committee members, are resisting this push.

Please support Supervisor Fielder's resolution calling on state legislators to allow our city to have more control over our streets.

Darnell Granberry  
darnellgranberry15@gmail.com  
3491 20th Street #30  
San Francisco, CA 94110



# Item 27

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** File No. 260178 Transfer Tax - 77 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 4:50:31 PM  
**Attachments:** [260178 - 77 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 77 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 260178 - Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to, for transfers occurring on or after July 1, 2026: halve the real property transfer tax rate from 5.5% to 2.75% when the consideration or value of the property conveyed equals or exceeds \$10,000,000 but is less than \$25,000,000, and from 6% to 3% when the consideration or value equals or exceeds \$25,000,000; exempt from these reductions the transfer of single-family residences; reduce the penalties for delinquent real property transfer taxes; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

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

Dear Supervisor Connie Chan and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not gut Prop 1. Oppose the BUILD Act. Spend Prop 1's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition

thousands of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed on to a petition <https://url.avanan.click/y2r0l/> <https://www.sfsocialhousing.org/> YXAAOmMZHQyOmE6bz0ZGYzMYjYzU5YTA4NjE1ZTdiMDUyMDIiZDliZDQyOTQ0Mz0M4Mzc5ZjBmZjNlNTdiY2Y2Yz5YzE0ZDM1MwNhNDYyZTY2MTI0NzY1QwZGM0MDFjZDQ5YyW5NzY1YTJ2MGlmZGQyZm9kY5t6t6 demanding you spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

District 1 resident.

**From:** [Linda A. Cicero](#)  
**To:** [Linda Cicero \(mailto:\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(Rafael\)](#); [MandelmanCalf \(Rafael\)](#)  
**Cc:** [luciano@luciano.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not gut Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 5:02:22 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 64.7% of District 8 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not gut Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition (<https://ud.ayman.clicky2/01/> — <https://www.sfsocialhousing.org/about> — [YXA4OnNmZHFyOmE6bzqjNzgyNDMNDzZjODANmF3MwY5S0WlcNDNkCGNkOTl0OT03QjF0ODc6MDUzZDEyYjhiNzE0GY3NkMUM7U5ZGMlNWw5ZjBhNzUyYjlsN2RlYzRlYzQzMWU0YVJMTMzMVjNwMAMjEwYzpaOkY6Tg](#)) demanding you spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Linda A. Cicero  
1535 Church Street, San Francisco CA 94131  
[laciero@gmail.com](mailto:laciero@gmail.com)  
District 8 resident

**From:** Patrick Casfield  
**To:** Lurie, Daniel [mailto:]; Mahmood, Bilal [BOS]; MahmoodSiafi  
**Cc:** pascal01@gmail.com; Board of Supervisors [BOS]  
**Subject:** Do not gut Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 9:29:44 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Bilal Mahmood and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 65.8% of District 5 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not gut Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition (<https://url.ayman.clicks/2/01/>—<https://www.sfsocialhousing.org/about>—YX3uOsNmZHCyOmE6huo2OWIsYgAZ0TpeNTTfwYJmYmFsNzFjZTU5YzhnSWRmNzo3OmIsYtGfNTJlY2MsYzhhMjZiZWZjZDk5YmIsMjIjZDEwM2Q0ZmFZZmZhMjQ0NjlmMzMyZTpeNjI2MGNhOTk3MmN0mSWYsNzpsOkY6TGp demanding you spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Patrick Casfield  
1148 Masonic Ave  
pascal01@gmail.com  
District 5 resident

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

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

Do not gut Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

District 8 resident

**From:** [Olivia McHaney](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 9:32:44 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Olivia McHaney  
oliviamchaney@gmail.com  
2852 Mission St  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Tanvi Meringenti](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 11:23:00 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Tanvi Meringenti  
tmeringenti@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110





**From:** [Valentin Orbe](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 7:25:11 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Valentin Orbe  
[tinoorbe@icloud.com](mailto:tinoorbe@icloud.com)

San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Jen Snyder](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 8:36:49 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Jen Snyder  
jencsnnyder@gmail.com  
260 Cumberland St, Apt 18 18  
Brooklyn, New York 11205



**From:** [Maria Imperial](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 8:51:34 PM

---

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Maria Imperial  
thrsimperial@gmail.com  
150 Franklin St Apt 104  
San Francisco, California 94102-6003



**From:** [Alan Shaw](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 9:29:45 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Alan Shaw  
[alanshaw@alanshaw.com](mailto:alanshaw@alanshaw.com)

San Francisco, California 94103





**From:** [Christopher Lamkin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 12:35:03 AM

---

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Christopher Lamkin  
cjlamkin64@gmail.com  
600 25th Ave Apt 1  
San Francisco, California 94121-2952



**From:** [Benjamin Peterson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 8:40:04 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Benjamin Peterson  
District 5 resident

Benjamin Peterson  
[peterson2012ben@gmail.com](mailto:peterson2012ben@gmail.com)  
3031 Pine St.

San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** [Kristin Tieche](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [ktieche@gmail.com](mailto:ktieche@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 8:41:14 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Connie Chan and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Kristin Tieche  
[ktieche@gmail.com](mailto:ktieche@gmail.com)  
District 1 resident

**From:** [Reeves Peeler](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Repealing Prop I: a generational mistake  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 9:00:37 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I.

I work in Community Development Finance at SVB/FCB, financing 100% affordable housing across the country (including many projects in San Francisco, such as Casa de la Mission and Shirley Chisholm Village). While LIHTC is an important element of affordability, it will never be close to enough. SF needs Prop I (and more progressive taxation like Prop I) to be successful in keeping working class families in our city. Prop I's transfer tax is a vital element to raising revenue and should be put forwards building affordable housing. Not only was Prop I the will of the voters, but keeping it intact is the fiscally responsible and moral thing to do

Sincerely,

Reeves Peeler  
919-412-7122

Reeves Peeler  
[reevespeeler@gmail.com](mailto:reevespeeler@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122





**From:** [Geoff Smith](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 12:49:42 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Geoff Smith  
geoff.gordon.smith@gmail.com  
2760 Melendy Drive, Apt 2  
San Carlos, California 94070-3657



**From:** [lgpetty](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Segal, Ned \(MYR\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** No No No on "Build Act" Furtive Attack Against Affordable Housing Ballot Prop I. 260178. Connect the Disturbing Dots  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 7:08:37 PM

---

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,  
RE: 260178 Proposed "BuildAct"

I write to oppose reducing the transfer tax on real estate sales of over \$10 million. Such an action would be in defiance and contempt of the will of 67 % of San Francisco voters in passing the 2020 Prop I. This prospective "Build Act" ordinance is connected to a much broader, ominous trend in San Francisco governance.

First, any attempt to repeal Prop I, would take away the most reliable source of San Francisco affordable housing funding.

The Mayor and Sup. Mahmood's move to repeal the voter initiative is deceptively titled, "The Build Act," (Balanced Update to Incentivize Local Development). Except it isn't really designed to encourage housing construction. It will mostly enable whopping extra profit for real estate flippers – those who rapidly turn over (mainly) downtown office buildings, and also rent-controlled older apartment buildings.

Even **IF** lowering transfer taxes could make new construction more feasible, it will only be by a small amount that won't move the housing construction needle. Plus, a tax reduction would not result in lower rents or homeowner costs, as prices will still be set as high as the market will bear. This will only boost profit for sellers on resale of luxury market rate projects.

The Prop I transfer tax extension has brought in about \$504 million so far, intended by voters to be used for creating and stabilizing affordable housing.

However, Mayor Breed and Mayor Lurie have undermined its affordable housing purpose – largely dumping the monies into the General Fund instead. Now the Mayor and Sup. Mahmood (+ Sups. Dorsey & Sauter), through the "Build Act," intend to get rid of Prop I altogether. They offer a weak, less lucrative substitute in a separate, uncertain ballot proposal to tax in-lieu foreclosure transfers.

This is a significant policy shift away from ongoing city financing of affordable housing needs through taxes on turnovers of over \$10million office and residential buildings. The Mayor and Sup. Mahmood refer vaguely to possibly supplementing the foreclosure tax plan with a city bond issue, or smaller measures. Bonds sound Really Big, until you realize they involve lengthy and obscure apportionments and schedulings, and are limited to only a project or two. This method has already proven inadequate for keeping up with our ever-increasing needs.

How do I know? Because I've spent more than a dozen years (a period of many bond issues) trying to help seniors secure housing they can afford. An increasingly impossible task. The average 65+ elder relies solely on social security income of \$1824 a month. There are 146,000 of us seniors now, and by 2030, at 213,000 strong, we'll be 25% of San Francisco's population. There are still up to 8,000 lottery applicants for each new senior project of maybe 100 units. Older folks have been trying to get in unsuccessfully for 10 or more

years. They're hanging on by a thread-- often forced onto the streets or into painful, permanent exile from San Francisco.

Thousands of families and single workers add to the ranks of affordable housing seekers -- plus thousands more (already declared) homeless.

We're not keeping up. We never will if we take away current funding, and never put enough serious money (**tens of billions**) into building affordable housing.

So, in the face of enormous, desperate need, why would we be so foolish and cruel as to remove a solid, steady source of affordable housing funds we already have? Why would we give more tax breaks to those who would build un-affordable housing? Why take away crumbs from home-hungry people and give massive cakes to those already choking on too much? Why would we betray the public trust?

### **Connecting the Disturbing Dots**

Excluding the public's will from city governing did not start with Prop I tinkering. We all witness the ever-growing anti-public wave that emanates from the Trump White House. Now, alas, it's being picked up here.

A line can be drawn from attempting to repeal the voter-determined Prop I, right through squeezing housing and human services out of the City Budget, and severely undermining the City Charter with three public-bypassed, Mayor power-grab ballot proposals. Follow the line all the way through the public exclusion practiced and proposed in the on-going, over-reaching Commission Streamlining process. The line continues with shutting the public out of impactful conversations between the Mayor and President Trump and his surrogates. And it follows on with the diversion of publicly-mandated Prop C Our City Our Homes tax revenue away from permanent affordable housing and into temporary shelters. Many might add the direction of Sacramento in diminishing the public's voice in development planning as just a removable "constraint."

All of this represents a pattern of setting aside voter determinations, reducing public participation, scrutiny, and oversight, and abandonment of diversity -- setting aside the very formidable public contributions that have improved and strengthened San Francisco for more than a century.

All of this disregard for the public interest is related. And it must be stopped.

Start with rejecting the repeal of Prop I.

Thank you,

Lorraine Petty  
Advocate for Seniors and Affordable Housing

**From:** [Beth McDowell](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 11:52:48 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Beth McDowell  
ermcdowell@gmail.com  
4900 Fulton St. Apt. 109  
San Francisco, California 94121



**From:** [Alex Behrend](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 1:39:46 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Alex Behrend  
750 O'Farrell Street  
SF CA 94109

Alex Behrend  
[asb.sfo@gmail.com](mailto:asb.sfo@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94109



**From:** [Niketa Kumar](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [niketak.kumar26@gmail.com](mailto:niketak.kumar26@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 8:29:41 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Jackie Fielder and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

In 2020, like most SF voters, including over 64% of voters in District 9, I voted for Prop I. I've worked in local nonprofits and community organizations, and volunteered at 826 Valencia and the food bank for many years. So many community members and families are struggling to afford rent and many families are being pushed out of the neighborhoods they make thrive.

Prop I was a solution and an essential step towards creating more housing and more affordable housing. And yet, despite rhetoric that appears to affirm those aims, Mayor Lurie and some supervisors are proposing to reject voters' democratic decision and put more money in the hands of the wealthy at the expense of an affordable, livable city for thousands.

I am writing asking you to protect Prop I and its funding for social housing. Oppose the BUILD Act and adhere to SF voters' voices, who said clearly and together that we need more affordable housing in our city.

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program. Oppose the BUILD Act, an indefensible attack of SF voters' ballots and our city's progress towards affordable housing.

Sincerely,  
Niketa Kumar  
1406 South Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94110  
[niketak.kumar26@gmail.com](mailto:niketak.kumar26@gmail.com)  
District 9 resident

**From:** [Nate Horrell](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 6:40:11 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Nate Horrell  
[nathan.horrell@gmail.com](mailto:nathan.horrell@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Kat Worthington](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 6:47:15 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Kat

Kat Worthington  
worthingtonkathryn@proton.me  
2298 Pacific Ave  
San Francisco, California 94115



**From:** [Luca Schnell Heringer](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [ljsheringer@gmail.com](mailto:ljsheringer@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 8:34:34 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Chyanne Chen and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Luca Schnell Heringer  
122 Cayuga ave  
[ljsheringer@gmail.com](mailto:ljsheringer@gmail.com)  
District 11 resident

**From:** [Jason](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [jtmoto2nd@gmail.com](mailto:jtmoto2nd@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 2:30:40 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 64.7% of District 8 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,

Jason

\*

[jtmoto2nd@gmail.com](mailto:jtmoto2nd@gmail.com)

District 8 resident

**From:** [Julia Cima](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 10:07:51 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Julia Cima

Julia Cima  
[juliarcima@gmail.com](mailto:juliarcima@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94118





**From:** [Shawn Trombley](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 10:10:51 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Shawn Trombley  
swellpadsf@gmail.com  
800 Dolores St  
San Francisco, California 94110-2207



**From:** [Eric Brenner](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 10:26:29 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Eric Brenner  
[Brenner@aft1493.org](mailto:Brenner@aft1493.org)  
4279 23rd Street  
San Francisco, California 94114-3138



**From:** [Danielle Douglas](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds!  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 10:37:15 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

As a 5th generation San Franciscan, I am disappointed with the plan to reverse course on our city's affordable housing plans.

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Danielle Douglas

Danielle Douglas

danielledouglas.producer@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Dakota](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 10:55:08 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Dakota Raymundo

Dakota  
[dakotablue02@gmail.com](mailto:dakotablue02@gmail.com)

Santa Cruz, California 95064





**From:** [Richard Girling](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** "Build act" a disguised ultra rich tax cut!!!  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 11:16:43 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Richard Girling  
[rzgirling@gmail.com](mailto:rzgirling@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Megan Dukes](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 1:00:17 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Megan Dukes  
megandukes14@gmail.com



**From:** [AnaChristina Arana](#)  
**To:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 1:15:29 PM

---

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

AnaChristina Arana

anachristinaarana@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** [Jeantelle Laberinto](#)  
**To:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 1:26:56 PM

---

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

Jeantelle Laberinto



jeantellelabyrinth@gmail.com  
527 2nd Ave Apt A  
San Francisco , California 94118

**From:** [norman nager](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 1:28:01 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Norman Nager

norman nager  
normannager@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94127



**From:** [Kyle Smeallie](#)  
**To:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 1:42:50 PM

---

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

Kyle Smeallie

ksmeallie@sfclt.org

San Francisco, California 94102

**From:** [Joseph Smooke](#)  
**To:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 1:47:31 PM

---

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

Joseph Smooke

joseph\_smooke@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** [Erica Zweig](#)  
**To:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 2:45:05 PM

---

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely, Erica Zweig

Bizarre and Trumpian that this is even under consideration at this moment! Voters are



watching this latest movw to bolster big developers while making sure no funds available to house or help the working class the less privaledge. Do NOT say you are progressive or "moderate" if you promote rolling back PROP I!

Erica Zweig  
dumpdump2020@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Ralph Lane](#)  
**To:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 3:08:18 PM

---

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

Ralph Lane, D4

Ralph Lane  
d4ralphlane@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [olneyrom@gmail.com](mailto:olneyrom@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 3:38:39 PM

---

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

olneyrom@gmail.com



**From:** [Lisa Yu](#)  
**To:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 4:48:47 PM

---

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

Lisa Yu

lisayu567@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** [Brittany Noble Fukuda](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [lorinenoble@gmail.com](mailto:lorinenoble@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 9:54:49 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Alan Wong and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Brittany Noble Fukuda  
1323 38th Ave, San Francisco CA 94122w  
[lorinenoble@gmail.com](mailto:lorinenoble@gmail.com)  
District 4 resident



**From:** [Ken Tray](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 11:16:49 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Ken Tray

Ken Tray  
ktray50@gmail.com  
40 virginia Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Brian Gomola](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 12:46:12 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Brian Gomola  
[brian.gomola@gmail.com](mailto:brian.gomola@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Claire Thomas](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 4:21:22 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Claire Thomas  
[cet.samoht@gmail.com](mailto:cet.samoht@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94109



**From:** [Walkiria Sanchez](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [wavalsa@gmail.com](mailto:wavalsa@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 5:40:14 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Chyanne Chen and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Walkiria Sanchez  
795 Vienna Street Apt 3  
[wavalsa@gmail.com](mailto:wavalsa@gmail.com)  
District 11 resident

**From:** [Kyanna Ollison](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [k.ollison01](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 5:41:15 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Connie Chan and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Kyanna Ollison  
330 Parker Ave  
[k.ollison01@gmail.com](mailto:k.ollison01@gmail.com)  
District 1 resident



**From:** [Charles Kieser](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 6:38:23 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Charles Kieser  
chaskieser@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [John Nguyen](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [nguyen.jhuy@gmail.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 8:24:01 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Bilal Mahmood and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 65.8% of District 5 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
John Nguyen  
1053 Oak St, Apt 203, San Francisco CA 94117  
[nguyen.jhuy@gmail.com](mailto:nguyen.jhuy@gmail.com)  
District 5 resident

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Marty Cerles  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:34:45 AM

---

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

From: martycerles@gmail.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Marty Cerles  
Lone Mountain

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Usha and John Burns  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:34:46 AM

---

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

From: Johnmburns48@yahoo.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Usha and John Burns  
Presidio Heights

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Judi Hurabiell  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:42:29 AM

---

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

From: jmhurabiell1@gmail.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Judi Hurabiell  
Richmond

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Norma Gengler  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:00:42 PM

---

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

From: gina46@gmail.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Norma Gengler  
Anza Vista

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Martha Ehmann Conte  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:04:35 PM

---

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

From: martha@ehmannconte.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Martha Ehmann Conte  
Presidio Heights



**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - John McNamara  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:29:30 PM

---

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

From: mcnamara229@hotmail.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
John McNamara  
South Beach

**From:** [Samantha DiStefano](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 3:50:08 PM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,  
Samantha DiStefano

Samantha DiStefano  
[samdistefano21@gmail.com](mailto:samdistefano21@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Hickey, Jacqueline \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 4:25:12 PM

---

---

**From:** lizzyhkramer@gmail.com <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:02 PM  
**To:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Stop the Tax Giveaway! Protect Affordable Housing Funds

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not repeal the transfer tax on luxury real estate deals.

San Francisco voters approved Proposition I to make sure that when properties worth over \$10 million change hands, the wealth generated at the top helps fund affordable housing and prevent displacement. That was the deal — and it's working.

Prop I has already delivered more than \$200 million for affordable housing, rent relief, and building preservation with real results, including:

- \$42 million funded the most comprehensive COVID rent relief program in the country, saving 25,000+ San Franciscans from eviction.
- \$64 million supported a housing acquisition program that took hundreds of homes off the speculative market and made them permanently affordable.
- \$40 million purchased sites that will create 550+ new affordable homes.

These funds have kept families housed, protected our communities, and supported new affordable housing opportunities.

Now, with rents climbing higher than ever, the proposal to repeal or weaken this tax is outrageous. Cutting this funding puts San Francisco's state-mandated housing goals (RHNA) at risk and threatens the future of over 17,600 affordable homes currently in our development pipeline. The BUILD Act (File No. 260178) would be a costly giveaway to billionaire developers and corporate property owners at the expense of working people.

San Francisco cannot afford to slash one of its most effective housing funding tools. Not

during a housing crisis. Not when families are being pushed out. Not when affordable housing projects are stalled for lack of gap financing.

We need big real estate to pay their fair share, now more than ever.

I urge you to reject this tax giveaway and uphold the will of the voters. Protect Prop I funds and invest them in the affordable housing and rent relief our communities urgently need.

Sincerely,

[lizzyhkramer@gmail.com](mailto:lizzyhkramer@gmail.com)

,

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Massimo Kaz  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 6:48:35 PM

---

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

From: mossik@gmail.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Massimo Kaz  
Marina

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Emily Borowski  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 8:27:36 PM

---

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

From: ejborowski@icloud.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Emily Borowski  
Fillmore

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Judi Hurabiell  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 9:47:30 PM

---

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

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

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to paved the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Judi Hurabiell  
Richmond



**From:** [bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net](mailto:bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 11:38:42 AM

---

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

[bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net](mailto:bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net)

,



**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Ali Mandviwala  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:16:33 PM

---

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

From: samali48@yahoo.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Ali Mandviwala  
East Cut

**From:** [Jotform](#)  
**To:** [ChenStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax - Senta Tsantilis  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 8:59:33 AM

---

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

From: sptsantilis@gmail.com

Subject: Please Support Amending and Decreasing Real Property Transfer Tax

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

We support your efforts to amend and reduce the tax rates on real property transfers.

As you are aware, the current conditions in the market are not cooperating with the unit economics to pave the way for developers to build housing in San Francisco.

We believe reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate it was prior to Prop I (2020) was approved.

We propose reversing the real property transfer tax rate to the rate established prior to the approval of Proposition I in 2020.

While offering an alternative solution to offset the tax reduction from real property transfers helps all parties get to their own respective goals and aspirations.

Continuing to remove barriers, such as this proposal to reduce real property transfers will give San Francisco a better chance at creating more jobs, welcoming new residents to San Francisco and rejuvenating projects that have been stalled for years.

Please approve this common sense ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Senta Tsantilis

**From:** [Jakub Kusmierz](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [jakubkusmierz@gmail.com](mailto:jakubkusmierz@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 9:21:03 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Connie Chan and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Jakub Kusmierz  
435 11th Ave  
[jakubkusmierz@gmail.com](mailto:jakubkusmierz@gmail.com)  
District 1 resident

**From:** [Colby Croft](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 9:15:56 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Colby Croft  
colbycroft@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Joseph De La Cruz Fernandez](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 11:17:18 AM

---

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Joseph De La Cruz Fernandez  
jodelacruz031102@gmail.com  
1861 Eddy Street  
San Francisco, California 94115-3956





**From:** [Alba Tapia](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 11:56:10 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Alba Tapia  
[albaitapia@gmail.com](mailto:albaitapia@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Tess Jarrett](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [tessamjarrett@gmail.com](mailto:tessamjarrett@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 2:07:42 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Matt Dorsey and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 59.2% of District 6 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Tess Jarrett  
346 1st St. San Francisco 94105  
[tessamjarrett@gmail.com](mailto:tessamjarrett@gmail.com)  
District 6 resident

**From:** [Henry Ostendorf](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [henrywostendorf@yahoo.com](mailto:henrywostendorf@yahoo.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 2:07:49 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Danny Sauter and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

Sincerely,  
Henry Ostendorf  
81 Frank Norris  
[henrywostendorf@yahoo.com](mailto:henrywostendorf@yahoo.com)  
District 3 resident

**From:** [Anita Kline](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [anitakline@comcast.net](mailto:anitakline@comcast.net); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 3:01:47 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Jackie Fielder and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am a 40-year resident of San Francisco, writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 64.1% of District 9 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Anita Kline  
19 Mirabel Ave  
[anitakline@comcast.net](mailto:anitakline@comcast.net)  
District 9 resident

**From:** [Susan Green](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [green.susan.s@gmail.com](mailto:green.susan.s@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 3:02:04 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 64.7% of District 8 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Susan Green  
920 Diamond ST  
[green.susan.s@gmail.com](mailto:green.susan.s@gmail.com)  
District 8 resident

**From:** [Caroline Ayres](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [carolineayres6@gmail.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 3:53:04 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to sincerely ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 64.7% of District 8 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Caroline Ayres  
87 Dolores Street , APT 105  
[carolineayres6@gmail.com](#)  
District 8 resident



**From:** [paul andrew french](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [misterpaulfrench@gmail.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 4:07:02 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Alan Wong and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
paul andrew french  
2728 taraval street  
[misterpaulfrench@gmail.com](mailto:misterpaulfrench@gmail.com)  
District 4 resident

**From:** [Eihway Su](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [esinsf@yahoo.com](mailto:esinsf@yahoo.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 4:08:20 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 64.7% of District 8 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Eihway Su  
170 Parnassus Avenue, Apartment 2  
[esinsf@yahoo.com](mailto:esinsf@yahoo.com)  
District 8 resident

**From:** [Scott Yarbrough](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [yarbrough.scott@gmail.com](mailto:yarbrough.scott@gmail.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 10:18:38 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

San Francisco needs more housing for people in the community, including nurses, teachers, and public service employees, all who no longer can afford to live in the community where they serve. Most new housing in my neighborhood during the past 25 years has been for the wealthy, and has come at the cost of pushing service employees out.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 64.7% of District 8 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Scott Yarbrough  
4063 26th St.  
[yarbrough.scott@gmail.com](mailto:yarbrough.scott@gmail.com)  
District 8 resident

**From:** [Jan Medina](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [jan@janmedina.com](mailto:jan@janmedina.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:13:51 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Rafael Mandelman and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. 64.7% of District 8 voted for Prop I. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Jan Medina  
4629 18th Street  
[jan@janmedina.com](mailto:jan@janmedina.com)  
District 8 resident

**From:** [Amy Androw](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:15:38 AM

---

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Amy Androw  
amy.androw@gmail.com  
1585 Waller St  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Allen Demoura](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#)  
**Cc:** [allen.demoura@gmail.com](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Do not repeal Prop I—protect social housing funding  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 5:24:33 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Danny Sauter and Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I am writing to ask you to protect Proposition I and its funding for the Social Housing Program.

In 2020, San Francisco voters passed Prop I, which levied a transfer tax on properties worth over \$10 million. The Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a resolution assuring voters that Prop I revenue would fund a Social Housing Program—permanently affordable, publicly-owned housing for a wide mix of incomes.

Do not repeal Prop I. Oppose the BUILD Act (File No. 260178) as it is currently written. Spend Prop I's revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Oppose any attempt to remove or reduce the property transfer tax until equal or greater substitute funding for social housing is secured and passed into law.

Hundreds of my fellow San Franciscans for Social Housing have already signed onto a petition asking you to spend Prop I revenue on the Social Housing Program as voters intended. Please don't take away our city's only tool to fund social housing. Please don't gut Prop I.

San Franciscans need real housing solutions. Prop I is one of the few tools we have to fund them. Do not undermine a law voters approved only a few years ago. Fulfill the promise of Prop I.

Sincerely,  
Allen Demoura  
1542 Grant Avenue  
[allen.demoura@gmail.com](mailto:allen.demoura@gmail.com)  
District 3 resident

**From:** [Heather Carrico](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Subject:** Don't Repeal Prop I: Save Affordable Housing Funds  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 8:04:05 AM

---

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Please oppose the BUILD Act (file #260178) and preserve 2020 Proposition I, which has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for affordable housing by taxing rich real estate investors. As a working San Franciscan, my future in this city would be put in peril by this massive cut to affordable housing.

Although Prop I revenue has never been fully dedicated to social housing as intended, it has funded over \$200 million to help San Franciscans afford housing as of 2024, including \$42 million for the strongest Covid rent relief program in country, which helped save more than 20,000 San Franciscans from eviction; \$40 million for land banking, which has been used to build more than 550 affordable homes; and \$64 million for housing acquisition that has taken hundreds of homes off the private speculative market. Even more can be accomplished if the City devotes future Prop I revenues to social housing as voters intended.

Sponsors of the BUILD Act claim it would help build housing, but most transactions that would receive a tax cut are sales of office buildings, and have nothing to do with new residential construction. Giving tax breaks to speculators and billionaires has failed to build homes before. After San Francisco slashed affordable housing requirements in 2023, more new housing wasn't built – 2024 saw the fewest housing permits filed in more than a decade. And even if these tax cuts got market-rate housing built, it would be far too expensive for working households like mine.

There's a better way to build housing. When 57% of voters approved Prop I in 2020, they were supporting a vision to build social housing in San Francisco. Social housing is housing that's permanently affordable, democratically governed by residents, sustainable and accessible, and serves San Franciscans of all income levels, but especially those who need it most. Instead of repealing Prop I, honor this intent and dedicate Prop I revenue to social housing. That's what will get cranes back on the skyline and San Franciscans housed.

Sincerely,

Heather Carrico  
pleikuchiku@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122





# Item 28

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** File No. 260267 Irish Cultural Center - 8 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 4:55:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [File No 260267 ICC 8 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 8 letters from members of the public regarding:

Resolution No. 180-26, File No. 260267 - Resolution expressing the intent of the City and County of San Francisco to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District to recognize and preserve the history, legacy, and living cultural traditions of the Irish and Irish American community in San Francisco's Sunset District.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

From: [Jessica Ho](#)  
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
Cc: [Alan Wong \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [Alan Wong \(WongShall \(BOS\)\)](#)  
Subject: Please support Supervisor Wong's resolution to establish the Irish Cultural District  
Date: Thursday, March 19, 2020 2:39:16 PM

---

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

Dear Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in my personal capacity to express my strong support for Supervisor Alan Wong's resolution establishing the Sunset Irish Cultural District.

The Irish and Irish American community has been an integral part of San Francisco since the Gold Rush era, enduring hardship, building institutions, and contributing meaningfully to the city's civic, cultural, and political life. For generations, the Sunset District has served as the heart of this community, home to the United Irish Cultural Center, traditional music and dance academies, Gaelic athletic organizations, and the families who continue to sustain and evolve these traditions.

San Francisco has long recognized that its strength lies in the richness and diversity of its communities. Through my involvement with the Sunset Chinese Cultural District, I have seen how formal recognition can help preserve cultural heritage, support local institutions, and strengthen community identity. I share this perspective as an individual, not on behalf of the organization.

Establishing the Sunset Irish Cultural District would extend that same opportunity and support to another deeply rooted community in the Sunset.

I respectfully urge the Board of Supervisors to support this resolution and take this important step toward honoring a community that has contributed so much to San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Jessica Ho

--

Jessica J. Ho  
REALTOR | Sequoia Real Estate | DRE #02251177

Where real estate meets real connection  
<https://url.avammi.click/2z01/> [www.jessicaho.com](http://www.jessicaho.com) YXAeOmNmZHQzOmE8azwZUzZUyZWUyODMyYzU5YjRkODQzMdYyZjBmOWI4MTQ3QjMwNmI6M2YmNjA5ODAxNDBlOGMyOTRlNTIzNDRIYjlmOGYyNjcwYmEJZThkNDZkMjEzYjY4YmNhdYWM2NTQxZjZhZjpsOIQ6Tg  
Sunset District, SF | (415) 509-5353 | @jessica\_j\_ho  
Listen to my podcast: The Sunset Connection

**From:** [Kelly Cannon](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Khoo, Arthur \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support Supervisor Wong's resolution to establish the Irish Cultural District  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 6:45:01 PM

---

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

Dear Clerk of the Board and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Alan Wong's resolution expressing the City and County of San Francisco's intent to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District.

The Irish and Irish American community has called San Francisco home since the Gold Rush era, enduring hardship, building institutions, and contributing to every corner of this city's civic, cultural, and political life. For generations, the Sunset District has been the heart of that community—home to the United Irish Cultural Center, traditional music and dance academies, Gaelic sporting clubs, and the families who have kept these living traditions alive and growing.

San Francisco has long recognized that its strength lies in the diversity of its communities and the depth of their roots. The Sunset Irish Cultural District would ensure that the Irish and Irish American community receives the same formal recognition and institutional support that other cultural communities across this city already enjoy.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to support this resolution and take this important step toward honoring a community that has given so much to San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Kelly Cannon  
United Irish Cultural District

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [John & Mary McKeon](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Khoo, Arthur \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support Supervisor Wong's resolution to establish the Irish Cultural District  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 8:18:33 AM

---

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

Dear Clerk of the Board and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Alan Wong's resolution expressing the City and County of San Francisco's intent to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District.

The Irish and Irish American community has called San Francisco home since the Gold Rush era, enduring hardship, building institutions, and contributing to every corner of this city's civic, cultural, and political life. For generations, the Sunset District has been the heart of that community—home to the United Irish Cultural Center, traditional music and dance academies, Gaelic sporting clubs, and the families who have kept these living traditions alive and growing.

San Francisco has long recognized that its strength lies in the diversity of its communities and the depth of their roots. The Sunset Irish Cultural District would ensure that the Irish and Irish American community receives the same formal recognition and institutional support that other cultural communities across this city already enjoy.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to support this resolution and take this important step toward honoring a community that has given so much to San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Mary C McKeon  
[johnamdmariamckeon@sbcglobal.net](mailto:johnamdmariamckeon@sbcglobal.net)

**From:** [debkleinfeld@icloud.com](mailto:debkleinfeld@icloud.com)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Khoo, Arthur \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support Supervisor Wong's resolution to establish the Irish Cultural District  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 2:19:27 PM

---

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

Dear Clerk of the Board and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Alan Wong's resolution expressing the City and County of San Francisco's intent to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District.

The Irish and Irish American community has called San Francisco home since the Gold Rush era, enduring hardship, building institutions, and contributing to every corner of this city's civic, cultural, and political life. For generations, the Sunset District has been the heart of that community—home to the United Irish Cultural Center, traditional music and dance academies, Gaelic sporting clubs, and the families who have kept these living traditions alive and growing.

San Francisco has long recognized that its strength lies in the diversity of its communities and the depth of their roots. The Sunset Irish Cultural District would ensure that the Irish and Irish American community receives the same formal recognition and institutional support that other cultural communities across this city already enjoy.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to support this resolution and take this important step toward honoring a community that has given so much to San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Deb Kleinfeld  
Alameda

Trust me, for every problem there is a solution.....Deb Kleinfeld

Deb Kleinfeld  
[debkleinfeld@icloud.com](mailto:debkleinfeld@icloud.com)  
(510) 410 - 5270

**NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS:** If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are prohibited from sharing, copying or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and permanently delete this email and any attachments without reading, forwarding or saving them. Thank you.

**From:** [Stephanie McGinn Luedorf](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Khoo, Arthur \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support Supervisor Wong's resolution to establish the Irish Cultural District  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 3:20:07 PM

---

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

Dear Clerk of the Board and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Alan Wong's resolution expressing the City and County of San Francisco's intent to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District.

The Irish and Irish American community has called San Francisco home since the Gold Rush era, enduring hardship, building institutions, and contributing to every corner of this city's civic, cultural, and political life. For generations, the Sunset District has been the heart of that community—home to the United Irish Cultural Center, traditional music and dance academies, Gaelic sporting clubs, and the families who have kept these living traditions alive and growing.

San Francisco has long recognized that its strength lies in the diversity of its communities and the depth of their roots. The Sunset Irish Cultural District would ensure that the Irish and Irish American community receives the same formal recognition and institutional support that other cultural communities across this city already enjoy.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to support this resolution and take this important step toward honoring a community that has given so much to San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Stephanie McGinn Luedorf  
Glen Park

Sent from Gmail Mobile

**From:** [Carleen Durkin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Khoo, Arthur \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support Supervisor Wong's resolution to establish the Irish Cultural District  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 5:13:02 PM

---

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

Dear Clerk of the Board and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Alan Wong's resolution expressing the City and County of San Francisco's intent to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District.

The Irish and Irish American community has called San Francisco home since the Gold Rush era, enduring hardship, building institutions, and contributing to every corner of this city's civic, cultural, and political life. For generations, the Sunset District has been the heart of that community—home to the United Irish Cultural Center, traditional music and dance academies, Gaelic sporting clubs, and the families who have kept these living traditions alive and growing.

San Francisco has long recognized that its strength lies in the diversity of its communities and the depth of their roots. The Sunset Irish Cultural District would ensure that the Irish and Irish American community receives the same formal recognition and institutional support that other cultural communities across this city already enjoy.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to support this resolution and take this important step toward honoring a community that has given so much to San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Carleen Durkin  
Sunset district

[Carleen Durkin](#)  
[Cell: 415-275-4007](#)



**From:** [Lauren Kerins](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Khoo, Arthur \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support Supervisor Wong's resolution to establish the Irish Cultural District  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 7:41:40 AM

---

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

Dear Clerk of the Board and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Alan Wong's resolution expressing the City and County of San Francisco's intent to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District.

The Irish and Irish American community has called San Francisco home since the Gold Rush era, enduring hardship, building institutions, and contributing to every corner of this city's civic, cultural, and political life. For generations, the Sunset District has been the heart of that community—home to the United Irish Cultural Center, traditional music and dance academies, Gaelic sporting clubs, and the families who have kept these living traditions alive and growing.

San Francisco has long recognized that its strength lies in the diversity of its communities and the depth of their roots. The Sunset Irish Cultural District would ensure that the Irish and Irish American community receives the same formal recognition and institutional support that other cultural communities across this city already enjoy.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to support this resolution and take this important step toward honoring a community that has given so much to San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Lauren Doyle Kerins  
Sunset and Irish Cultural Center

**From:** [Lauren Kerins](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Khoo, Arthur \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Jocelyn \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support Supervisor Wong's resolution to establish the Irish Cultural District  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 7:41:41 AM

---

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

Dear Clerk of the Board and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Alan Wong's resolution expressing the City and County of San Francisco's intent to establish the Sunset Irish Cultural District.

The Irish and Irish American community has called San Francisco home since the Gold Rush era, enduring hardship, building institutions, and contributing to every corner of this city's civic, cultural, and political life. For generations, the Sunset District has been the heart of that community—home to the United Irish Cultural Center, traditional music and dance academies, Gaelic sporting clubs, and the families who have kept these living traditions alive and growing.

San Francisco has long recognized that its strength lies in the diversity of its communities and the depth of their roots. The Sunset Irish Cultural District would ensure that the Irish and Irish American community receives the same formal recognition and institutional support that other cultural communities across this city already enjoy.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to support this resolution and take this important step toward honoring a community that has given so much to San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Lauren Doyle Kerins  
Sunset and Irish Cultural Center

# Item 29

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Balboa Skate Park - 50 letters  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 8:42:36 AM  
**Attachments:** [50 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 50 letters from members of the public regarding the Balboa Skate Park.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte

**Office of the Clerk of the Board – Operations Division**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Voice (415) 554-7709 | Fax (415) 554-5163

[richard.lagunte@sfgov.org](mailto:richard.lagunte@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [Adrian Turnbull](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 12:18:19 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Adrian Turnbull  
[adrian@turnbull-contracting.com](mailto:adrian@turnbull-contracting.com)

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Calvin Elzweig](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:14:00 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Calvin Elzweig  
manniquinman@gmail.com

Mountain View, California 94043

**From:** [Henry Walen](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:18:09 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Henry Walen  
[henry.walen@gmail.com](mailto:henry.walen@gmail.com)



San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** [Wendy Tu](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:41:51 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Wendy Tu  
saigemia@gmail.com

Mountain View, California 94043

**From:** [Vanessa MERO](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 6:09:00 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding and rollerskating community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Vanessa MERO  
vmero20@gmail.com

San Bruno, California 94066

**From:** [Samuel Miranda](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 10:20:53 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Samuel Miranda  
[cha.chask8@gmail.com](mailto:cha.chask8@gmail.com)

Oakland, California 94610

**From:** [Emily Cerf](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 10:39:16 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding and rollerskating community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding and wheeled sports have long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Emily Cerf



emilykcerf@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110-3223

**From:** [Tyler Ford](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 6:59:15 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Tyler Ford  
[artcondition@gmail.com](mailto:artcondition@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Elaina A Ford](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2026 7:00:59 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Elaina A Ford  
setbford@gmail.co

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Chance Williams](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 9:27:21 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Chance Williams  
chancew820@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Ras Williams](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 9:27:42 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Ras Williams  
wras023@gmail.com



San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [reese uteda](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 10:30:18 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

reese uteda  
[reeseuteda@gmail.com](mailto:reeseuteda@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Cameron Ray](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 12:41:35 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Cameron Ray  
[cameronray.it@gmail.com](mailto:cameronray.it@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [Eugene Brodsky](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 12:42:30 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Eugene Brodsky  
[eugenebrod@gmail.com](mailto:eugenebrod@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** [Quinn Patrick](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 12:44:32 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Quinn Patrick  
quinnpatrick@gmail.com



San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Cesar Lopez](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 12:46:19 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Cesar Lopez  
[cesarln+balboa@gmail.com](mailto:cesarln+balboa@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94103

**From:** [aaron popelka](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 12:58:30 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

aaron popelka  
[aaronpopelka@gmail.com](mailto:aaronpopelka@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** [Shelby Rodef](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 12:59:28 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Shelby Rodef  
[shelbyrodef@yahoo.com](mailto:shelbyrodef@yahoo.com)

San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** [Ryan Bromm](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 1:32:08 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Ryan Bromm  
[ry.bromm@gmail.com](mailto:ry.bromm@gmail.com)



Asheville, North Carolina 28801

**From:** [Dan Rodriguez](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 2:25:50 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Dan Rodriguez  
[dantastik@hotmail.com](mailto:dantastik@hotmail.com)

Daly City, California 94015

**From:** [Eli Brooks](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 3:15:01 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Eli Brooks  
[elibrooks002@gmail.com](mailto:elibrooks002@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94142

**From:** [Greg Detwiler](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 4:14:14 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Greg Detwiler  
[Gregdexplore@gmail.com](mailto:Gregdexplore@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94123

**From:** [Keri Fishman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 4:47:43 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Keri Fishman  
[kerifishman@sbcglobal.net](mailto:kerifishman@sbcglobal.net)



San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Ace Wiseman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 5:21:42 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. For example, many of the ramps have loose screw heads that stick out and unstable sheets of wood that are hazardous. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

-Ace Wiseman  
(District 9 resident)

Ace Wiseman  
awiseman@mail.ccsf.edu

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [travis.knapp-prasek](mailto:travis.knapp-prasek@sf.gov)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 6:47:06 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

travis.knapp-prasek  
traviskp+balboa@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Drew Bader](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 9:00:33 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Drew Bader  
[drew.bader@gmail.com](mailto:drew.bader@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Justin Marks](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 5:12:14 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Justin Marks  
[justinmarks51@gmail.com](mailto:justinmarks51@gmail.com)



San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [Evan Brooks](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 5:51:40 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Evan Brooks  
laxhead30@gmail.com

Santa Rosa, California 95403

**From:** [jesse marandino](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 1:30:23 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

jesse marandino  
[jesse@hellojtm.com](mailto:jesse@hellojtm.com)

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Lachlan Maclean](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 2:12:31 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Lachlan Maclean  
[lmaclean0@yahoo.com](mailto:lmaclean0@yahoo.com)

San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** [Sonny Pearce](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 4:20:31 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Sonny Pearce  
sonnypearce88@gmail.com



San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** [Alex Young-Davies](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 8:11:07 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Alex Young-Davies  
[alexycd@rogers.com](mailto:alexycd@rogers.com)

San Francisco, California 94107

**From:** [Corey Cain](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 9:39:12 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding, roller skating, and scootering has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Corey Cain

coreycainphd@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94124

**From:** [Christian Espiritu](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 10:57:10 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Christian Espiritu  
cespamitu@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Jordan Medrano](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 6:49:22 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Jordan Medrano  
[jjjhsm@gmail.com](mailto:jjjhsm@gmail.com)



San Francisco, California 94107

**From:** [Diego Lawson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 7:47:12 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Diego Lawson  
[diego.lawson@gmail.com](mailto:diego.lawson@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** [Axel Glenney](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 7:29:46 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Axel Glenney  
axelglenney@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [Chris Long](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 7:26:53 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Chris Long  
[cslong1200@gmail.com](mailto:cslong1200@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Alan Fu](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 12:53:35 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Alan Fu  
[alanzfu@gmail.com](mailto:alanzfu@gmail.com)



San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** [the415maurice@gmail.com](mailto:the415maurice@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:23:55 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Maurice Rivers  
Executive Director

OMI Cultural Participation Project

the415maurice@gmail.com

,

**From:** [Andrew Tran](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 1:54:15 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Andrew Tran  
[ajtran@umich.edu](mailto:ajtran@umich.edu)

San Francisco, California 94118

**From:** [Romario Caceres](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:08:54 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Romario Caceres  
brewwhound666@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [Henry Rittenberg](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:38:24 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Henry Rittenberg  
hmrittenberg@gmail.com



San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Shane Booth](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:40:47 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Shane Booth  
shanerama@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Jacob Krimston](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 3:17:21 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Jacob Krimston  
[jdkrimston@gmail.com](mailto:jdkrimston@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94132

**From:** [Marina Ortiz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 5:10:14 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Marina Ortiz  
maortiz738@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94124

**From:** [Theodore Goddard](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 5:10:24 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Theodore Goddard  
whateveriwant312@gmail.com



San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Jonny Andeola](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 12:26:25 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Jonny Andeola  
[jonnyandeola@gmail.com](mailto:jonnyandeola@gmail.com)

Manteca, California 95336

**From:** [John Montgomery](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Formally Support for the Balboa Skatepark Renovation & Lighting Project  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 3:46:47 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Dear San Francisco Recreation & Park Department Grant Review Committee,

As the father of a ten-year-old skateboarder who frequents Balboa Park, I am writing to strongly urge the full approval and funding of the Balboa Skatepark renovation. While our city has made incredible strides with new facilities like UN Plaza and Sunset Dunes, the southern part of San Francisco is currently a "skate desert," leaving local youth with an aging, dangerous facility that fails to meet the community's needs.

The Neighborhood Reality: A Lack of Safe Space

Balboa Park is a vital artery for District 11 and the surrounding neighborhoods, which house one of the highest concentrations of children in the city. However, the current skatepark is in a state of severe neglect. The wooden structures are splintering and structurally compromised, making it an unsafe environment for the many 10-year-olds, like my son, who want to skateboard in a safe environment. Our children deserve a modern, all-concrete park that is built to last and designed for safety.

Ending the "Blackout": The Necessity of Lighting

One of the most critical needs for this renovation is the installation of permanent lighting. In this part of town, recreational equity is currently out of balance:

The Disparity: Nearby tennis and basketball courts in the surrounding area often benefit from lighting that allows for evening play. Meanwhile, the skatepark—a primary outlet for hundreds of local kids—becomes a "dead zone" the moment the sun sets.

Safety and Access: Without lights, kids are forced to either stop playing or find less safe, unlit areas in the streets. Providing a lit, dedicated space at Balboa ensures that after-school activity can continue safely through the winter months, keeping youth engaged and off the pavement.

Distance to Alternatives: The Logistics of the "Desert"

For families in this part of San Francisco, there are no other options within a reasonable distance. To find a comparable, safe concrete park, a child from this neighborhood faces a

daunting commute:

Potrero del Sol: ~4.5 miles

Sunset Dunes: ~4.2 miles

SoMa West: ~5.1 miles

For a 10-year-old, these are not neighborhood parks; they are inaccessible. Balboa Park is the only viable hub for the southern corridor, and its current state of disrepair is a disservice to the thousands of families living nearby.

Conclusion: A Commitment to Equity

A renovated, lit, and concrete Balboa Skatepark will do more than just provide a place to skate—it will revitalize a corner of the park that has been overlooked for too long. I want my son to grow up in a city that treats his sport with the same respect and investment as baseball or tennis.

I respectfully request that the committee prioritize this renovation for completion by 2027 to provide our children with the safe, world-class recreational space they deserve.

Thank you for your time and your dedication to San Francisco's youth.

Sincerely,

John Montgomery (father) and William Montgomery (son)

John Montgomery  
johnlmontgomery@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** [Christopher Deemer](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Support the Renovation of Balboa Skatepark  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 7:24:52 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Alongside the local skateboarding community, I am asking the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, and the Recreation and Parks Department to support the renovation and revitalization of Balboa Skatepark by 2027.

Once a cornerstone of San Francisco's skatepark network and a welcoming entry point for beginners, the park was originally constructed as a wooden structure on a concrete slab. After 14 years of active use, it no longer meets safety or usability standards for all skill levels and presents a growing maintenance burden. Despite these conditions, the skatepark continues to serve wheeled users of all ages and backgrounds and hosts community programming, including skateboard lessons that rely on a safe, functional environment. Located just one block from the Balboa Park transit hub, with direct BART and Muni access, the skatepark draws users from both nearby neighborhoods and across the Bay Area, making it one of the region's most accessible facilities and a strong candidate for reinvestment.

Investing in the Balboa Park Skatepark is an investment in long-term safety, durability, and community benefit. The proposed improvements prioritize a thoughtful, inclusive design process shaped by community input and delivered through high-quality concrete construction that meets modern industry standards. By working with a qualified skatepark designer and specialty contractor, the project will result in a facility that reduces long-term maintenance costs, supports a wide range of users, and becomes a safe, welcoming, and inclusive public asset within Balboa Park for decades to come.

Through three public outreach meetings and ongoing coordination with the Recreation and Parks Department, the Friends of Balboa Skatepark have received approval for the skatepark renovation project. The City and community have expressed clear alignment on the need for a modern, durable, and inclusive skatepark. A renovated Balboa can preserve the character of the original park while improving flow, safety, and the overall experience for all users and spectators.

Skateboarding has long been an integral part of San Francisco's cultural and community life, and I ask for your support in ensuring Balboa Park Skatepark continues to serve the community as a safe, inclusive, and long-lasting public space for generations to come.

Christopher Deemer  
[chrisdeemer@gmail.com](mailto:chrisdeemer@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94131

# Item 30

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Cesar Chavez St - 6 letters  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 8:51:09 AM  
**Attachments:** [6 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 6 letters regarding Cesar Chavez Street.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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



**From:** [Adrienne Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [FelderStaff](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Resolution to request to change Cesar Chavez (formerly Army Street) to Dolores Huerta Street  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 8:18:27 PM

---

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

As a fourth generation San Franciscan whose relatives and friends were active union representatives, dock workers, and social activists in the Mission, I am deeply disturbed and heart broken by the recent revelations regarding Cesar Chavez against living activist Dolores Huerta and other women and girls. (<https://www.nytimes.com/2026/03/18/us/cesar-chavez-sexual-abuse-allegations-ufw.html>)

I implore you and other members of the Board of Supervisors to change Cesar Chavez St. (formerly Army Street) to Dolores Huerta Street.

As a change marks a significant financial and administrative commitment from the City and County of San Francisco, it would behoove the city to officially reach out to Ms. Huerta and those impacted and traumatized by Chavez's assaults to underscore the City's commitment to change, social justice, remediation, and intention for a street name change, up to and including any official buildings, parks, landmarks, etc., that currently honor his name.

Regards and concern,

-----

**Adrienne M. Anderson**

LEED ® Green Associate

**From:** [J](#)  
**To:** [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Cesar Chavez Street  
**Date:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 10:58:20 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Safaí,

I live in District 11 near Russia Avenue, and I wanted to share a thought about Cesar Chavez Street.

In light of recent reporting about serious sexual-abuse allegations, I don't think it makes sense for the City to continue honoring someone with a major street name in the same way. A street name is a form of recognition, and I think we should be careful about who we elevate in that way.

Personally, I'd support going back to the original name, Army Street. It feels like a straightforward, neutral solution that avoids a lot of back-and-forth over time. I'm not really interested in swapping one individual for another and potentially revisiting the same issue again down the road. Reverting the name avoids embroiling the City in another round of hero worship and all its attendant pitfalls.

To me, this isn't about erasing history. Cesar Chavez is an important historical figure, and that belongs in books, classrooms, and public discussion. But naming a major street after someone is a different kind of statement.

I hope you'll consider taking a look at this and possibly starting a broader conversation about it.

Thank you for your time,  
JEREMY BOND SHEPHERD

**From:** [Susie K](#)  
**To:** [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Community Input on Cesar Chavez Street  
**Date:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 8:44:11 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Fielder,

I'm writing as a Bay Area parent to express appreciation for the City's thoughtful approach to questions around public naming.

Given the recent information about Cesar Chavez, I support taking time to reflect on whether continued commemoration is appropriate. If renaming is considered, I would strongly encourage a process that includes meaningful public input.

Should a change move forward, I hope the City will consider honoring **women**—especially those whose contributions have been historically underrecognized. I would support consideration of **Dolores Huerta**, whose leadership and lifelong advocacy for farmworkers and women have had a profound impact in California.

Thank you for your care in navigating this.

Respectfully,

Susan H. Kavanagh

**From:** [Graham Westby](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SFOSB \(ECN\)](#)  
**Subject:** Change Cesar Chavez Street to Chuck Norris Boulevard  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 5:36:50 AM

---

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

In light of the recent controversy around Cesar Chavez, we respectfully request that Cesar Chavez Street be re-named Chuck Norris Boulevard, after US Air Force Veteran, martial artist, and actor Carlos Ray "Chuck" Norris. We feel he is a great example to our community. He exemplifies the virtues of physical and mental toughness, self-discipline, and service before self. We appreciate your consideration in this matter.

**From:** [jimwolpman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Renaming Caesar Chavez St  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2026 1:59:10 PM

---

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

A far classier name would be “Avenida Si, Se Puede”

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Blaire Zachary](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Cesar Chavez Street Renaming  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 11:16:05 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident and homeowner on Cesar Chavez Street in San Francisco. Given the recent news regarding his legacy, I have been nominated by my neighbors to reach out and request guidance on how affected residents can participate in any process to rename the street.

I understand from my district supervisor's office that they are deferring to the two Latina members of the Board on this matter, which I respect. However, neighbors in our district would still like to ensure that residents who live on the street have an opportunity to provide feedback on any proposed replacement name. We have aligned on specific requests - including not naming it after another person as this doesn't typically work out positively, and keeping it to one word ie " \_\_\_\_ Street." We have aligned on some recommendations that continue to honor the efforts of our farmworkers, but still reflect something meaningful to our city. We have come up with the below for your consideration:

- **Dahlia Street** (first choice)— San Francisco's city flower and an original crop of the area. The flower is celebrating 100 years as our city flower this year, so it feels the most locally rooted, civic, and broadly appealing.
- **Huelga Street** — "Huelga" means "strike," so it keeps a direct connection to labor and farmworker history without naming another person.
- **Cosecha Street** — "Cosecha" means "harvest," which ties to agriculture in a way that feels elegant, meaningful, and less polarizing.
- **Siembra Street** — "Siembra" means "planting" or "sowing," so it has a farmworker connection but feels more hopeful and forward-looking.
- **Blossom Street** — Flower- and growth-adjacent, easy to understand, and softens the tone while still feeling like a natural SF street name.

Given the direct impact on our homes and addresses, I would appreciate your guidance on the process for resident involvement, including whether there will be a hearing, public comment opportunity, or another forum for community input. I would also appreciate knowing which office or staff member is leading this effort so that we can engage through the appropriate channel.

My goal is simply to understand how to participate constructively and make sure neighborhood input is available for consideration if the renaming proceeds.

Thank you for your help.

Best,  
Blaire Zachary, 919-412-0922

# Item 31

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 8:54:17 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Kyle Whitney regarding banning plastic cigarette filters.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Kyle Whitney <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 21, 2026 11:50 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gathered at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featured Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, shone a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kyle Whitney

[kwhitney2014@gmail.com](mailto:kwhitney2014@gmail.com)

3366 Pierce St Apt 104

San Francisco , California 94123



# Item 32

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please close the intersection of West Portal Avenue and Ulloa Street to car traffic and install Transit-Only Lanes to make it safe for all people, while improving the speed and reliability of public transportation  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 8:59:01 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Margot Warren-Bancquart regarding the intersection of West Portal Avenue and Ulloa Street.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Margot Warren-Bancquart <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 7:04 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Please close the intersection of West Portal Avenue and Ulloa Street to car traffic and install Transit-Only Lanes to make it safe for all people, while improving the speed and reliability of public transportation

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to direct SFMTA to close the intersection of West Portal Avenue and Ulloa Street to car traffic and install Transit-Only Lanes on Ulloa Street and West Portal Avenue to make the area safe for all people, especially children, seniors, and people with disabilities as well as those walking, taking public transportation, and biking around West Portal Station. Now is the time for action, and I urge you to take immediate action to make this intersection and the broader area safer for all people, while improving the speed and reliability of public transportation to and from West Portal.

The intersection of Ulloa Street and West Portal Avenue is dangerously designed and, with its numerous Muni stops and high number of people walking, biking, and taking public transit through the area, it should be closed to car traffic to make the area safe for people, especially children, seniors, and people with disabilities who often use walk and public transportation as well as visit the nearby library, playground, park, schools, and shops.

On March 16, 2024, four people — an entire family, including a toddler and infant — were killed when a driver crashed a car near this intersection.

Closing the intersection to cars will instantly make it safer for all people, including people who need to drive or use cars, and improve the speed and reliability of Muni to and from West Portal and helping more people shift trips away from cars to public transportation. Installing Transit-Only Lanes on Ulloa Street and West Portal Avenue will improve the speed and reliability of Muni while significantly increasing safety for all people, including people in cars.

Please take action by directing SFMTA to close the intersection of West Portal Avenue and Ulloa Street to car traffic and install Transit-Only Lanes on Ulloa Street and West Portal Avenue to make the area safe for all people, especially children, seniors, and people with disabilities, while simultaneously improving the speed and reliability of public transportation to and from West Portal.

Thank you.

Margot Warren-Bancquart  
[margotwarrenbancquart@gmail.com](mailto:margotwarrenbancquart@gmail.com)  
3880 Cesar Chavez  
San Francisco, California 94131

# Item 33

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Request for Caution on Proposed Cannabis Café Legislation - File No. 260281  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 9:28:16 AM  
**Attachments:** [Cannabis Cafe" Presentation.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached from Kevin Reed regarding:

File No. 260281- Ordinance amending the Health, Planning, Police, and Business and Tax Regulations Codes to establish a new permit type for cannabis cafés to be administered by the Office of Cannabis that will authorize the permittee to sell cannabis and cannabis products only for consumption on the premises of the café; exempt cannabis cafés from the prohibition on smoking in business establishments; eliminate the prohibition on establishments with a cannabis consumption permit requiring employees to enter a designated smoking room as a condition of employment; exempt cannabis cafés in certain circumstances from the 600-foot buffer rule that applies to cannabis retail establishments; restrict eligibility for cannabis café permits for one year to businesses that currently hold a cannabis storefront retailer permit or that have the same owners as such a business; require Equity Applicants that apply for a cannabis café permit to pay the \$2,000 application fee, any permit amendment processing costs, and the \$3,000 license fee for the first year of operation, associated with the cannabis café permit; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written*

*or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Kevin Reed <kevinreed@thegreencross.org>

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 11:07 AM

**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Wong, Alan (BOS) <alan.wong@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; WongStaff (BOS) <WongStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Patel, Nikesh (ADM) <nikesh.patel@sfgov.org>; Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>; CON, Controller (CON) <controller.con@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Re: Request for Caution on Proposed Cannabis Café Legislation

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

Dear President Mandelman and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I hope you are doing well.

Earlier today, additional details on the proposed cannabis café legislation were shared with members of the cannabis retail community by Sophie Marie from your office and Ben Van Houten from OEWD, as reflected in the attached materials.

After reviewing everything, I wanted to reach out directly because I have real concerns about both the direction and the timing of this proposal.

For the past several years, operators across San Francisco have been saying the same thing: the market is oversaturated, margins are tight, and businesses are closing. This

has been shared in meetings, emails, and ongoing conversations with the City. None of this should be a surprise.

That's why it's difficult to understand why we would move forward with something like this right now.

This isn't a small change. It shifts the model toward hospitality and consumption-first businesses, including concepts that don't even rely on traditional retail. That's a major change, and it directly competes with existing operators for the same customer base.

It doesn't create new demand — it just moves it around.

In a strong market, maybe that's manageable. In today's market, it likely means more closures.

What's even harder to reconcile is the timing. The City has already recognized there are open questions about the health of this industry by commissioning a Controller's report. That report won't be ready until June 2027. Moving ahead with a major shift before that analysis is done just doesn't make sense.

It raises a simple question: what are we basing this decision on?

There also seems to be a broader lack of alignment in how consumption is being approached. The City appears to be simultaneously considering expanding indoor consumption while exploring additional restrictions on outdoor smoking. That sends mixed signals about where policy is actually headed.

To be clear, I'm not against evolving the cannabis experience in San Francisco. But right now, the priority should be stabilizing the businesses that are already here.

There are more practical, lower-risk ways to do that — including making targeted improvements within the existing consumption framework so current operators can enhance the customer experience without taking on major new capital burdens or competing with an entirely new class of businesses.

At a minimum, changes of this scale should come after the City has completed its own economic analysis.

San Francisco has always tried to lead on cannabis policy. Right now, leadership means recognizing what's happening on the ground and not making it harder for existing operators to survive.

I respectfully ask that the Board pause this legislation until the Controller's report is

complete and we have a clearer understanding of the market.

Thank you for your time and for considering this perspective.

Sincerely,

--

**Kevin Reed**

*Founder & President*

**The Green Cross**

415.846.7671

✉ [KevinReed@TheGreenCross.org](mailto:KevinReed@TheGreenCross.org)

TheGreenCross.org



# Item 34

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislative Affairs](#)  
**Cc:** [Charles Ingels \(BOS\)](#); [Michael Echea \(BOS\)](#); [Ike Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Someni Akua \(BOS\)](#); [De Jong, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2025 9:30:38 AM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Ferry Gunawan regarding proposed E-Bike Incentive Program.

Regards,

**Richard Lagente**  
Office of the Clerk of the Board  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[boa@sfgov.org](mailto:boa@sfgov.org) | [www.sfgov.org](http://www.sfgov.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** Ferry Gunawan <[noreply@educationnetwork.org](mailto:noreply@educationnetwork.org)>

**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2025 10:28 PM

**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at

[https://url.avanan.click/v2t01/\\_\\_\\_https://eBikeSF.org\\_\\_\\_YXAzOnNmZHQyQmE6b3pkM2NjMTM4NjZlZyZFYzIjZAwNjEONjU3NzY2ZjZp3QmRiZjYyYWMxMzQ4NjYODU4MzI3ZmU5MzE1Y2ZmOTg4NzhhYDYyY2Y5MjY5MmEKMWNjYWNkZjI0ZDRmNGQ1ZmI2MDp0ZjpoOIQ6Tg](https://url.avanan.click/v2t01/___https://eBikeSF.org___YXAzOnNmZHQyQmE6b3pkM2NjMTM4NjZlZyZFYzIjZAwNjEONjU3NzY2ZjZp3QmRiZjYyYWMxMzQ4NjYODU4MzI3ZmU5MzE1Y2ZmOTg4NzhhYDYyY2Y5MjY5MmEKMWNjYWNkZjI0ZDRmNGQ1ZmI2MDp0ZjpoOIQ6Tg)

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

Ferry Gunawan  
[ferry4@hotmail.com](mailto:ferry4@hotmail.com)  
62 Hawkins Ln  
San Francisco, California 94124

# Item 35

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: General Public Comment - Department of Police Accountability  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 9:32:40 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Stephanie Lehman regarding the Department of Police Accountability.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Stephanie Lehman <slehman21@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2026 7:37 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** General Public Comment

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

To San Francisco City Leadership,

I am writing to make a direct and urgent request: initiate a formal, independent audit of the



Department of Police Accountability.

This is not a new concern. I have been raising it for two years. During that time, the core issue has remained unchanged — the DPA is overstepping its Charter-defined authority.

The Charter authorizes the DPA to **receive and investigate complaints**. It does not authorize the routine expansion of cases through **added or self-initiated allegations** that go beyond the original complaint. Yet that is what we are seeing in practice.

When an agency can layer on additional allegations, it is no longer simply investigating — it is shaping and expanding the case itself. That blurs the line between neutral fact-finding and advocacy, and raises serious due-process concerns.

There is also a real-world consequence that this committee cannot ignore: every added allegation pulls officers off the street. Officers are taken off the beat, out of service, and into extended investigative processes to defend against claims that were not part of the original complaint. That impacts staffing, response times, and ultimately public safety in our neighborhoods.

Oversight should strengthen the system — not strain it.

If the DPA is operating within its authority, an audit will confirm that. If it is not, then this body has a duty to act.

That means: **a full independent audit, clear Charter clarification on the limits of investigations, restrictions on adding allegations beyond the original complaint, and stronger procedural guardrails.**

This is about balance. Accountability must exist — but it must exist within the law and within the limits voters approved.

Right now, that balance is off. It is your responsibility to correct it.

Thank you,  
Stephanie Lehman

# Item 36

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 4th St and Channel - 2 letters  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 9:37:43 AM  
**Attachments:** [2 letters 4th and Channel.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 2 letters from members of the public regarding the intersection at 4th Street and Channel Street.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [Annie Scalmanini](#)  
**To:** [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [LivableStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Jamie.Parks@sfmta.com](#); [Tom.Maguire@sfmta.com](#); [Lasky, Matt \(MTA\)](#); [Leung, Kimberly \(MTA\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Mission Bay mother of 3, born in SF, love biking and walking all over this city, we can do better  
**Date:** Sunday, March 22, 2026 11:12:57 PM  
**Attachments:** [PastedGraphic-1.png](#)  
[Screenshot 2026-03-14 at 2.01.28 AM.png](#)

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

I wanted to follow up and share this article about Paris' transformation into a pedestrian- and bike-friendly city under its visionary outgoing mayor Anne Hidalgo, whose successor just won the mayoral race...



...and arrived by bicycle to give his victory speech! Iconic.

## Socialist Emmanuel Grégoire elected Paris mayor, as National Rally fails to take key cities

City hall veteran beats rightwinger Rachida Dati in French capital, while far-right RN fails to win Marseille and Toulon in French local elections



■ Socialist Emmanuel Grégoire arrives on bicycle after being elected mayor of Paris – video

On Mar 14, 2026, at 2:15 AM, Annie Scalmanini <[anniescal@icloud.com](mailto:anniescal@icloud.com)> wrote:

MTA Board Members, Mayor Lurie, and Supervisors,

I'm a mother of 3 young kids in Mission Bay, and I had just started a new job that I can bike to here in San Francisco when a driver killed a 2-year old girl and injured her mother right in front of Gus's, the grocery store we frequent as a family at the intersection we cross multiple times a day.

Mission Bay is FILLED with strollers and young kids on bikes and scooters. And it's also filled with distracted drivers driving way too fast who are in the area for events – I was biking my older two kids to preschool last week when a rideshare driver blew through the red light at the pedestrian crossing on 4th in front of the Koret Quad. I won't take more of your time with my other near-miss stories with my kids.

I am writing in fervent support of the following safety measures for the 4th and Channel intersection:

**Ban right on red and U turns** from all approaches


**Install concrete bumpouts at each corner**

**Make 4th street a neighborhood slow street** (à la Minneslowta in the Dogpatch, which is actually the same street as 4th just on the other side of UCSF, so technically it could be considered an extension of an existing slow street as opposed to a whole new one) **between Channel and 16th**. 4th street dead-ends for cars at UCSF, so cars have to detour to 3rd at 16th to continue going south anyway

Within 500 feet of the intersection where the car killed the 2 year old, there is a daycare, park, and neighborhood grocery store – the number of strollers that cross the streets at this intersection could easily be in the hundreds every day.

Thank you for your time and for the space in your heart to do something about this.

Peace,  
Annie



**From:** [Cameron Scott](#)  
**To:** [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [LivableStreets@sfmta.com](mailto:LivableStreets@sfmta.com); [Jamie.Parks@sfmta.com](mailto:Jamie.Parks@sfmta.com); [Lasky, Matt \(MTA\)](#); [Leung, Kimberly \(MTA\)](#); [Kirschbaum, Julie \(MTA\)](#)  
**Subject:** Demand for safety improvements at 4th and Channel streets now  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 11:03:51 AM

---

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

MTA Board Members, Mayor Lurie, and Supervisors,

On February 27, a driver killed a 2-year old girl and injured her mother at the intersection of 4th and Channel. This horrific death is the second time a driver has killed a child on 4th Street in the last three years.

I'm writing to you to demand action, at this intersection and at similarly dangerous intersections throughout the neighborhood and the City. A family lost a child last month and every day there are near-misses at this intersection. As more families move to Mission Bay and more drivers come to the area for events, the likelihood of a driver killing another of our neighbors will only increase unless immediate action is taken.

We are asking that you do the following at the 4th and Channel intersection:

Ban right on red and U turns from all approaches  
Install concrete bumpouts at each corner  
Bring back the scrapped 2021 plan to make the 4th Street Bridge (just north of the intersection) one-way only for southbound cars

These improvements are urgently needed. Within 500 feet of the intersection there is a daycare, park, and neighborhood grocery store, and inaction will continue to put our neighbors in this busy area in jeopardy. Fix this intersection, fix the increasingly chaotic and dangerous streets of Mission Bay, and give us real, citywide Vision Zero policies so that this does not happen again. Do not wait for a third child to be killed by a driver on 4th before you take action.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

# Item 37

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Deported 6-year-old deaf boy could die in Colombia without medical attention, his attorney says  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 9:43:29 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Lea McGeever regarding an Immigrations and Customs Enforcement incident in South of Market Area.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**

**Office of the Clerk of the Board**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163

[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Lea McGeever <lea.mcgeeever@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 3:20 PM

**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; dorseyintern@gmail.com; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <MelgarStaff@sfgov.org>; WongStaff (BOS) <WongStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Press Office, Mayor (MYR) <mayorspressooffice@sfgov.org>; MYR - Scheduling <scheduling@sfgov.org>; MYR-Appointments <mayor.appointments@sfgov.org>; commendations (MYR) <commendations@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>;



DPH CDTA Contractor Communications <cdtaunit@sfdph.org>; CON, Controller (CON) <controller.con@sfgov.org>; Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>; Assessor, SF (ASR) <assessor@sfgov.org>; DPH-Press <DPH.Press@sfdph.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>; Slaughter, Staci (MYR) <staci.slaughter@sfgov.org>; Goudeau, Matthew (MYR) <matthew.goudeau@sfgov.org>; Garcia, Moises (MYR) <moises.garcia@sfgov.org>; Zou, Han (MYR) <han.zou@sfgov.org>; Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>; Gabillet, Annie (MYR) <annie.gabillet@sfgov.org>; Black, Haakon (MYR) <haakon.black@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Mariano, Eileen (MYR) <eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org>; Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>; Negusse, Nina (MYR) <Nina.Negusse@sfgov.org>; Adeyemi, Andre (MYR) <andre.adeyemi@sfgov.org>; Ethics Commission, (ETH) <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>; Lutvak, Charles (MYR) <charles.lutvak@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Deported 6-year-old deaf boy could die in Colombia without medical attention, his attorney says

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

A deaf 6-year-old boy snatched by immigration agents from Northern California and deported to Colombia this month needs to be returned to the U.S. immediately or he could die, a lawyer representing the child said Wednesday.

Attorney Nikolas De Bremaeker said the boy, Joseph Lodano Rodriguez, was “at risk every day that he is not getting his treatments.” The child has a cochlear implant that requires the same routine maintenance and cleaning he was receiving stateside but may not get in Colombia.

“Joseph is at immense risk for his life if he does not continue the treatment that he was receiving in the United States,” De Bremaeker said at a virtual news conference hosted by California Supt. of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond, [a Democratic gubernatorial candidate](#).

“He is at risk of infection, he is at risk of meningitis, he is at risk of death if he is not given the proper care for his surgical implants.” [SOURCE](#)

**Is there anything YOU can do with your position of power and influence to help bring this family back home in the Bay Area? They were abducted in SoMa, San Francisco in D6, the district I live in. Then they were disappeared and deported. If I had your power, I would hold a press conference. I would talk about it. I would reach out to this family's lawyer and gov reps. I would make a BIG DEAL about this. These people matter. This little boy shouldn't DIE because we let ICE kidnap people indoors. Do you know what it's like having your kid DIE? Do you know what it's like being a deaf kid in a country you can't communicate with and then DYING? Do you want this kid to DIE?!?!?! If not, then DO SOMETHING!!!!!!!**

Lea McGeever, MS.

District 6 homeowner



# Item 38

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
To: [BOS Secretary](#) [BOS Legal/Policy Affairs](#)  
Cc: [Cabrillo, Andrea \(BOS\)](#) [Kocher, Brian \(BOS\)](#) [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#) [Somera, Alexa \(BOS\)](#) [Du Jui, Edward \(BOS\)](#) [BOS Operations](#) [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
Subject: FWR: Firing Projectiles! File No. 250979  
Date: Friday, April 3, 2026 9:46:17 AM  
Attachments: [image.png](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Richard Hylton regarding:

File No. 250979 - Ordinance approving the Police Surveillance Technology Policy for electronic location tracking devices and making required findings.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunta**  
Office of the Clerk of the Board  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-6163  
[bos@sf.gov](mailto:bos@sf.gov) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

From: RichardGB Hylton <[rylton749@msn.com](mailto:rylton749@msn.com)>  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 4:39 PM  
To: Campbell, Christopher (POL) <[christopher.r.campbe@sfgov.org](mailto:christopher.r.campbe@sfgov.org)>; Records, Supervisor (CAT) <[supervisor.records@sfcityattly.org](mailto:supervisor.records@sfcityattly.org)>; Cox, Brian (PDR) <[brian.cox@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.cox@sfgov.org)>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <[paul.henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:paul.henderson@sfgov.org)>; SFPD, Commission (POL) <[SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org](mailto:SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Andrea Guerrero <[andrea@alliancesd.org](mailto:andrea@alliancesd.org)>; research.services@doj.ca.gov; AB953-cab953@doj.ca.gov  
Subject: Firing Projectiles! Re: I may have found what I have been waiting for, SFPD RIPA Stop Data for all of 2025. Re: Re: Congratulations on Pretext Stops. but where is the data?

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

**SF supes approve SFPD 'StarChase' tracking tech for pursuits amid privacy concerns**

These StarChase things fire projectiles, something that the SFPD is know for doing, according to data.

The tech involves a projectile device that is attached to the front of a police cruiser and contains a GPS tag. When activated by an officer, the tag is released and affixes to a suspect's vehicle.

"The purpose of StarChase, specifically, is short-term tracking for contemporaneous apprehension, allowing officers to disengage from vehicle pursuits while maintaining the ability to locate a fleeing vehicle or suspect," said SFPD government affairs manager Carl Nicita at the meeting.

There would be more teachers alive if the OPD had adopted this technology, The Sacramento-born skateboarder would be alive too; the one killed by a bunch of brutal, Black-skinned cops in the Midwest. Of course, ALPR's accomplish what this thing seeks to accomplish, from a stand-off place, and without vomited projectiles.

From: RichardGB Hylton <[rylton749@msn.com](mailto:rylton749@msn.com)>  
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2026 10:02 AM  
To: Campbell, Christopher (POL) <[christopher.r.campbe@sfgov.org](mailto:christopher.r.campbe@sfgov.org)>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <[supervisor.records@sfcityattly.org](mailto:supervisor.records@sfcityattly.org)>; Cox, Brian (PDR) <[brian.cox@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.cox@sfgov.org)>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <[paul.henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:paul.henderson@sfgov.org)>; SFPD, Commission (POL) <[sfpd.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:sfpd.commission@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Andrea Guerrero <[andrea@alliancesd.org](mailto:andrea@alliancesd.org)>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <[paul.henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:paul.henderson@sfgov.org)>; research.services@doj.ca.gov <[research.services@doj.ca.gov](mailto:research.services@doj.ca.gov)>  
Subject: I may have found what I have been waiting for, SFPD RIPA Stop Data for all of 2025. Re: Re: Congratulations on Pretext Stops. but where is the data?

A few days ago, I came across a dataset of Stop Incidents that I mistook as a possible candidate or substitute for Stop Records. Although, they are not stop records they could be used in the Data Integrity validation of stop records. I intend to do so in future, God willing.

Just now, I think that I came across the real deal, these items that are said to have been updated on March 18, 2026.

The screenshot displays a web interface for a dataset titled "Updated March 18, 2026". The interface includes a sidebar with navigation options like "Inventory", "Publishing", "Topics", "Tags", "Licensing", and "License". The main content area shows "Views: 8,145" and "Downloads: 3,379". A "What's in this Dataset?" section indicates 326K rows and 95 columns, with a description "Individual in a police stop". A table of columns is visible, with headers "Column Name", "Description", "API Field Name", and "Data Type". Overlaid on this is a "Save As" dialog box for a file named "San Francisco Police Department Stop Data 52760320.csv". The dialog shows a file explorer view with a list of files including "ripa-stop-data-2024" and various "ripa\_\*\_dataset.csv" files. The "Save as type" is set to "Microsoft Excel Comma Separated Values File (\*.csv)".

I shall have to evaluate the contents of these 326,000 records, and then to include them in my Longitudinal computations next week, since I began or ran my weekly computations, following download of LAPD data yesterday.

From: RichardGB Hylton <[rylton749@msn.com](mailto:rylton749@msn.com)>  
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2026 12:09 AM  
To: Campbell, Christopher (POL) <[christopher.r.campbe@sfgov.org](mailto:christopher.r.campbe@sfgov.org)>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <[supervisor.records@sfcityattly.org](mailto:supervisor.records@sfcityattly.org)>  
Cc: Andrea Guerrero <[andrea@alliancesd.org](mailto:andrea@alliancesd.org)>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <[paul.henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:paul.henderson@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: Re: Congratulations on Pretext Stops. but where is the data?

Just in case you misunderstand, this picture should illuminate the condition. My assertion rather than an accusation is that the 6,883 records were meat-axed so that SFPD could be said to have reduced stops and disparities so as to extricate it from the unwatchful eyes of the CA-DOJ.

Paul Henderson's SF DPA doubtless, concluded as much, but its leader lacks the testicular fortitude to say it. What he did say is that 6,800 records were unusable and that pointed to a lack of controls and audit systems. I call that meaty-mouthed.

There is a 1,700 difference in 2024 too. It is not trivial, no matter what meat-axe wielding malleasants say.



Accuse and assert are different things.

From: RichardGB Hylton <[hyton749@msn.com](mailto:hyton749@msn.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2026 7:31 PM  
To: Campbell, Christopher (POL) <[christopher.c.campbell@sfpd.org](mailto:christopher.c.campbell@sfpd.org)>; Supervisor Records (CAT) <[supervisor.records@sfcityattv.org](mailto:supervisor.records@sfcityattv.org)>  
Cc: Andrea Guerrero <[andrea@allianced.org](mailto:andrea@allianced.org)>  
Subject: Fw: Congratulations on Pretext Stops. but where is the data?

As we both know, there is no reason to believe any SFPD data, or SFPD reports, for that matter, but I am growing to like charades too.

Just before coming across the below, I read the minutes of a RIPA Meeting from around [11 months ago \(March 2025\)](#) in preparation to writing an epistle. This is the text of PUBLIC COMMENTS, including comments attributed to me:

9. PUBLIC COMMENT Karen L., a data analyst for a community organization, stated that she is happy to hear that the RIPA Board is in the process of developing a stop data dashboard and reiterated the importance of this endeavor. As it stands, the data formats made available can be challenging for the average of the public to navigate. She thinks a dashboard will go a long way to make the vast amount of stop data more accessible for all. If it is helpful to the Board, she will include links in the chat to existing dashboards by the California Department of Education, California Department of Finance, California Department of Health and Human Services, that could serve as a starting point for what a data dashboard might look like. Richard Hylton of San Diego is entertained, but not amused. He stated that if members of the Board may assert that the data is so bad that the public would not stand for it if the public knew about, he sees no purpose in engaging with the public in dealing with data that members of the Board and DOJ knows to be highly faulty. He stated they are indulging in a form of self-delusion that they ought to have remedied. With respect to the data on pretext stops, in the last meeting, he sought the help of the Board, specifically the DOJ, in obtaining data on pretext stops for San Francisco. He has been seeking that data for more than sixty days and has not been able to get that data. It seems to him that because of his own illness, he has a feeling that the heavy hand of the DOJ is behind his inability to get pretext stop data. There is no legal basis for the DOJ to not provide the data or delay it. He states that this is not new, and accused the DOJ of delaying and concealing data. They may be wasting his time and their time doing these things. Many can see through the claims of transparency, which he feels are deceitful.

I daresay it is seems accurate, even prescient.

From: RichardGB Hylton <[hyton749@msn.com](mailto:hyton749@msn.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2026 7:16 PM  
To: Cox, Brian (PDR) <[brian.cox@sfpd.org](mailto:brian.cox@sfpd.org)>; AB953 <[ab953@doj.ca.gov](mailto:ab953@doj.ca.gov)>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <[paul.henderson@sfpd.org](mailto:paul.henderson@sfpd.org)>; SFPD, Commission (POL) <[sfpd.commission@sfpd.org](mailto:sfpd.commission@sfpd.org)>; research.services@doj.ca.gov <[research.services@doj.ca.gov](mailto:research.services@doj.ca.gov)>  
Cc: [sfpd.officer@doj.ca.gov](mailto:sfpd.officer@doj.ca.gov) <[sfpd.officer@doj.ca.gov](mailto:sfpd.officer@doj.ca.gov)>  
Subject: Congratulations on Pretext Stops. but where is the data?

According to Chris Campbell, in response to a CPRA Request for Pretext Stop data, a few months ago, "Pretext Stop Data is not available." May I have the data that these people used to produce the good news, please

"The Police Commission, SFPD, and DPA should be proud that the policy has resulted in reduced racial disparities while crime has fallen in San Francisco," said Brian Cox, the director of the Public Defender's Office Integrity Unit. "We must use the success of this research-based policy and model of community engagement as a catalyst to find other ways to reduce racial disparities in the criminal legal system."

[https://data.sfpd.org/Public-Safety/Police-Department-Stop-Data/ubof-asnw/about\\_data](https://data.sfpd.org/Public-Safety/Police-Department-Stop-Data/ubof-asnw/about_data)

According to newly released data from SFPD, from January 2024 through September 2025

It would be unforthcoming were I not to find remarkable the absence of SFPD pretext results, or meaningful SFPD pretext stop references, in the recent RIPA report. HOW WAS THAT INCLUSION POSSIBLE on a news release published 5 or so days before the RIPA Annual Report that covers 1/1/2024 through 12/31/2024?

In God we trust, all others must display data.

# Item 39

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Streamlining Task Force - 5 letters  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 9:49:22 AM  
**Attachments:** [5 Letters Streamlining Task Force.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 5 letters from members of the public regarding the Commission Streamlining Task Force.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [AJ cho](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support keeping the Commission on the Environment as a Governance Body  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 5:52:44 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

The Commission Streamlining Task Force's recommendation to downgrade the Commission on the Environment to advisory status - and after 3 years to eliminate it altogether - is damaging to San Francisco's reputation as a climate leader, to say nothing of the actual health and safety of City residents.

The Commission on the Environment promotes environmental justice by directing funding and programs to communities most impacted by pollution and climate change; it strengthens workforce development by investing in youth climate internships and green jobs; it provides residents a formal platform to speak out and influence policy. These are just some of its functions.

Now more than ever, the world needs climate leadership from local governments - not heads in the sand. Drastic cuts to the SF Environment Department in the recent 2-year budget revealed an ominous willingness to ignore action to prevent the ever-increasing severity of climate disasters. Gutting and cutting the Department's oversight body only reinforces this impression. It will not streamline government - it will make it harder for the City to keep its focus on eliminating the cause of global warming. Other departments are each much more focused on their primary mission; it is SFE alone, directed by the Commission, whose mission is to reduce emissions citywide and protect our climate.

AJ cho  
amenoartemis@gmail.com  
159 Santa Teresa  
San Leandro, California 94579

**From:** [Karen Kirschling](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support keeping the Commission on the Environment as a Governance Body  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 8:46:30 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

The Commission Streamlining Task Force's recommendation to downgrade the Commission on the Environment to advisory status - and after 3 years to eliminate it altogether - is damaging to San Francisco's reputation as a climate leader, to say nothing of the actual health and safety of City residents.

The Commission on the Environment promotes environmental justice by directing funding and programs to communities most impacted by pollution and climate change; it strengthens workforce development by investing in youth climate internships and green jobs; it provides residents a formal platform to speak out and influence policy. These are just some of its functions.

Now more than ever, the world needs climate leadership from local governments - not heads in the sand. Drastic cuts to the SF Environment Department in the recent 2-year budget revealed an ominous willingness to ignore action to prevent the ever-increasing severity of climate disasters. Gutting and cutting the Department's oversight body only reinforces this impression. It will not streamline government - it will make it harder for the City to keep its focus on eliminating the cause of global warming. Other departments are each much more focused on their primary mission; it is SFE alone, directed by the Commission, whose mission is to reduce emissions citywide and protect our climate.

Karen Kirschling  
kumasong@icloud.com  
633 Oak  
SF, California 94117

**From:** [Linda Dallin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support keeping the Commission on the Environment as a Governance Body  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 8:59:33 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

The Commission Streamlining Task Force's recommendation to downgrade the Commission on the Environment to advisory status - and after 3 years to eliminate it altogether - is damaging to San Francisco's reputation as a climate leader, to say nothing of the actual health and safety of City residents.

The Commission on the Environment promotes environmental justice by directing funding and programs to communities most impacted by pollution and climate change; it strengthens workforce development by investing in youth climate internships and green jobs; it provides residents a formal platform to speak out and influence policy. These are just some of its functions.

Now more than ever, the world needs climate leadership from local governments - not heads in the sand. Drastic cuts to the SF Environment Department in the recent 2-year budget revealed an ominous willingness to ignore action to prevent the ever-increasing severity of climate disasters. Gutting and cutting the Department's oversight body only reinforces this impression. It will not streamline government - it will make it harder for the City to keep its focus on eliminating the cause of global warming. Other departments are each much more focused on their primary mission; it is SFE alone, directed by the Commission, whose mission is to reduce emissions citywide and protect our climate.

Linda Dallin  
dallinlinda@gmail.com  
3 Elsie St  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Kathie Piccagli](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support keeping the Commission on the Environment as a Governance Body  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 4:00:54 PM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

The Commission Streamlining Task Force's recommendation to downgrade the Commission on the Environment to advisory status - and after 3 years to eliminate it altogether - is damaging to San Francisco's reputation as a climate leader, to say nothing of the actual health and safety of City residents.

The Commission on the Environment promotes environmental justice by directing funding and programs to communities most impacted by pollution and climate change; it strengthens workforce development by investing in youth climate internships and green jobs; it provides residents a formal platform to speak out and influence policy. These are just some of its functions.

Now more than ever, the world needs climate leadership from local governments - not heads in the sand. Drastic cuts to the SF Environment Department in the recent 2-year budget revealed an ominous willingness to ignore action to prevent the ever-increasing severity of climate disasters. Gutting and cutting the Department's oversight body only reinforces this impression. It will not streamline government - it will make it harder for the City to keep its focus on eliminating the cause of global warming. Other departments are each much more focused on their primary mission; it is SFE alone, directed by the Commission, whose mission is to reduce emissions citywide and protect our climate.

Kathie Piccagli  
kpiccagli@gmail.com  
1450 Post St  
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [Julie Lindow](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support keeping the Commission on the Environment as a Governance Body  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:41:36 AM

---

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

The Commission Streamlining Task Force's recommendation to downgrade the Commission on the Environment to advisory status - and after 3 years to eliminate it altogether - is damaging to San Francisco's reputation as a climate leader, to say nothing of the actual health and safety of City residents.

The Commission on the Environment promotes environmental justice by directing funding and programs to communities most impacted by pollution and climate change; it strengthens workforce development by investing in youth climate internships and green jobs; it provides residents a formal platform to speak out and influence policy. These are just some of its functions.

Now more than ever, the world needs climate leadership from local governments - not heads in the sand. Drastic cuts to the SF Environment Department in the recent 2-year budget revealed an ominous willingness to ignore action to prevent the ever-increasing severity of climate disasters. Gutting and cutting the Department's oversight body only reinforces this impression. It will not streamline government - it will make it harder for the City to keep its focus on eliminating the cause of global warming. Other departments are each much more focused on their primary mission; it is SFE alone, directed by the Commission, whose mission is to reduce emissions citywide and protect our climate.

Julie Lindow  
jujulindow@yahoo.com  
516 1/2 Linden St  
San Francisco, California 94102-5025



# Item 40

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Request for Formal Hearing — Tesla Supercharger in Residential Neighborhood, 1965 Lombard Street  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 10:55:27 AM

---

Hello Supervisors,

Please see below communication from the Moulton Coalition regarding a Tesla Supercharger Station at 1965 Lombard Street.

Sincerely,

**Justice Alcantar**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
**[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)**

---

**From:** Moulton Coalition <moultoncoalition@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 8:59 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Request for Formal Hearing — Tesla Supercharger in Residential Neighborhood, 1965 Lombard Street

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Moulton Coalition is writing to request your support regarding a significant land use and quality-of-life issue in District 2.

Since mid-2025, a 16-stall Tesla Supercharger station has operated 24/7 at 1965 Lombard Street. This facility is the only Tesla Supercharger in San Francisco not located within a commercial parking structure and directly abuts residential properties on Moulton Street. While Supervisor Sherrill has been actively engaged, we are writing to the full Board to formally request:

1. A formal hearing regarding the impacts of commercial EV charging infrastructure sited adjacent to residential neighborhoods.
2. A Board resolution calling on Tesla, Inc. and Plantation Associates LP to engage in a community stakeholder process and implement structural remedies.
3. Support for San Francisco Planning enforcement action should it be determined that the conversion of this lot required Conditional Use authorization that was not obtained.

Documented impacts include noise levels reaching 85 dB, 24/7 light trespass, obstructed residential garages, and several unexplained power shutoffs. This situation has generated significant media attention and a community petition with over 100 signatures.

We filed a CPRA request with SF Planning on March 25 and a Letter of Determination request with the Zoning Administrator on March 26 regarding the authorization status of this site.

We are available to brief any Supervisor's office and can provide our full impact briefing deck upon request.

Respectfully,

Moulton Coalition

[moultoncoalition@gmail.com](mailto:moultoncoalition@gmail.com)

(415) 630-7525

# Item 41

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** File No. 251003 Expanding Drug-Free Permanent Supportive Housing - 41 letters  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 9:55:44 AM  
**Attachments:** [251003 41 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 41 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 251003 - Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to state that it is City policy to expand the availability of Site-Based Permanent Supportive Housing (“PSH”) that prohibits on-site illicit drug use among residents (“Drug-Free PSH”) to meet the demand of people experiencing homelessness who prefer such a residential option; bar the City from funding new Site-Based PSH for people experiencing homelessness that prohibits evictions on the basis of drug use alone (“Drug-Tolerant PSH”), except where operation of the housing as Drug-Free PSH would conflict with standards imposed by law or by a condition of other funding, or the Board of Supervisors has waived the funding prohibition based on specific findings; and require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) to survey residents of Site-Based PSH to assess their interest in living in either Drug-Tolerant PSH or Drug-Free PSH and report on the survey findings and HSH’s strategies to meet PSH residents’ demands.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [Eben Marsh](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:03:52 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Eben Marsh

Email                              ebenmarsh@hotmail.com

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                         Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Eben Marsh

**From:** [Mari Murayama](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:07:42 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Mari Murayama

Email      mdmurayama@gmail.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Mari Murayama  
District 1  
San Francisco

Mari Murayama

---

**From:** [Calum Mackay](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:13:33 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Calum Mackay

Email                              CalumLMackay@gmail.com

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                        Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Calum Mackay

**From:** [Carmen Morrison](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:16:55 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Carmen Morrison

Email      nas4us@gmail.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Carmen Morrison

**From:** [David Nolley](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:27:43 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      David Nolley  
Email                              danolley@aol.com

Subject                              Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                              Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco. I take this position based upon my decades of professional relationships with California citizens as a California Licensed Psychologist specializing in Brain Injury Rehabilitation, some of my clients having experienced their brain injuries as the result of substance and/or alcohol abuse.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond

funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

David Nolley

---

**From:** [Usha and John Burns](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:32:34 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Usha and John Burns  
  
Email                              Johnmburns48@yahoo.com

Subject                              Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                              Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Usha and John Burns

**From:** [Marty Cerles Jr](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:32:43 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Marty Cerles Jr

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

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Marty Cerles Jr

**From:** [J. Barry Gurdin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:52:49 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      J. Barry Gurdin

Email                              gurdin@hotmail.com

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                         Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

J. Barry Gurdin

**From:** [Igor Yurinok](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 11:02:38 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Igor Yurinok

Email                              iyurinok@gmail.com

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                         Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Igor Yurinok

**From:** [Newton Butler](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 11:15:34 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Newton Butler

Email      Louissf@yahoo.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Newton Butler

**From:** [Newton Butler](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 11:17:51 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Newton Butler

Email      Louissf@yahoo.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Newton Butler

**From:** [richard.brandi](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 11:45:37 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      richard.brandi

Email      rbrandi@earthlink.net

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

richard brandi

**From:** [Machelle Burkstrand](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 11:51:39 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Machelle Burkstrand

Email      mlburkstrand@gmail.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Machelle Burkstrand

**From:** [Sondra Halperin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:00:44 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Sondra Halperin

Email      [plastique@kpobox.com](mailto:plastique@kpobox.com)

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Sondra Halperin

**From:** [Martha Ehmann Conte](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:02:50 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Martha Ehmann Conte  
Email                              martha@ehmannconte.com

Subject                              Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                              Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Martha Ehmann Conte

**From:** [Patti McMahon](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:04:48 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Patti McMahon

Email      [pattired12@gmail.com](mailto:pattired12@gmail.com)

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Patti McMahon

**From:** [John McNamara](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:30:49 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      John McNamara

Email                              mcnamara229@hotmail.com

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                         Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

John McNamara

**From:** [Kate English](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:59:45 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Kate English

Email                              kenglish1775@comcast.net

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                         Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Kate English

**From:** [David Levy](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 1:13:41 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      David Levy

Email      [djlevy1@comcast.net](mailto:djlevy1@comcast.net)

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

David Levy

**From:** [Amy Murphy](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 1:23:50 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Amy Murphy

Email                              ammurphy1@dons.usfca.edu

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                        Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Amy Murphy

**From:** [Dan Bowermaster](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 1:37:39 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Dan Bowermaster

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

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Dan Bowermaster

**From:** [Karen Breslin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 2:35:55 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Karen Breslin

Email      kbsmail@sbcglobal.net

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Karen Breslin

**From:** [Stephen Martin-Pinto](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 2:37:41 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

**From your constituent** Stephen Martin-Pinto

**Email** [stephen@stephenmartinpinto.com](mailto:stephen@stephenmartinpinto.com)

**Subject** Supporting Drug Free Housing

**Message:** Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Stephen Martin-Pinto

**From:** [Edward Sullivan](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 3:16:38 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Edward Sullivan

Email      efsullyjr@aol.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Edward Sullivan

**From:** [Erik Sens](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 3:22:42 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Erik Sens

Email      [esens123@yahoo.com](mailto:esens123@yahoo.com)

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Erik Sens

**From:** [Amanda Hoenigman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 4:23:42 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Amanda Hoenigman

Email                              amanda@hoenigman.com

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                         Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am just coming home from closing statements at the Hall of Justice where the defendant admitted on the stand that he is on meth every waking hour, and he steals in order to feed himself. He can spend his money on drugs and does not have to worry about paying rent because he lives in Supportive Housing.

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

Safety and Choice: Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

Effective Use of Resources: By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Amanda Hoenigman

---

**From:** [vince.hoenigman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 8:08:33 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      vince hoenigman

Email      Vince@Citymark.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

vince hoenigman

**From:** [Emily Borowski](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 8:26:35 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Emily Borowski

Email      ejborowski@icloud.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Emily Borowski

**From:** [Kevin Wallace](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 8:31:30 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Kevin Wallace

Email      kevinwallace415@gmail.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Kevin Wallace

**From:** [Nathan Lang](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 8:47:39 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Nathan Lang

Email                              nathanlang@comcast.net

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                        Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Nathan Lang

**From:** [Jane Day](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:03:38 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Jane Day

Email      [janeday@earthlink.net](mailto:janeday@earthlink.net)

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Jane Day

**From:** [Spencer Camp](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 4:50:41 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Spencer Camp

Email      [hello@spencercamp.com](mailto:hello@spencercamp.com)

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Spencer Camp

**From:** [Stephanie Lehman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 7:51:36 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Stephanie Lehman

Email      slehman21@yahoo.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Stephanie Lehman

**From:** [Machelle Burkstrand](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 9:11:32 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Machelle Burkstrand

Email      mlburkstrand@gmail.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Machelle Burkstrand

**From:** [Tracy Scruggs](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Friday, March 27, 2026 3:39:37 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Tracy Scruggs

Email                              tracy\_scruggs@yahoo.com

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                        Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Tracy Scruggs

**From:** [Desiree Maggiora Miles](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 12:09:41 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Desiree Maggiora Miles

Email      [desireemiles@msn.com](mailto:desireemiles@msn.com)

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.  
Desiree Maggiora Miles

Desiree Maggiora Miles

---

**From:** [Esfir Shrayber](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 11:46:32 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Esfir Shrayber

Email      to\_fira@yahoo.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Esfir Shrayber

**From:** [Ali Mandviwala](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 1:11:40 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Ali Mandviwala

Email      [samali48@yahoo.com](mailto:samali48@yahoo.com)

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Ali Mandviwala

**From:** [Cynthia Brown](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 9:28:34 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Cynthia Brown

Email      cymphany@hotmail.com

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.



Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Cynthia Brown

**From:** [Senta Tsantilis](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Sunday, March 29, 2026 9:01:34 AM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Senta Tsantilis

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

Subject      Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:      Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Senta Tsantilis

**From:** [Rebecca Saroyan](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Felder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Supporting Drug Free Housing  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 3:14:37 PM

---

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

## Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent      Rebecca Saroyan

Email                              rebecca.saroyan@gmail.com

Subject                            Supporting Drug Free Housing

Message:                         Dear Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Mr. Modi, and Mayor Lurie,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Matt Dorsey's legislation to expand the availability of drug-free and recovery-oriented Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in San Francisco.

For too long, our city's approach to supportive housing has overlooked a vital segment of the unhoused population: those who are actively seeking or maintaining sobriety. Under the current "Housing First" framework, individuals in early recovery are frequently placed in environments where they are surrounded by the very substances and behaviors they are trying to escape. This lack of choice isn't just a policy gap, it is a barrier to life-saving recovery.

I support this legislation because:

**Safety and Choice:** Residents deserve the right to choose a living environment that supports their health goals. For many, a "drug-tolerant" building is not a bridge to stability, but a trigger for relapse.

**Effective Use of Resources:** By utilizing Prop 1 bond funds and other state resources specifically intended for recovery housing, we can expand our housing portfolio without taking away from existing "Housing First" programs.

Addressing the Overdose Crisis: With overdose deaths reaching record highs, we must provide every possible tool for long-term remission. Sober living environments are a proven component of successful recovery.

We cannot continue to offer a "one-size-fits-all" model for supportive housing. I urge you to vote YES on this ordinance to ensure that San Francisco provides a diverse range of housing options that honor and protect the hard work of recovery.

Thank you.

Rebecca Saroyan

# Item 42

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Amend SF's EV Charging Bill: Add Residential Cross-Sidewalk Charging - File No. 260238  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 9:58:05 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Jonathan Weisman regarding:

File No. 260238 - Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to authorize the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to establish a curbside electric vehicle charging station permit program for the installation and operation of curbside electric vehicle charging stations on City sidewalks and provide that permittees are not required to obtain a sidewalk encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works; amending the Public Works Code to reflect the authority of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to issue permits for the curbside electric vehicle charging station program; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Jonathan Weisman <[jonathan.r.weisman@gmail.com](mailto:jonathan.r.weisman@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 26, 2026 10:39 AM

**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Amend SF's EV Charging Bill: Add Residential Cross-Sidewalk Charging

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

Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Mandelman,

Thank you for introducing legislation to formalize SF's curbside EV charging rules. It's a good start — but it misses a faster, cheaper, and more equitable solution: residential cross-sidewalk charging.

I'm a long-time SF resident, renter, and EV owner who cannot charge at home because I don't have a garage. I am far from alone. The new legislation primarily helps residents in dense neighborhoods like Duboce Triangle, where it's electric and other VC-backed companies can turn a profit. In less dense, mixed-use neighborhoods, those chargers simply won't be deployed. And even where they are, curbside commercial chargers don't offer the convenience or affordability of charging at home. Would you walk 3 blocks to charge your car? 5 blocks? At commercial rates instead of home electricity rates?

The fix is simple: allow residential cross-sidewalk charging — a cord from home, an ADA-approved cover on the sidewalk, and no permit needed as long as you follow the rules.

**The city spends nothing.** No company profits. **Citizens solve their own infrastructure problem and have affordable home re-fueling.** (This is already happening informally in SF neighborhoods; a city process would simply make it safe and sanctioned.)

Another opportunity is to allow for embedded cord channels, a flush, non-intrusive cut in the sidewalk for the cord to be placed. This is already used in the UK with several companies offering the product and the UK government officially sanctioning in their curbside charging best practices (the density and car use of British cities is actually very similar to SF). Currently homeowners with garages receive a curb cut (which actually impedes accessibility) plus exclusive parking rights in front of their driveway. A flush, non-intrusive cord channel is far less impactful, and yet it's forbidden. That's a double standard that disadvantages renters directly.

There is precedent here: Seattle, Oakland, and Washington D.C. all have programs

enabling residents to charge this way and have policies that can be largely copy and pasted. UC Berkeley researchers call this "a simple, low-cost alternative to dedicated public infrastructure."

You framed this bill as part of PermitSF — faster, easier, more transparent progress in the city. A residential cross-sidewalk charging option is exactly that. It will incentivize EV ownership in San Francisco to help achieve our climate goals and improve our air quality. It's a pathway toward affordability as it gives residents the control over their electricity prices for charging. **Please amend the legislation to include these provisions before it advances.**

- UC Berkeley study: <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Residential-EV-Charging-Cords-in-the-PROW.pdf>
- Oakland program: [https://www.oaklandca.gov/files/assets/city/v/2/city-administrator/documents/sustainability/ev-charging-crossing-the-prow\\_guidance.2025.2.25.pdf](https://www.oaklandca.gov/files/assets/city/v/2/city-administrator/documents/sustainability/ev-charging-crossing-the-prow_guidance.2025.2.25.pdf)
- UK government guidance: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cross-pavement-solutions-for-charging-electric-vehicles/cross-pavement-solutions-for-charging-electric-vehicles>
- UK embedded channel (Kerbocharge): <https://www.kerbocharge.com/local-authorities>

Thank you,  
Jonathan Weisman  
District 9



# Item 43

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition to the proposed street tree legislation changes - File 251211  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 10:02:40 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Anastasia Glikshtern regarding:

File No. 251211 - Ordinance amending the Public Works Code to allow development projects to satisfy street tree planting requirements through payment of an in lieu fee or providing alternative landscaping; exempt accessory dwelling units from street tree planting requirements; eliminate appeals to the Board of Appeals for tree removals undertaken by City departments and commissions; and update in lieu fee reporting requirements; amending the Administrative Code to create a separate account within the Adopt-A-Tree Fund to receive in lieu fees for street tree requirements; amending the Planning Code to update street tree applicability requirements; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Anastasia Glikshtern <apglikshtern@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2026 1:39 PM

**To:** Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; WongStaff (BOS) <WongStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Opposition to the proposed street tree legislation changes - File 251211

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

Dear members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

I **strongly** oppose the proposed street tree legislation changes - they will **harm** San Francisco's already inadequate tree canopy, and **greatly reduce** or, in many cases, **completely remove** oversight and public participation.

I 100% agree with Joshua Klipp's analysis below:

"As written, the proposed legislation will allow developers to choose between planting trees or paying an inadequate in lieu fee. We know the in lieu is inadequate because a nexus study hasn't been conducted for three years, even though City law requires an annual evaluation of this fee. Meanwhile, the costs of labor, materials and fuel for City trucks have skyrocketed. Additionally, this legislation has no check to ensure developers leave sufficient space for future trees to be planted at their sites. Developers will choose the cheap and easy route, and San Francisco's tree canopy will suffer. As written, the proposed legislation will completely remove the public from even objecting, let alone appealing, to the removal of trees that the City deems "hazardous". While SFPW promises to only use qualified arborists to make these designations, one such arborist recently - *and erroneously* - designated an entire block of trees in Hayes Valley for immediate removal. It was only a massive public outcry that drew attention to the error. If this law passes, mistakes like these are subject to *zero* public oversight. It's also worth noting that, of the 6 hazard tree appeals in the last 6 years, 2 of them were granted by the Board of Appeals. This further undercuts any assertion that SFPW's "hazard" designation is infallible.

As written, the proposed legislation will prevent the public from appealing any City-initiated tree removal. This means that City projects which seek to remove hundreds of trees can no longer be appealed. Projects such as: the Van Ness BRT, the Geary Boulevard BRT, the Folsom / Howard Bike Lane and Streetscape projects - these

would no longer be subject to review by the Board of Appeals. Notably, the Board of Appeals - who was not consulted about this proposed change to their jurisdiction - has expressed serious concerns about this amendment.

Even if appeals are limited to 30 days, this effectively renders the appeals process meaningless. Appellants cannot obtain records in time for briefing schedules, and the City can force hearings before a Board of Appeals that does not have all the facts. And while City Officials claim that tree permit appeals slow down projects, they have yet to cite a single example of this in the many news articles and public meetings regarding these proposed amendments.

San Francisco has the smallest tree canopy of any major City in the United States. We have already failed the tree planting goals set out in the 2014 Urban Forest Plan. And now we are thousands of trees behind our tree planting goals in the 2021 Climate Action Plan - a plan created in response to the Declaration that we are in a Climate Emergency. Now is not the time to be playing games with tree planting, oversight and public engagement. **Now is the time to invest in our trees and green infrastructure, and to partner with the community who so desperately wants to make San Francisco healthy, green and resilient for generations to come."**

Thank you,  
Anastasia Glikshtern  
1683 34th Ave.,  
San Francisco, CA 94122

# Item 44

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Budget - 27 letters  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 10:12:39 AM  
**Attachments:** [Budget 27 letters.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached 27 letters from members of the public regarding the San Francisco budget.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**

**Office of the Clerk of the Board**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163

[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2026 10:40:52 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Fahmida Faiza

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 11:27:42 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Remi Tan



**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Monday, March 30, 2026 11:35:27 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Robb Fleischer

**From:** [Aditya Chandran](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Increased Funding for the Development of Recovery Facilities  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 10:27:06 AM

---

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of the Bay Area and I am writing to address the lack of recovery facilities for individuals battling drug addiction in San Francisco.

Drug addiction has been a prominent issue in San Francisco for some time, with over 600 deaths each year since 2020, and over 800 in 2023. Despite this extreme number, there are only 35 treatment beds available for opioid recovery, as San Francisco Public Health Director mentioned in a news conference. This is the main problem we have, and why the drug epidemic is not improving.

As someone who has witnessed the terrible effects of drug addiction in the streets of San Francisco, I believe the most effective way to counter this epidemic is to increase access to recovery facilities. I have seen many people lying on the street and having no place to stay which worsens the issue. Increasing the number of facilities will directly attack the issue of drug addiction and give individuals the treatment they need. While this will not provide a long-term solution to relapse, which is one of the biggest struggles with addiction, it will put individuals on the path to recovery, and it is important that they are able to have a strong starting point.

Specifically, I am writing to ask the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to increase funding for the development of recovery facilities. By doing this, the city will be on the right track to addressing the terrible epidemic of drug addiction.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Aditya Chandran

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail message is intended to be received only by persons entitled to receive the confidential information it may contain. E-mail messages from Fremont Unified School District may contain information that is confidential and legally privileged. Please do not read, copy, forward, or store this message unless you are an intended recipient of it. If you have received this message in error, please forward it to the sender and delete it completely from your computer system.

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:05:06 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jason jungreis

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:05:11 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Gary Pinkus

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:05:29 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit



responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Stanley

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:06:51 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark McInerney

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:07:00 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Heidi Huchberger

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:07:13 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert Rutkowski

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:08:18 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit



responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Chalz Mayer

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:11:53 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Art L

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:11:56 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Joni Lachman

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:13:08 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Thelma deSouza

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:13:36 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit



responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

David Marsiano

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:15:50 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Scott Jacques

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:16:13 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Weininger

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:16:46 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sherial Heller

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:17:17 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit



responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Anna Coles

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:22:12 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Henry Hunter

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:23:36 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Philip A Parker

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:26:06 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Eisler

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:30:11 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit



responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Castellanos

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:34:31 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas McCarthy

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:54:25 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jim Bowlby

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:54:54 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit

responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Robb Fleischer

**From:** [Blueprint SF](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [blueprint@sfbudget.org](mailto:blueprint@sfbudget.org)  
**Subject:** Fix the City Budget the right way - no short term fixes.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:55:31 AM

---

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



Dear Mayor and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge the City to confront San Francisco's long-term structural budget deficit, which could grow to over \$1 billion by 2030, with a clear-eyed, responsible approach that restores fiscal stability and public trust.

As the City's own financial projections make clear, San Francisco is facing a persistent spending problem. Our City is simply spending money it does not have. The deficit is a serious structural problem that if not solved, will harm our quality of life and lead to cuts to services that we cherish such as our libraries and parks.

Critically, this deficit cannot be solved by relying on strategies that merely delay hard decisions. San Francisco must address its budget gap while following the below principles:

- Do not use reserves, which exist to protect the City during true emergencies and economic shocks and not to paper over recurring imbalances.
- Do not use one-time fixes and shortcuts, which provide temporary relief while worsening the long-term outlook.
- Do not increase taxes, which would further burden residents and businesses already struggling with affordability and economic uncertainty.

Using reserves, one-time fixes, or new taxes may appear expedient in the short run, but each approach ultimately weakens the City's fiscal foundation and compounds the problem in future budget cycles.

Instead, the City should focus on sustainable solutions that align recurring spending with recurring revenues. That means taking a hard look at baseline costs, staffing levels, and program effectiveness including roughly \$1.6 billion in annual nonprofit spending, where repeated audits and scandals have revealed weak oversight, misuse of funds, and poor accountability for results.

It also means confronting the City's own irresponsible spending practices. San Francisco has poured billions into homelessness programs with little improvement in outcomes and even raided a dedicated healthcare fund to paper over short-term budget gaps. These practices reflect a broader failure to track spending, measure performance, and enforce accountability.

San Franciscans expect and deserve a budget strategy that is honest about the scale of the challenge and disciplined in how it is addressed. Tackling the structural deficit



responsibly is essential not only to the City's financial health, but to its credibility, economic recovery, and ability to deliver on its commitments to residents.

I respectfully urge you to prioritize long-term fiscal sustainability and to commit to solutions that solve the problem at its root rather than passing it forward to future leaders, future taxpayers, and future budgets.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

Joseph Dayner

# Item 45

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Frederick Street Safety Concern - Cyclist/pedestrian conflicts  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 10:15:07 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Alejandro Chang regarding cyclist and pedestrian interactions on Frederick Street.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Alejandro Chang <aljndrx@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 30, 2026 8:06 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Frederick Street Safety Concern - Cyclist/pedestrian conflicts

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my serious concern about cyclist and pedestrian conflicts on Frederick Street near my home at 474 Frederick Street. The lack of dedicated bike infrastructure forces cyclists and pedestrians to compete for limited space, creating dangerous situations. My family has experienced frightening near-misses. I urge the SFMTA to create separated infrastructure that safely accommodates both cyclists and pedestrians.

Thank you for your attention to this critical safety matter.

Sincerely,  
Alejandro Chang  
474 Frederick Street  
San Francisco, CA 94117  
[Aljndrx@gmail.com](mailto:Aljndrx@gmail.com)

---

Submitted: March 30, 2026 at 11:04 AM PST

# Item 46

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment: Proposal to Adjust Construction Start Time  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 10:14:58 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from a member of the public, regarding adjusting permitted construction time.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** Avi and Katelyn Resnick <[avielkatelyn@gmail.com](mailto:avielkatelyn@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 1, 2026 9:41 AM  
**To:** Crayton, Monique (BOS) <[monique.crayton@sfgov.org](mailto:monique.crayton@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Proposal to Adjust Construction Start Time

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to offer public comment and to respectfully request that you consider new legislation adjusting the permitted construction start time in San Francisco from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m.

A shift of just one hour would make a meaningful difference in the daily lives of many San Francisco residents. Early morning construction noise often disrupts sleep, affects families with young children, and reduces overall well-being in neighborhoods that are already dense and acoustically active. Allowing quieter morning hours would support public health, improve quality of life, and create a more balanced relationship between necessary development and the needs of the people who live here.

San Francisco can continue to grow while also protecting the restorative morning quiet that residents rely on. I urge you to explore this adjustment as a practical, community-minded improvement to our city's noise regulations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Katelyn

# Item 47

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: DON'T LET CITY GOVERNMENT ABANDON MID-MARKET AND CIVIC CENTER! File No. 260017  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 10:17:49 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Michael Nulty regarding:

File No. 260017 - Resolution approving and authorizing the Director of Property, on behalf of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS), to execute a lease agreement with Double Wood Investment, Inc., a California Corporation, as landlord, for use of a portion of 111 Pine Street, consisting of 47,482 rentable square feet for an initial term of 10 years with two five-year extension options to renew and 12 months of rent credit with an annual base rent of \$2,089,208 with 3% annual increases; SFERS to contribute up to \$4,748,200 on tenant improvement; effective upon approval of the Resolution by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor and upon execution of the lease by the Director of Property; and authorizing the Director of Property to execute any amendments, make certain modifications and take certain actions that do not materially increase the obligations or liabilities to the City, do not materially decrease the benefits to the City and are necessary or advisable to effectuate the purposes of the lease agreement or this Resolution.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

---

**From:** San Francisco Resident <noreply@jotform.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 30, 2026 6:48 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** DON'T LET CITY GOVERNMENT ABANDON MID-MARKET AND CIVIC CENTER!

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

I'm standing with Supervisor Matt Dorsey to strongly oppose a plan by the city employees' pension fund to decamp from Mid-Market to a luxury high-rise in the Financial District.

It's a slap in the face to neighborhood residents. It's less convenient to the city workers it serves. It makes no sense financially. It's inconsistent with the San Francisco General Plan. And it sets a worrisome precedent in diminishing Civic Center foot traffic and economic activity that other city departments could soon seek to follow.

**CIVIC CENTER AND MID-MARKET RESIDENTS DESERVE BETTER FROM THEIR CITY!**

During the COVID pandemic, it was city government policies — and city government policies alone! —that left Mid-Market and Civic Center neighborhood corridors an empty shell of what they once were.

- Our city's Shelter-In-Place Hotel program turned that neighborhood's largest hotels into massive drug-permissive shelters — forcing taxpayers to pay more than \$40 million in damages to just three Mid-Market hotels alone. (Including the 459-room Whitcomb, which remains shuttered.)
- Our city tolerated 24-hour-a-day drug dealing on our major thoroughfares for nearly two years, with sanctioned and unsanctioned encampments throughout the Civic Center and Mid-Market neighborhoods that residents still haven't fully recovered from.
- Our city's so-called "Linkage Center" at U.N. Plaza was a magnet for rampant drug scenes, drug markets, and drug-driven lawlessness — hurting countless neighborhood businesses and causing the closure of a long-anticipated Whole Foods supermarket, which remains closed to this day.

City government caused these neighborhood problems. And city government has a moral obligation now to help revitalize the Civic Center and Mid-Market area — not abandon it.

I urge SFERS to drop its planned move — and I urge City Hall to support legislation Supervisor Dorsey is authoring to require city agencies to honor the Civic Center Area Plan and be full partners in helping reinvigorate our Mid-Market and Civic Center neighborhoods.

Michael Nulty

# Item 48

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: I love Sunset Dunes  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2026 10:19:13 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below from a member of the public regarding Sunset Dunes.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte  
Office of the Clerk of the Board  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

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

From: Allison Klein Backer <[alkleinbacker@me.com](mailto:alkleinbacker@me.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 10:00 AM  
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <[daniel.lurie@sfgov.org](mailto:daniel.lurie@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <[connie.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:connie.chan@sfgov.org)>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <[Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org](mailto:Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org)>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <[matt.dorsey@sfgov.org](mailto:matt.dorsey@sfgov.org)>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <[joel.engardio@sfgov.org](mailto:joel.engardio@sfgov.org)>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <[Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org](mailto:Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org)>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <[Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org](mailto:Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org)>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <[Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org](mailto:Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org)>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <[bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org](mailto:bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org)>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <[myrna.melgar@sfgov.org](mailto:myrna.melgar@sfgov.org)>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <[rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org](mailto:rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org)>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <[shamann.walton@sfgov.org](mailto:shamann.walton@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: I love Sunset Dunes

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and



has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:

- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:

- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

# Item 49

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Julien DeFrance various subjects - 3 letters  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:53:47 AM  
**Attachments:** [Julien DeFrance 3 letters.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached 3 letters, from Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**

**Office of the Clerk of the Board**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163

[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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

**From:** [Julien DeFrance](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: URGENT - Demand for Immediate Closure of 711 Post St Shelter  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 6:48:36 PM

---

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

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com>  
**Date:** March 31, 2026 at 17:11:40 PDT  
**To:** Danny Sauter <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>, SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>, Daniel Lurie <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** ec@lowernobhill.org  
**Subject:** URGENT - Demand for Immediate Closure of 711 Post St Shelter

Dear Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Sauter,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the extension of the 711 Post Street shelter for another year.

<https://lowernobhill.org/f/711-post-street-shelter-update>

This shelter was scheduled to close this month. That commitment must be honored. Our neighborhood was promised relief, and instead we are being asked — once again — to absorb the consequences of a decision made without regard for the residents who live here every day.

A change in management does not change the reality on the ground. The concentration of social services on this block continues to bring with it serious safety concerns, drug activity, and a significant degradation of our quality of life. These are not abstract complaints — they are the daily experience of our community.

Our neighborhood has carried this burden long enough. Extending the shelter's operation, under any arrangement, is unacceptable.

We expect the closure to proceed as originally planned. We will be watching closely and will hold you both accountable to that commitment.

Sincerely,

JD.

**From:** [Julien DeFrance](#)  
**To:** [MTABoard](#); [constituentrqst@sfmta.com](#); [Silva, Christine \(MTA\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Sherrill, Stephen \(BOS\)](#); [SherrillStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [McCormick, Patrick \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Muni could cut 20 lines next year if ballot measures don't pass. Most riders have no idea  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 7:08:24 PM

---

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,  
Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,  
Dear undemocratically-appointed Members of the SFMTA Board,

MUNI wouldn't be there today, facing this deficit, if ALL riders were actually paying for their fare, instead of constantly evading those!

<https://sfstandard.com/2026/03/29/muni-could-cut-20-lines-next-year-if-ballot-measures-don-t-pass-riders-have-idea/>

**MUNI remains dirty.** Trains and buses are consistently late. At peak hours, vehicles are **dangerously overcrowded** — and a significant portion of those onboard have not paid their fare. The disparity is glaring: when fare enforcement officers do show up, a bus carrying 100 to 120 people can drop to 30 paying riders almost immediately. That tells you everything you need to know about the scale of the fraud.

This **rampant fare evasion** has real consequences. Paying customers are often unable to board at all because vehicles are already packed with non-paying riders. Meanwhile, the presence of individuals in crisis — including those struggling with **drug addiction and homelessness** — continues to create serious **safety and sanitary concerns** for riders who have no choice but to use the system.

Enforcement staffing remains woefully inadequate. More fare officers are needed, but enforcement alone is not the solution.

**I urge you to implement a common-sense measure used in transit systems around the world: front-door boarding with operator verification. Passengers board from the front, show proof of payment to the operator, and move to the back. Simple. Proven. Effective. If you haven't paid, you don't board. This is not a radical idea — it is standard practice globally.**

**Instead of begging for more of our taxpayer dollars, instead of putting us at risk every single time, how about you just make sure every single rider actually pays?**

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

JD

**From:** [Julien DeFrance](#)  
**To:** [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#); [Fielder, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [FielderStaff](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Jackie Fielder Must Resign Immediately  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 31, 2026 9:25:52 AM

---

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to demand the immediate resignation of Supervisor Jackie Fielder.

<https://www.kqed.org/news/12078055/san-francisco-supervisor-jackie-fielder-takes-medical-leave-for-mental-health>

The people of San Francisco are paying a full supervisor's salary for an empty seat. Fielder has repeatedly failed to show up and do her job - and that is not acceptable. Her constituents deserve better. Her district deserves better.

If Fielder does not have the backbone to fulfill the duties she was appointed to perform, she needs to step aside and let someone who will.

Mayor Lurie, upon her resignation, I urge you to make a responsible reappointment - someone who will work constructively with the current moderate majority, not obstruct it. Someone focused on real results for District 9: public safety, economic recovery, and quality of life. San Francisco does not need another ideological obstructionist in that seat. It needs a pragmatic, moderate voice who will get to work on Day One.

Fielder's failure to perform is costing this city time, money, and momentum. Enough is enough.

We The People, expect action.

Best regards,

JD.