From: <u>Margarita Bilko-Richardson</u>
To: <u>Board of Supervisors (BOS)</u>

Subject: I am AGAINST "General Obligation Bond Passthrough" legislation"

**Date:** Thursday, April 11, 2024 12:04:42 PM

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

## Dear Angela,

My name is Margarita Richardson, and I am a San Francisco resident and renter. I am writing to let you know about my opposition to File Number 240174, General Obligation Bond Passthroughs, which aims to eliminate the ability for rental property owners to pass through General Bonds to tenants. Placing this additional burden solely on property owners would be unfair.

Businesses are leaving San Francisco due to the impact of COVID-19 and new laws like this legislation, causing the city to resemble a ghost town. To preserve San Francisco as a vibrant and livable city, we must support businesses that contribute significantly to taxes and sustain the city's economy.

Over twenty years ago, Tom Ammiano brokered a settlement agreement regarding passthroughs, ensuring a fair split of General Obligation bond costs between property owners and tenants. All San Francisco residents must share the responsibility of covering costs for essential services like emergency response and transportation.

The current General Obligation Bond Passthrough amounts on tenants are minimal, and mechanisms exist to assist low-income tenants facing hardship. Both tenants and property owners should contribute to civic improvements. Also, less than 30% of property owners do these types of pass-throughs.

The city is considering approving over \$1 billion in General Obligation bonds for critical projects like waterfront safety, earthquake safety, and emergency response in the coming years. Now is not the time to risk future bond approvals with this legislation. If this new legislation is passed, I will vote against it and contribute to campaigns to defeat future bond measures.

The Board of Supervisors risks the City's capital plan and future bond measures. This legislation unfairly places 90% of the burden of funding public services and critical infrastructure improvements onto property owners, while all city residents should contribute to these costs.

We're risking driving away the businesses that financially support San Francisco through taxes and various fees. Pushing business owners out of the city will exacerbate existing problems and make San Francisco's recovery increasingly difficult.

Many landlords in San Francisco are hardworking residents who diligently pay taxes and contribute to the community by providing housing. It's crucial to consider the long-term consequences of these actions and reflect on their impact on the city's future.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please think about the future and vote NO on this legislation.

Sincerely, Margarita Richardson San Francisco Resident From: totallity

To: Chan, Connie (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston, Dean (BOS);

Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Ronen, Hillary (BOS); Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)

Subject: Opposition to "File Number 240174

Date: Thursday, April 11, 2024 12:04:40 PM

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

To the Board of Supervisors:

I am another property owner in San Francisco who is in opposition to "File Number 240174, General Obligation Bond Passthroughs" legislation.

All city residents should share in the cost of funding the public services and critical infrastructure improvements that General Obligation bonds pay for. This legislation unfairly pushes 90% of the burden of those costs onto property owners.

Tom Ammiano negotiated a compromise in the form of a settlement agreement over an SFAA lawsuit over passthroughs more than twenty years ago. Ammiano's settlement agreement shares the costs of General Obligation bonds fairly between property owners and tenants.

The City is looking at approving over \$1 Billion in General Obligation bonds over the next few years, including for critical items like waterfront safety, earthquake safety, and emergency response. Now is not the right time to approve this legislation and put future bonds at risk.

If this legislation passes as currently written, you will be voting NO on all future bond measures and contributing to campaigns to defeat future bond measures.

If the Board of Supervisors approves this legislation, they are putting the City's capital plan and future bond measures at risk.

The existing General Obligation Bond passthrough amount for tenants is minimal, and there are currently financial hardship provisions for low-income tenants. Even so, it's important that tenants and property owners each contribute to civic improvements.

Michael J. Carroll 601 Van Ness #845 SF, CA 94102 From: Chuck Benz

To: <u>Chan, Connie (BOS)</u>; <u>Stefani, Catherine (BOS)</u>; <u>Peskin, Aaron (BOS)</u>; <u>EngardioStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>Preston, Dean (BOS)</u>;

Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary (BOS); Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)

Subject: File Number 240174, General Obligation Bond Passthroughs

**Date:** Thursday, April 11, 2024 11:23:21 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to vote no on File Number 240174, General Obligation Bond Passthroughs.

All city residents should share in the cost of funding the public services and critical infrastructure improvements that General Obligation bonds pay for. This legislation unfairly pushes 90% of the burden of those costs onto property owners.

Thank you for being fair.

Sincerely,

Charles Benz

District 8

From: wjaeck@gmail.com

To: <u>Chan, Connie (BOS)</u>; <u>Stefani, Catherine (BOS)</u>; <u>Peskin, Aaron (BOS)</u>; <u>EngardioStaff (BOS)</u>; <u>Preston, Dean (BOS)</u>;

Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary (BOS); Walton, Shamann

(BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)

Subject: File Number 240174, General Obligation Bond Passthroughs

**Date:** Thursday, April 11, 2024 11:13:00 AM

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

## Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to vote no on File Number 240174, General Obligation Bond Passthroughs.

All city residents should share in the cost of funding the public services and critical infrastructure improvements that General Obligation bonds pay for. This legislation unfairly pushes 90% of the burden of those costs onto property owners.

Thank you for being fair and for not supporting legislation that unfairly oppresses housing providers.

Sincerely, William Jaeck From: Phill Boersma

To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)

Subject: Opposition to File # 240174 - General Obligation Bond Passthrough

**Date:** Thursday, April 11, 2024 11:11:33 AM

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

## Hello Supervisor -

I am shocked to hear that this legislation to remove the ability for rental property owners to pass-through General Bonds to tenants is even being considered to be eliminated. ALL residents of SF should be required to pay their fair share of costs to utilize critical items like emergency response, transportation, etc.

The existing General Obligation Bond Passthrough amounts on tenants is very minimal, and if any tenant is having a hardship, there are systems in place for those low-income tenants to be relieved of paying the passthrough if necessary. It is important for both Tenants and Property Owners to contribute to civic improvements.

It would be extremely unfair to place this additional burden on property owners.

**Phill Boersma** 

Direct: 415.273.2173

MB Property Group

PO BOX 489 Mill Valley, CA 94942

CA Lic #01328021