FILE NO. 260037

Petitions and Communications received from December 31, 2025, through January 8, 2026, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on January 13, 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 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) agenda for the January 8, 2026, ISCOTT meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms. 3 Forms. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Resolution No. 95-23, submitting the final quarterly report showing actual California Independent System Operator (CAISO) charges compared with projections and remaining contract expenditures. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Sheriff's Office (SHF), pursuant to Ordinance No. 10-25, submitting Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, waiver notifications. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Planning Department (CPC), pursuant to Planning Code, Section 306.7(i), submitting the Interim Zoning Controls Legacy Businesses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 118, submitting the Unsheltered Estimate Report as of November 11, 2025. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the California Fish & Game Commission, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code, Section 2073.3, submitting notice of receipt of petition regarding the southern resident killer whale. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From Sydney Hough, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From a member of the public, regarding scooters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From Mari Eliza, regarding the San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency (SFMTA) N Judah Layover Pilot project. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Carrie Bergey, regarding flight patterns over Treasure Island. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Deborah Gatiss, regarding the Ordinance 1) amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; 2) amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; 3) urging SFMTA to develop a fair review process and to develop further exceptions to the two-hour restriction as may be needed to support the public interest; 4) amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; 5) amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and 6) affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 250655. Ordinance No. 122-25. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From members of the public, regarding Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Reparations Fund. File No. 240701, Ordinance No. 258-25. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor (13)

From members of the public and various organizations, regarding Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the Statutory Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act issued by the Planning Department on October 31, 2025, for the proposed project to remove the Embarcadero Fountain by Armand Vaillancourt (Vaillancourt Fountain), located on Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0233, Lot No. 035, proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to address significant public safety hazard at Embarcadero Plaza by disassembling and removing the Vaillancourt Fountain to storage. (District 3) (Appellant: Susan Brandt-Hawley of Brandt-Hawley Law Group, on behalf of Docomomo US/Northern California (Docomomo NOCA)) (Filed December 1, 2025). File No. 251202. 18 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From members of the public and various organizations, 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. 27 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From members of the public, regarding Hearing to discuss the cause(s), escalation, response, and impacts of the widespread power outages that began on December 20, 2025, and which have disproportionately affected residents and small businesses in the Richmond, Sunset, Presidio, Civic Center, SOMA, and other San Francisco neighborhoods; to understand how a localized substation incident escalated to affect nearly one-third of the City; to assess communication failures and gaps in emergency response protocols; to evaluate economic impacts on small businesses and hardships faced by seniors, persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable residents; to discuss and understand the remedies, claims processes and support being provided to affected residents and businesses; and requesting the Pacific Gas and Electric Company to report. File No. 260035. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Reuben, Junius and Rose, LLP, regarding Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the approval of a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code, Sections 210.1 and 303 for a proposed project at 825 Sansome Street (Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0164, Lot No. 003) identified in Planning Case No. 2025-008202CUA, issued by the Planning Commission by Motion No. 21868, dated November 13, 2025, that involves a change of use from the existing Public Parking Garage use with 96 parking spaces and the establishment of a private Fleet Charging use at the upper level (30 private EV chargers), a public Electric Vehicle Charging Location use (principally permitted) at the ground level (18 public EV chargers), and a Private Parking Garage use at the basement level at the subject property, an existing enclosed two-story, multi-level Public Parking Garage with a basement, in the C-2 (Community Business) Zoning District and 65-A Height and Bulk District, Washington-Broadway Special Use District, and Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District; and minor exterior alterations are also included as part of this project. (District 3) (Appellant: Mark Malouf) (Filed December 12, 2025). File No. 251239. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From Kelley Trahan, regarding Tenancy-in-Common (TIC) ownership and condominium conversion. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From the San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association (SFDSA) regarding leadership transition within the SFDSA. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Linda Tong, regarding the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) Program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From Mari Eliza, regarding a San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) quick-build project on Sloat Boulevard. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Robert Hall, regarding the Commission Streamlining Task Force. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Marina Roche, regarding the Great Highway/Sunset Dunes. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding lobbying activity in San Francisco government. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Julien DeFrance, regarding various subjects. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Peter Sherman, regarding sound levels on public transit. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From a member of the public, regarding public transit funding. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Sooyoung Chung, regarding public transit issues. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From Zach Sharpe, regarding 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. File No. 251247. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

Item 1

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: ISCOTT Hearing on Thursday, 1/8/26 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests
Date:	Friday, January 2, 2026 1:07:06 PM
Attachments:	ISCOTT_1607_Agenda.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the SFMTA, submitting an agenda for the January 8, 2026, ISCOTT hearing.

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 | 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: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Friday, January 2, 2026 1:02 PM
Cc: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: ISCOTT Hearing on Thursday, 1/8/26 - Agenda - Temporary Street Closure Requests

Hello–

Attached is the agenda for the upcoming ISCOTT hearing on Thursday, January 8, 2025.

If you have any questions, please email us.

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 AGENDA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of January 8, 2026 - Thursday, 9:00 AM
1607th Regular Meeting

Online Participation	Please join Microsoft Teams Meeting at 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 with "Public Hearing" in the subject line or by mail to SFMTA, 1 South Van Ness, 7th 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 DECEMBER 18, 2025, 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.

NONE

REGULAR CALENDAR

A. 29th Avenue between Judah and Irving streets
Sunday, February 15, 2026, 10 am to 3 pm
Block Party - 29th Ave Birthday Bash

B. Jennings Street between Gilman and Fitzgerald avenues
Saturday, February 28, 2026, 9:30 am to 6 pm
Block Party - Jennings St for Josiah and Ari

C. Grant Avenue between Broadway and California Street;

Pacific Avenue between Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue; Jackson Street between Stockton and Kearny Streets; Washington Street between Stockton and Kearny Streets; Commercial Street between Kearny Street and Grant Avenue; Sacramento Street between Kearny Street and Grant Avenue;

Beckett Street between Pacific Avenue and Jackson Street; Ross Alley between Jackson and Washington Streets; Wentworth Place between Jackson and Washington Streets; Spofford Street between Washington and Clay Streets; Waverly Place between Washington and Clay Streets; Walter U. Lum Place between Washington and Clay Streets

Intersections closed: Pacific, Jackson, Washington, Commercial and Sacramento streets at Grant Avenue; Pacific Avenue at Beckett Street; Beckett, Ross and Wentworth at Jackson Street; Ross, Wentworth, Spofford, Waverly and Walter U. Lum at Washington Street
(Note: Clay Street and all intersections along Clay Street open.)

Friday, February 13, 2026, 11 pm to
Sunday, February 15, 2026, 11 pm
Chinese New Year Flower Market Fair
and
Friday, March 6, 2026, 11 pm to
Sunday, March 8, 2026, 11 pm
Chinese New Year Community Fair

D. Geary Street (most northerly lane only) between Stockton and Powell streets; Stockton Street (westerly right turn lane only) between Post and Geary Streets; Geary Street (south side parking lane only) between Stockton and Powell Streets; Powell Street (most easterly lane only) from mid-block (bollards at ticket booth) to Geary Street; Geary Street (south side parking lane only between Parking Meter #s 440-03010 thru 440-03110) between Powell Street and 130 feet westerly

Friday, March 6, 2026, 5 am to
Saturday, March 7, 2026, 11 pm
and

Geary Street between Stockton and Powell Streets

Saturday, March 7, 2026, 3 pm to 11 pm
ABC7 Broadcast of the Chinese New Year Parade

E. Valencia Street between 22nd and 23rd streets
Thursday, January 29, 2026, 6 am to 11 pm
Square Neighborhood Event

F. Erie Street between Mission Street and easterly terminus
Thursday, February 5, 2026, 10 am to
Friday, February 6, 2026, 2 am
TEU and Sports Illustrated Present: Tight End U and Friends

G. Leidesdorff Street between California and Pine streets
Thursday, February 5, 2026, 10 am to
Friday, February 6, 2026, 2 am
Mike Ditka's Gridiron Greats Assistance Fund Reception

H. Front Street between California and Sacramento streets; Halleck Street between Battery and Front streets
Sunday, February 8, 2025, 7 am to
Saturday, February 9, 2025, 1 am
Celebration on Front Street

I. Grove Street between Polk and Larkin streets
Monday, February 2, 2026, 6 am to
Monday, February 9, 2026, 11:59 pm
and
Grove Street between Van Ness Avenue and Polk Street
Thursday, February 5, 2026, 4 pm to 11:59 pm
Friday, February 6, 2026, 4 pm to 11:59 pm
Saturday, February 7, 2026, 4 pm to 11:59 pm
and
Polk Street (Carlton B. Goodlett Place) between McAllister and Hayes streets
Intersection closed: Polk at Grove Street
Saturday, February 7, 2026, 12 noon to
Sunday, February 8, 2026, 1 am
BAHC Live!

J. Montgomery Street (west curbside lane) between Sutter and Post streets; Post Street (north curbside lane) between Kearny and Montgomery streets
Saturday, January 31, 2026, 7 am to
Monday, February 9, 2026, 11:59 pm
Home Turf

K. Bay Street (westbound travel and parking lane) between Lyon and Baker streets
Thursday, February 5, 2026, 6 am to 10 pm
(Local access to residences maintained from Lyon Street)
Super Bowl LX - Palace of Fine Arts - NFL Honors

L. 19th Street between 3rd and Tennessee streets
Sunday, February 1, 2026, 12 pm to
Monday, February 9, 2026, 2 pm
(Local access maintained to 777 & 815 Tennessee St. garages)
Super Bowl LX - NFL Culture House @ The Pearl

M. Jones Street between McAllister Street and Golden Gate Avenue; McAllister Street (westbound travel and parking lanes) between Jones and 7th streets
Friday, February 6, 2026, 12:01 am to
Sunday, February 8, 2025, 6 am
Super Bowl LX - The Hibernia - Taste of the NFL

N. Sacramento Street (south parking lane) between Taylor and Jones streets;
Friday, January 30, 2026, 8 am to
Sunday, February 8, 2026, 8 am
and

Taylor Street (west parking lane) between California and Sacramento streets; California Street (north parking lane) between Taylor and Jones streets

Saturday, January 31, 2026, 8 am to
Sunday, February 8, 2026, 8 am

and

Taylor Street between California and Sacramento streets; California Street (northernmost parking and one travel lane only) between Mason and Jones streets

Thursday, February 5, 2026, 5 pm to
Saturday, February 7, 2026, 6 am

and

Jones Street (east parking lane) between California and Sacramento streets

Thursday, February 5, 2026, 7 pm to
Saturday, February 7, 2026, 6 am

and

Cushman Street between California and Sacramento streets

Friday, February 6, 2026, 12 pm to
Saturday, February 7, 2026, 1 am
(Local access maintained from Sacramento Street)

Super Bowl LX – Private Event at Grace Cathedral

O. Howard Street between 3rd and 4th Streets; Howard Street (most southerly travel lane and south parking lane) between Hawthorne and 3rd streets; Folsom Street (most northerly travel lane and north parking lane) between Mabini and 3rd streets; 3rd Street (two most westerly parking or travel lanes) between Harrison and Stevenson streets; 4th Street (two most easterly travel or parking lanes) between Market and Folsom streets; Jessie East Street between Mission and Jessie streets; Jessie Street between Jessie East and 4th streets

Friday, January 30, 2026, 10 pm to
Tuesday, February 10, 2026, 6 am

and

4th Street (two most westerly right turn lanes) between Minna and Howard streets; Minna Street between 4th Street and 540 feet westerly (InterContinental driveway); Howard Street (north parking lane) between 4th and 5th streets;

Saturday, January 31, 2026, 10 pm to
Tuesday, February 10, 2026, 6 am

and

4th Street between Market and Howard streets; Howard Street between 4th and 5th Streets

Saturday, January 31, 2026, to
Sunday, February 8, 2026
6 am to 11:59 pm, Daily
(Local access maintained from 5th Street at Howard Street)

and

Mission Street between 3rd and 5th streets (local access maintained from 5th Street)

Monday, February 2nd, 2026, to
Sunday, February 8, 2026
6 am to 11:59 pm, Daily
(Local access maintained from 5th Street at Mission Street)

and

Minna Street between New Montgomery and 3rd Street (local access maintained from New Montgomery)

Thursday, February 5, 2026, 10 am to
Monday, February 9, 2026, 2 pm

and

Jessie Street between New Montgomery and Annie streets

Friday, February 6, 2026, 8 am to
Monday, February 9, 2026, 2 pm

Super Bowl LX - SOMA Closures

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 Date
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

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. ***

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*. 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*.

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 2

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 - 3 forms
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:54:34 AM
Attachments:	3 12b waivers.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached from various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms.

Requester: Lisseth Salazar Lopez
Department: CON
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000028248
Requested total cost: $723.46
Short Description: materials for promotional Button Making Kit

Requester: Alejandro Garcia
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)
Supplier ID: 0000016668
Requested total cost: $2,000.00
Short Description: Cat, TDOC, 1x Sens., Cou, Tip, 7 Fr 7FSC

Requester: Stanley Lam
Department: ADM
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000010986
Requested total cost: $7,289.54
Short Description: Laboratory reference standard material to perform toxicology analyses and tests.

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 | 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:	CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time:	2026-01-08 08:44:11 Pacific Standard Time
Run by:	ServiceNow Admin
Table name:	u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004693	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Stanley Lam	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Katharine Petrucione	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2026-01-02 09:36:26	Requesting Department:	ADM
		Requester Phone:	(415) 641-3604
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Stanley Lam
		Watch list:	Robert Almeida, Luke Rodda

Short Description:

Laboratory reference standard material to perform toxicology analyses and tests.

Supplier ID:	0000010986	Requested Amount:	$7,289.54
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	$0.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Total Requested Amount:	$7,289.54

Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000999579
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-12-11
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-12-10

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

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

(a) Sigma-Aldrich Inc..
(b) To purchase chemical reference standards for toxicology testing.
(c) The vendor is the only City-registered supplier for both required standards: DL-Kavain (CAS# 3155-48-4) and Sodium 3-Hydroxybutyrate (CAS# 54965-10G-F). These materials are essential for the laboratory to respond to active testing requests, and although the laboratory has taken care to minimize ordering from noncompliant suppliers, it cannot avoid so in this case. For reference, a copy of the quoted items is attached.
Additionally, these supplies meet the stringent criteria required by FLD's accrediting bodies for manufacturers of certified reference materials.

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

OCME recently flagged to the vendor that it needs to complete the 12B compliance process, but response have been delayed and inconclusive. Most recently OCME called this out on Dec. 30, 2025 without a response.

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	The vendor is the only City-registered supplier for both required standards: DL-Kavain (CAS# 3155-48-4) and Sodium 3-Hydroxybutyrate (CAS# 54965-10G-F). These materials are essential for the laboratory to respond to active testing requests, and although the laboratory has taken care to minimize ordering from noncompliant suppliers, it cannot avoid so in this case. For reference, a copy of the quoted items is attached. Additionally, these supplies meet the stringent criteria required by FLD's accrediting bodies for manufacturers of certified reference materials.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:

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

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

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:

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

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:

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

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:

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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OCME requires certified reference materials to meet accreditation standards for forensic toxicology testing. Without this contract, reports issued to law enforcement, medical examiners, and courts where these substances are involved would be unaccredited, compromising the integrity of forensic autopsy services for City residents.

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

Sigma Aldrich is currently noncompliant with Chapter 12B, with its Equal Benefits status listed as Inactive. As mentioned above, the City has made efforts to engage the supplier in compliance without their completing the process.

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

OCME found no other City-registered supplier offering both required standards: DL-Kavain (CAS# 3155-48-4) and Sodium 3-Hydroxybutyrate (CAS# 54965-10G-F). A copy of the quoted items is attached.

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

The City has encouraged the supplier to initiate and complete the compliance process. These efforts reflect a commitment to align with the Equal Benefits Ordinance while ensuring continuity of essential forensic services. Although the vendor is currently noncompliant, OCME will continue efforts to educate the supplier and move them towards the intentions of the Ordinance.

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

Not Applicable

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

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:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List

Table name: sysapproval_approver

Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004693

Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Katharine Petrucione	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	2026-01-02 11:00:33		2026-01-05 08:59:27 - Katharine Petrucione (Comments) reply from: katharine.petrucione@sfgov.org Ref:TIS6363327_xYcffD6bCSaTQmG4Mily

Related List Title: Metric List

Table name: metric_instance

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2026-01-02 09:36:31	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Draft	2026-01-02 09:36:26	2026-01-02 11:00:33	1 Hour 24 Minutes	true
2026-01-02 11:00:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Dept. Head approval	2026-01-02 11:00:33	2026-01-02 11:00:33	0 Seconds	true
2026-01-02 11:00:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Draft	2026-01-02 11:00:33	2026-01-05 08:59:27	2 Days 21 Hours 58 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 08:59:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2026-01-05 08:59:27	2026-01-05 12:20:44	3 Hours 21 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 20:56:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Completed	2026-01-05 20:56:45			false
2026-01-05 12:20:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2026-01-05 12:20:44	2026-01-05 20:56:45	8 Hours 36 Minutes	true
2026-01-02 09:36:31	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Draft	2026-01-02 09:36:26	2026-01-02 11:00:33	1 Hour 24 Minutes	true
2026-01-02 11:00:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Dept. Head approval	2026-01-02 11:00:33	2026-01-02 11:00:33	0 Seconds	true
2026-01-02 11:00:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Draft	2026-01-02 11:00:33	2026-01-05 08:59:27	2 Days 21 Hours 58 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 20:56:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Completed	2026-01-05 20:56:45			false
2026-01-05 08:59:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2026-01-05 08:59:27	2026-01-05 12:20:44	3 Hours 21 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 12:20:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004693	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2026-01-05 12:20:44	2026-01-05 20:56:45	8 Hours 36 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2026-01-08 08:43:39 Pacific Standard Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004694	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Alejandro Garcia	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2026-01-05 13:01:45	Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 206-7456
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Alejandro Garcia
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Cat, TDOC, 1x Sens., Cou, Tip, 7 Fr 7FSC

Supplier ID:	0000016668	Requested Amount:	$2,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	$0.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Total Requested Amount:	$2,000.00

Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000999363
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21A GPO (DPH Only)	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-12-20
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-08-01

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:

LABORIE MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES Urgent PC is a good option for most patients suffering from urinary urgency, urinary frequency, and urge incontinence

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:	
Yes, we have reached out to the vendor to become fully compliant	
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:	Good option for most patients suffering from urinary urgency, urinary frequency, and urge incontinence		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved

Reason for Determination:
Approved per 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

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

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:	

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

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:	

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

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:

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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

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 checked with our Primary vendor Medline, unforutnately no luck, vendor doens tdistribute the device

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:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List

Table name: sysapproval_approver

Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004694

Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	2026-01-05 13:05:08		

Related List Title: Metric List

Table name: metric_instance

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2026-01-05 13:56:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2026-01-05 13:55:58	2026-01-05 14:47:50	51 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 14:47:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2026-01-05 14:47:50	2026-01-05 20:57:53	6 Hours 10 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 20:57:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Completed	2026-01-05 20:57:53			false
2026-01-05 13:01:46	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Draft	2026-01-05 13:01:45	2026-01-05 13:05:08	3 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 13:05:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Dept. Head approval	2026-01-05 13:05:08	2026-01-05 13:05:08	0 Seconds	true
2026-01-05 13:05:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Draft	2026-01-05 13:05:08	2026-01-05 13:55:58	50 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 13:56:01	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2026-01-05 13:55:58	2026-01-05 14:47:50	51 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 14:47:55	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2026-01-05 14:47:50	2026-01-05 20:57:53	6 Hours 10 Minutes	true
2026-01-05 20:57:56	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Completed	2026-01-05 20:57:53			false
2026-01-05 13:01:46	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Draft	2026-01-05 13:01:45	2026-01-05 13:05:08	3 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2026-01-05 13:05:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Dept. Head approval	2026-01-05 13:05:08	2026-01-05 13:05:08	0 Seconds	true
2026-01-05 13:05:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004694	Draft	2026-01-05 13:05:08	2026-01-05 13:55:58	50 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2026-01-08 08:43:06 Pacific Standard Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004695	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Director Approval
Requested for:	Lisseth Salazar Lopez	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2026-01-06 15:50:52	Requesting Department:	CON
		Requester Phone:	(415) 557-4244
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Lisseth Salazar Lopez
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

materials for promotional Button Making Kit

Supplier ID:	0000028248	Requested Amount:	$723.46
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	$0.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Total Requested Amount:	$723.46

Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0001001237
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2026-01-06
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-06-30

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

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

Dr. Don's Buttons is a leading provider in button making and promotional materials. This request is being requested to purchase an additional button maker and materials for the library's Hormel Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Center, which will support programming and outreaches offered to the public.

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

The vendor's current 12B status is inactive. Dr. Don's has been contacted and informed through email about the city's 12B compliance process and is working on becoming compliant again.

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)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Provids button making and promotional materials. To purchase an additional button maker and materials for the library's Hormel Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Center, which will support programming and outreaches offered to the public.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	

Reason for Determination:

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

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

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

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:

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

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:

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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Without this approval, the Hormel Center will continue to share the existing resources at the library, limiting their ability to share library collateral at both on and offsite events.

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

There is a limited vendor pool that offers button makers on the city supplier portal. Demco and Staples are 12B compliant but do not offer button makers that are to the size, quality, and type that the library uses. In the past, Demco was used and found to be of less quality and had issues with usability for patrons. Dr. Don's button makers are of higher quality and better suited to be used with the public for outreaches and programs as they have an easily operable design.

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

This waiver does not defeat the intent of this chapter because this will procure goods that support programming and outreach for our Hormel LGBT center. Button making is used for in-house programming and outreach distribution for the public. While the library already has button makers, these are constantly used by other departments and may not be available on site when they are programs or outreaches that happen simultaneously. As such, we are requesting this waiver to procure additional button makers so this center can have their own that they can use as they actively host programs and attend community events that would benefit by creating buttons as a form of collateral and publicity for the library.

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:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List

Table name: sysapproval_approver

Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0004695

Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	2026-01-06 16:04:45		

Related List Title: Metric List

Table name: metric_instance

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2026-01-06 16:02:55	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Draft	2026-01-06 16:02:54	2026-01-06 16:04:45	1 Minute	true
2026-01-06 16:04:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Dept. Head approval	2026-01-06 16:04:45	2026-01-06 16:04:45	0 Seconds	true
2026-01-06 16:04:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Draft	2026-01-06 16:04:45	2026-01-06 16:39:20	34 Minutes	true
2026-01-06 16:39:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2026-01-06 16:39:20	2026-01-07 07:40:25	15 Hours 1 Minute	true
2026-01-07 07:40:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2026-01-07 07:40:25			false
2026-01-06 16:02:55	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Draft	2026-01-06 16:02:54	2026-01-06 16:04:45	1 Minute	true
2026-01-06 16:04:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Dept. Head approval	2026-01-06 16:04:45	2026-01-06 16:04:45	0 Seconds	true
2026-01-06 16:04:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Draft	2026-01-06 16:04:45	2026-01-06 16:39:20	34 Minutes	true
2026-01-06 16:39:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2026-01-06 16:39:20	2026-01-07 07:40:25	15 Hours 1 Minute	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2026-01-07 07:40:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004695	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2026-01-07 07:40:25			false

Item 3

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: Quarterly Report Approving Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. PR0.0152
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2026 11:50:04 AM
Attachments:	image001.png 1.5.2026 BOS Quarterly Report.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), pursuant to Resolution No. 95-23, submitting the final quarterly report showing actual CAISO charges compared with projections and remaining contract expenditures.

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 | 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: Avery, Collin J <CAvery@sfwater.org>
Sent: Monday, January 5, 2026 11:22 AM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Spitz, Jeremy (PUC) <JSpitz@sfwater.org>; Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer (PUC) <JOliverosReyes@sfwater.org>; Halliday, Kylie (PUC) <KHalliday@sfwater.org>; Aboul Hosn, Samer (PUC) <SAboulHosn@sfwater.org>
Subject: Quarterly Report Approving Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. PR0.0152

Hello BOS team,

The following quarterly report has been prepared for the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Resolution No. 095-23.

Resolution No. 095-23 approved amendment No. 2 to Contract No. PRO. 0152, Power Scheduling Coordination and Related Support Services, with APX Inc. This contact allows for the processing of the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) power transmission service charges. Board approval increased the contract by $636M for a total not to exceed contract amount of $896M, with no change to the five-year term from June 2022, through June 2027.

Per Resolution No. 095-23, the Board directed the SFPUC to submit quarterly reports showing actual CAISO charges compared with projections remaining contract expenditures.

Collin Avery
Policy & Government Affairs
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
cavery@sfwater.org

San Francisco
Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

San Francisco Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

525 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.3155
sfpuc.gov/power

DATE: December 30, 2025

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

THROUGH: Dennis J. Herrera, General Manager DJH
Barbara Hale, Assistant General Manager, Power
Catherine Spaulding, Deputy Manager, Power Acting for C Spaulding

FROM: Suni Jones, Manager, Power Wholesale/Retail Services

SUBJECT: Resolution No. 095-23, Quarterly Report Approving Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. PR0.0152, Power Scheduling Coordination and Related Support Services, with APX Inc.

The following quarterly report has been prepared for the Board of Supervisors (Board) in accordance with Resolution No. 095-23.

Resolution No. 095-23 approved Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. PR0.0152, Power Scheduling Coordination and Related Support Services, with APX Inc. This contract allows for the processing of the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) power transmission service charges. Board approval increased the contract by $636M for a total not to exceed contract amount of $896M, with no change to the five-year term from June 2022, through June 2027.

Per Resolution No. 095-23, the Board directed the SFPUC to submit quarterly reports showing actual CAISO charges compared with projections and remaining contract expenditures.

In summary:

- CAISO actual pass-through charges for Year 1 totaled $173M.
- CAISO actual pass-through charges for Year 2 totaled $80M.
- CAISO actual pass-through charges for Year 3 totaled $65M.
- CAISO actual pass-through charges for Year 4 are $27M compared to the annual projected pass-through charges of $171M.
- Remaining contract amounts are $321M for CleanPowerSF and $231M for Hetch Hetchy Power, for a total of $552M.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

The table below shows a summary of contract expenditures for CAISO actual pass-through charges in year four.

Year Four Contract Expenditures			
PROJECTED CONTRACT EXPENDITURES			
Year	CleanPowerSF	Hetch Hetchy Power	Total
Year 4 (6/2025 - 5/2026)	$93M	$78M	$171M
ACTUAL CONTRACT EXPENDITURES			
Year	CleanPowerSF	Hetch Hetchy Power	Total
Year 4 (6/2025)	$18M	$8.6M	$27M
PROJECTED MINUS ACTUAL			
Year	CleanPowerSF	Hetch Hetchy Power	Total
Year 4 (6/2025 - 5/2026)	$75M	$69M	$144M
REMAINING CONTRACT EXPENDITURES			
End Date 5/2027	CleanPowerSF	Hetch Hetchy Power	Total
	$321M	$231M	$552M

This report meets the quarterly report for Fiscal Year 2025/2026 reporting requirements established by Resolution No. 095-23. On July 22, 2025, by Resolution No. 25-0123, the SFPUC Commission approved Amendment No. 3 to the contract, as did the Board in Resolution 501-25. The reporting requirement was not extended. This is the last report.

Should you have any questions, please contact Suni Jones, SFPUC Power Wholesale/Retail, Manager at Skjones@sfwater.org and (415) 554-1575.

Item 4

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: Sheriff"s Office Utilization of Admin. Code 21B for RESET Contract
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:59:29 AM
Attachments:	Chapter 21B Letter Update to Mayor"s Office.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the Sheriff's Office (SHF), submitting Administrative Code, Chapter 21B, waiver notification.

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 | 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: Leung, Patrick (SHF) <patrick.n.leung@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, January 2, 2026 11:18 AM
To: Bonde, Aly (MYR) <aly.bonde@sfgov.org>
Cc: Betz, Steven (MYR) <Steven.Betz.MYR@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Miyamoto, Paul (SHF) <paul.miyamoto@sfgov.org>; Gong, Henry (SHF) <henry.gong@sfgov.org>; Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Katherine (SHF) <katherine.johnson@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Gaeta, Krista (DPH) <krista.gaeta@sfdph.org>; Macaulay, Devin (CON) <devin.macaulay@sfgov.org>; Yuan, Jane (CON) <jane.yuan@sfgov.org>

Subject: Sheriff's Office Utilization of Admin. Code 21B for RESET Contract

Dear Ms. Bonde,

The Sheriff's Office is providing an updated notification letter on the utilization of Chapter 21B to enter into a Contract No. 1000037299 with ConnectionsCA, LLC. to provide a safe alternative to incarceration for individuals who are publicly intoxicated or under the influence of drugs to recover at a City-own building located at 444 6th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103 and to be referred to additional City services. The contract with ConnectionsCA, LLC. is necessary to meet the Core Initiatives of projects addressing drug overdoses and substance use disorders as part of the Sheriff's Office's overall overdose prevention and crime reduction strategies. The contract offers an alternative to jail and hospitalization by filling a gap in interventions for people who are arrested for intoxication or being under the influence of a controlled substance or drug and engaged in disordered behavior.

Thank you,

Patrick Leung
Chief Financial Officer
San Francisco Sheriff's Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
patrick.n.leung@sfgov.org
415-818-3689

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
ROOM 456, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102

PAUL MIYAMOTO
SHERIFF

January 2, 2026
Reference: CFO 2026-001

Aly Bonde
Office of the Mayor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Utilization of Administrative Code Chapter 21B for RESET Contract

Dear Ms. Bonde,

San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 21B, adopted on February 11, 2025, suspended and delegated certain approvals for contracts to accelerate the City's response to homelessness, drug overdoses and substance use disorders, mental health needs, integrated health needs, and public safety hiring.

Mayor Lurie released "Breaking the Cycle" in March 2025, an executive directive to break cycles of homelessness and addiction by enabling more effective coordination across departments and outlining both immediate actions and longer-term reforms. The goals of the directive are:

1) a system that helps people achieve lasting stability,
2) cleaner and safer sidewalks, and
3) more responsible governance and accountable services

The Sheriff's Office has a rich history of offering alternatives to jail, such as Pretrial Diversion and Electronic Monitoring, that are often paired with mental health and substance abuse treatment to keep offenders productive, reduce jail populations, and allow people to stay employed and with family while meeting the requirements of the Court.

The Sheriff's Office is providing the below written notification to utilize Chapter 21B to enter into a Contract No. 1000037299 with ConnectionsCA, LLC. to operate the Rapid Enforcement Support Evaluation and Triage (RESET) Center, a safe alternative to incarceration for individuals who are publicly intoxicated or under the influence of drugs to recover at a City-own building located at 444 6th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103 and to be referred to additional City services.

The contract with ConnectionsCA, LLC. is necessary to meet the Core Initiatives of projects addressing drug overdoses and substance use disorders as part of the Sheriff's Office's overall overdose prevention and crime reduction strategies. The contract offers an alternative to jail and hospitalization by filling a gap in interventions for people who are arrested for intoxication or being under the influence of a controlled substance or drug and engaged in disordered behavior.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 818-3689 if you have further questions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patrick Leung
Chief Financial Officer
Sheriff's Office

Department & Agreement Information (*required)

Department Name*: Sheriff's Department | **Agreement Type*: Contract**

Department Contact Name*: **Henry Gong** | **Department Phone #***: 415-554-7241

Department Contact Email*: henry.gong@sfgov.org

For Contracts, Requisitions, and Purchase Orders:

Contract/Req/PO PeopleSoft ID#: 1000037299

Anticipated Contract/PO Amount: $17,525,000

Anticipated Contract/PO Start Date: 2/1/2026

Anticipated Contract/PO End Date: 4/30/2029

Supplier ID: 0000059871

Supplier Name: ConnectionsCA, LLC

Provide details about the anticipated agreement*: RESET (Rapid Enforcement Support Evaluation and Triage) Center Contract will offer an alternative to incarceration for individuals who are publicly intoxicated or under the influence of drugs to recover and receive assertive services.

For Leases:

New Lease or Amendment:

City-as-tenant or City-as-landlord? Landlord

Anticipated Lease Start Date: Select date

Anticipated Lease End Date:

Contracting Party ID: Enter 10-digit ID

Contracting Party Name: Enter supplier name

Provide details about the anticipated lease*: Enter detailed description here

Core Initiative Information

This lease or contract is a "Core Initiative Lease" or a "Core Initiative Contract" per Administrative Code Section 21B.2 because it is a "Project Addressing _____":

- ☐ **Homelessness**, defined as "projects designed to prevent homelessness through the provision of housing subsidies or other services, and projects designed to provide shelter, housing, food, and/or social services to people experiencing homelessness."
- ☒ **Drug Overdoses and Substance Use Disorders**, defined as "projects designed to reduce drug-related deaths and support individuals with substance use disorders (SUDs)."
- ☐ **Mental Health Needs**, defined as "projects designed to support people with mental health disorders."
- ☐ **Integrated Health Needs**, defined as "projects designed to serve people who are at risk of experiencing homelessness due to the potential loss of their shelter, housing, or release from an institution."
- ☐ **Public Safety Hiring**, defined as "projects to support the hiring process for, and/or the recruitment, training, and retention of, police officers, deputy sheriffs, and 911 operators."

Describe why the contract or lease is necessary to support the Core Initiative(s) selected above:
*The contracted service will offer an alternative to incarceration for individuals who are publicly intoxicated or under the influence of drugs to recover and receive assertive services.

Signature

Patrick Leung Sheriff's Office CFO Name	Signature	**12/17/2025** Date

Item 5

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: 12 Month Report for Board File No. 240909
Date:	Friday, January 2, 2026 11:07:30 AM
Attachments:	CU for Legacy Business Removal 6-mth report.pdf 12 Month Report_Board File No 240909.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the Planning Department (CPC), pursuant to Planning Code, Section 306.7(i), submitting the Interim Zoning Controls Legacy Businesses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts Report.

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 | 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: Merlone, Audrey (CPC) <audrey.merlone@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2025 12:32 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Subject: 12 Month Report for Board File No. 240909

Attached, please find the Planning Department's 12-month report for BF 240909. I have also included the 6-month report as I don't see it as part of the Board File on Legistar.

Sincerely,

Audrey Merlone, Senior Planner

Legislative Affairs / Office of Executive Programs
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7534 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

Date:	December 31, 2025
Report Name:	Interim Zoning Controls - Legacy Businesses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts
Case Number:	2025-004097PCA
Board File:	240909
Staff Contact:	Audrey Merlone, Acting Manager of Legislative Affairs audrey.merlone@sfgov.org, 628-652-7534

Statement of Purpose

This report was prepared in response to a resolution (BF 240909), introduced by Supervisor Peskin on September 17, 2024, and enacted into law on November 12, 2024 (enactment number 532-24). The resolution imposed interim zoning controls for an 18-month period to require Conditional Use (CU) authorization prior to replacing a Legacy Business in Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Neighborhood Commercial Transit Districts, and the Chinatown Community Business, Chinatown Visitor Retail, and Chinatown Residential Neighborhood Commercial Districts.

The resolution directs the Planning Department to submit a written report to the Board pursuant to Planning Code, Section 306.7(i). Under Planning Code Section 306.7(i), once interim zoning controls are adopted, the Planning Department must study the proposed zoning change and deliver a public report to the body that imposed the controls every six months. Each report must update the study's status, present any findings or recommendations, and give an expected completion date. These reports are required to be considered in a public hearing duly noticed in accordance with the basic rules of the body that imposed the interim zoning controls.

Background

Resolution No. 532-24 was adopted in response to recent changes in state law that grant planning waivers, streamline approval processes, and mandate rezoning. These changes are anticipated to increase redevelopment pressure on structures within commercial corridors, potentially threatening the economic sustainability of neighborhood-serving businesses—especially Legacy Businesses, which hold cultural and historic significance.

On July 29, 2025, Supervisor Chan introduced a proposed Ordinance (Board File No. 250808) that would establish permanent controls; requiring Conditional Use authorization (CUA) for any business seeking to occupy a storefront space last occupied by a Legacy Business, regardless of use type or underlying zoning district controls, in all Neighborhood Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial Transit, and Chinatown Mixed Use districts. Both the Small Business Commission and the Planning Commission voted to disapprove the proposed Ordinance. The full Department report can be found in the proposed Ordinance's Board file[1]. The proposed Ordinance passed the Land Use and Transportation Committee but failed to garner enough support at the Full Board of Supervisors.

Ultimately, a majority of Supervisors agreed with the Planning and Small Business Commissions that the proposed CUA requirement misapplies a land use tool to an economic stabilization challenge. Land use controls are designed to manage intensity, compatibility, and physical impacts of development. They are not effective mechanisms for addressing business retention or stabilization needs. Additionally, the CUA would create barriers for small businesses, discourage landlords from leasing to Legacy Businesses, and prolong vacancies.

Affected Projects

As of this report, no CU applications have been submitted under these interim controls to remove a Legacy Business. The last CU application involving a Legacy Business was considered by the Planning Commission on September 19, 2024, under existing permanent controls in the Mission Street NCT District. That project proposed to establish a new tenant, "Kiitos," in a ground-floor commercial space formerly occupied by the Legacy Business "Uptown." The Commission approved the CU on a 4–3 vote, with Commissioners Williams, Imperial, and Moore dissenting.

Though permanent Legacy Business CUA controls have been in place in three zoning districts since at least 2018, the Uptown Bar is the only CUA that has been filed under the requirement. This suggests that these types of controls have limited effectiveness in practice.

Environmental Review

This Report was determined not to be a project per State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2), because it does not result in a physical change to the environment.

Report Conclusion

The Planning Department generally does not support requiring CU authorization based on the identity of a business operator. Legacy Business status is not a land use designation; it is based on longevity and historic significance of the operator, rather than the use of the space itself. Traditional zoning regulates land use types—such as retail, residential, or industrial—not the identities of those conducting the activities. Introducing operator-specific criteria undermines the objectivity and predictability of zoning, which is designed to address physical, spatial impacts—like traffic, noise, and building scale—not subjective cultural or social considerations.

[1] https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14886203&GUID=153728B8-D21E-4ACD-BE74-85760C73DD04

While the cultural importance of Legacy Businesses is acknowledged, regulating them through land use entitlements may not effectively support preservation goals. Instead, it may create uncertainty for prospective tenants and buyers unfamiliar with a location's Legacy Business history.

Requiring CU authorization to remove a business is also problematic because the City cannot compel a property owner to continue leasing space to a particular tenant. In other instances where the City has required CU authorization for the removal of a use—such as gas stations or grocery stores—the outcome has often been prolonged vacancies, resulting in either empty lots or unoccupied commercial buildings. These vacancies can undermine neighborhood vitality and lead to a loss of tax revenue, compounding the negative economic impact on the community.

The interim controls were enacted partly in response to state-mandated rezoning requirements tied to accommodating over 80,000 new housing units. Much of this rezoning is occurring along commercial corridors, potentially displacing existing businesses. Fortunately, various City agencies have created programs and policies to support business retention and relocation as part of the broader rezoning effort.

The Legacy Business Program, operated by the Office of Small Business, supports businesses that have been in operation for more than 30 years through marketing, grants, and technical assistance. One key component of the Legacy Business Program is Business Stabilization Grants. The Business Stabilization Grant program distributes millions in direct financial support to landlords and tenants, with grants tied to long-term lease commitments. Since FY 2016–17, this program has provided over $4.4 million in funding, benefitting 269 businesses. Similarly, Supervisor Melgar's newly approved Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Program will create loans and grants for businesses affected by construction impacts.

The Planning Department has also taken proactive steps to ensure small businesses, including Legacy Businesses, are supported. The newly passed Family Zoning ordinance contains several provisions that assist Legacy Businesses in either staying open or relocating. It waives CUA requirements (for the Use type where one is required) for Legacy Businesses that are displaced due to a new development and waives development impact fees for those businesses. It also gives development bonuses for Local Program projects that create space for legacy businesses (up to 2 additional sqft of building space for every 1ft of space provided for Community Serving uses, including Legacy Businesses, plus up to 10 feet in additional height). These targeted interventions address actual business needs: affordability, stability, and resilience, without misusing the CUA process or creating unintended barriers for new businesses.

The Department recommends that the Board continues to support and strengthen direct assistance programs—such as grants, technical support, and streamlined permitting assistance—to provide more equitable pathways for small businesses to enter and remain in the market. Such programs help reduce structural barriers, stabilize neighborhood commercial corridors, and foster more inclusive local economies.

Required Board Action

The Board may approve or disapprove this report.

San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

Date: May 9, 2025
Report Name: Interim Zoning Controls - Legacy Businesses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts
Case Number: 2025-004097PCA
Board File: 240909
Staff Contact: Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 628-652-7533

Statement of Purpose

This report was prepared in response to a resolution (BF 240909), introduced by Supervisor Peskin on September 17, 2024, and enacted into law on November 12, 2024 (enactment number 532-24). The resolution imposed interim zoning controls for an 18-month period to require Conditional Use (CU) authorization prior to replacing a Legacy Business in Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Neighborhood Commercial Transit Districts, and the Chinatown Community Business, Chinatown Visitor Retail, and Chinatown Residential Neighborhood Commercial Districts.

The resolution directs the Planning Department to submit a written report to the Board pursuant to Planning Code, Section 306.7(i). Under Planning Code Section 306.7(i), once interim zoning controls are adopted, the Planning Department must study the proposed zoning change and deliver a public report to the body that imposed the controls every six months. Each report must update the study's status, present any findings or recommendations, and give an expected completion date. These reports are required to be considered in a public hearing duly noticed in accordance with the basic rules of the body that imposed the interim zoning controls.

Background

Resolution No. 532-24 was adopted in response to recent changes in state law that grant planning waivers, streamline approval processes, and mandate rezoning. These changes are anticipated to increase redevelopment pressure on structures within commercial corridors, potentially threatening the economic sustainability of neighborhood-serving businesses—especially Legacy Businesses, which hold cultural and historic significance.

Affected Projects

As of this report, no CU applications have been submitted under these interim controls to remove a Legacy Business. The last CU application involving a Legacy Business was considered by the Planning Commission

on September 19, 2024, under existing permanent controls in the Mission Street NCT District. That project proposed to establish a new tenant, "Kiitos," in a ground-floor commercial space formerly occupied by the Legacy Business "Uptown." The Commission approved the CU on a 4–3 vote, with Commissioners Williams, Imperial, and Moore dissenting.

Environmental Review

This Report was determined not to be a project per State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2), because it does not result in a physical change to the environment.

Report Conclusion

Because no CU applications have been processed under these interim controls, it is difficult to evaluate their practical impact. However, the Planning Department generally does not support requiring CU authorization based on the identity of a business operator.

Legacy Business status is not a land use designation; it is based on longevity and historic significance of the operator, rather than the use of the space itself. Traditional zoning regulates land use types—such as retail, residential, or industrial—not the identities of those conducting the activities. Introducing operator-specific criteria undermines the objectivity and predictability of zoning, which is designed to address physical, spatial impacts—like traffic, noise, and building scale—not subjective cultural or social considerations.

While the cultural importance of Legacy Businesses is acknowledged, regulating them through land use entitlements may not effectively support preservation goals. Instead, it may create uncertainty for prospective tenants and buyers unfamiliar with a location's Legacy Business history.

Requiring CU authorization to remove a business is also problematic because the City cannot compel a property owner to continue leasing space to a particular tenant. In other instances where the City has required CU authorization for the removal of a use—such as gas stations or grocery stores—the outcome has often been prolonged vacancies, resulting in either empty lots or unoccupied commercial buildings. These vacancies can undermine neighborhood vitality and lead to a loss of tax revenue, compounding the negative economic impact on the community.

The interim controls were enacted partly in response to state-mandated rezoning requirements tied to accommodating over 80,000 new housing units. Much of this rezoning will occur along commercial corridors, potentially displacing existing businesses. The Planning Department is actively exploring programs and policies to support business retention and relocation as part of the broader rezoning effort.

Given that those policies are still in development, the Department recommends postponing any decision to make these interim controls permanent until after such proposals are implemented and evaluated.

Required Board Action

The Board may approve or disapprove this report.

Item 6

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: HSH Annual Unsheltered Estimate Report - Ord 92-22
Date:	Friday, January 2, 2026 11:10:25 AM
Attachments:	Informal Unsheltered Count Estimate Memo_2025_FINAL.pdf Outlook-DHSH_symbo.png

---

Hello,

Please see attached and below communication from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 118, submitting the Unsheltered Estimate Report as of November 11, 2025.

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 | 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: Schneider, Dylan (HOM) <dylan.schneider@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2025 12:09 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Pan, Eufern (MYR) <eufern.pan@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Gil, Hailey (HOM) <hailey.gil@sfgov.org>; Locher, Sarah (HOM) <sarah.locher@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Kaushal, Jessica (MYR) <jessica.kaushal@sfgov.org>; Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>
Subject: HSH Annual Unsheltered Estimate Report - Ord 92-22

Good afternoon and Happy New Years Eve!

Attached please find HSH's Annual Unsheltered Estimate report as required by Ordinance No. 92-22.

Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Dylan

Dylan Schneider, MPA (she/her)
Manager of Legislative Affairs
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
email@sfgov.org | O: 628.652.7742

Learn: sf.gov/hsh | Follow: @SF_HSH | Like: @SanFranciscoHSH

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: 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 Protected Personal Information (PPI) and/or Protected Health Information (PHI) contained herein may subject the discloser to civil or criminal penalties under state and federal privacy laws.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Shireen McSpadden, Executive Director

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

To: Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Emily Cohen

Date: December 31, 2025

Subject: 2025 Unsheltered Estimate Mandated by Ordinance No. 92-22

Overview

Ordinance No. 92-22 (Place for All Program – Chapter 118 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) requires the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) to submit estimates of the number of unsheltered people in need of shelter or permanent supportive housing.

Informal Unsheltered Estimate

To produce this informal unsheltered estimate, HSH conducted a review of administrative data from our Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) also known as the Online Navigation and Entry (ONE) System. We reviewed data on clients active in our system between September 1, 2025, to November 30, 2025, to provide information on their living situation.

Table 1: Estimate of Unsheltered Clients as of 11/30/2025

Current Living Situation	Number of Clients
Unsheltered	*3,067*
Unknown	*907*
Total	*3,974*

HSH administrative data indicates **up to 3,974 clients are potentially unsheltered.** This figure includes:

- 3,067 clients that are presumably unsheltered as indicated by data points including active street outreach program enrollments, service touchpoints, and exits from shelter or housing to street or unknown destinations within the past 90 days. This analysis deduplicates and removes individuals known to be living in HSH-administered shelter or housing.
- 907 clients that are actively engaged with the homelessness response system within the past 90 days but have unknown living situations. This includes individuals whose living situation has not been verified within the past 90 days and does not include individuals who are known to be in HSH-administered shelter or housing. While some of these clients are likely still unsheltered, others may have living situations outside of the homelessness response system (e.g. couch surfing, private shelter or housing).

HSH will conduct the next federally mandated Point in Time (PIT) Count in January 2026 that will provide formal sheltered and unsheltered counts for San Francisco. We are implementing some changes to the 2026 PIT Count to support with a more accurate collection of data.

Shelter Demand

To more accurately respond to the scope of this required annual report, HSH added a question to the 2024 PIT count survey to better understand the number of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness that are interested in shelter. In the 2024 PIT count survey, 40% of respondents indicated that they were interested in shelter.

HSH also tracks shelter demand through the 311 Shelter waiting list. As of December 19, 2025, there were 325 individuals active on the 311 Adult Shelter Waitlist and 313 family households with 892 people in those families active on the family shelter waiting list[1].

Housing Demand

Safe and affordable housing is the only way to permanently resolve homelessness. The vast majority of the ~300 people with lived experience of homelessness that were surveyed to inform the 5-year strategic plan confirmed that they would accept housing if offered.

In FY 2024-25, HSH's Coordinated Entry providers conducted 12,040 unique client housing assessments. Of those, 3,883 or 32% were determined to be a top priority for supportive housing (including permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing). It is important to note that referrals to housing are made based on the amount of housing resources available, with the most vulnerable households being prioritized. For the 68% who were not prioritized for supportive housing in FY 2024-25, those households were still in need of safe and affordable housing but did not qualify for supportive housing resources based on system's capacity and their circumstances at the time of assessment.

In the first 5 months of FY 2025-26, the monthly average of Coordinated Entry housing assessments is 1,120, demonstrating the continued demand for safe and affordable housing by people experiencing homelessness.

While we do not have a single estimate of the number of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness who would accept a shelter offer, we do know that we do not have the shelter capacity to meet the current need and demand for youth, adult and family shelter. HSH is working closely with the Mayor's Office and other City agencies to ensure we have the right beds and options to meet people where they are and connect them to safe, dignified and effective alternatives to the streets through the Breaking the Cycle Initiative.

[1] Clients on Shelter Waitlists are included in the unsheltered estimates if active in the ONE system between September 1, 2025, to November 30, 2025.

Item 7

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: Notice of receipt of CESA Petition - Southern Resident Killer Whale
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:50:00 AM
Attachments:	Notice of Receipt_SRKW_122325.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the California Fish and Game Commission, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 2073.3, submitting notice of receipt of petition regarding the southern resident killer whale.

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 | 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: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 1:28 PM
To: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>
Subject: Notice of receipt of CESA Petition - Southern Resident Killer Whale

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

View as a webpage / share

California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Receipt of California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Petition

Greetings,

A notice of receipt of the petition to list the southern resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) as an endangered species under CESA has been posted to the Commission's website and is available at https://fgc.ca.gov/CESA#active-petitions under "Active Petitions".

Please refer to the notice for additional information.

Sincerely,

Jenn Bacon
CESA Analyst
California Fish and Game Commission

Click Here to visit our CESA 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 fgc@fgc.ca.gov from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery.
California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Commissioners
Erika Zavaleta, President
Santa Cruz
Samantha Murray, Vice President
La Jolla
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville
Eric Sklar, Member
Saint Helena
Darius W. Anderson, Member
Kenwood

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

www.fgc.ca.gov

California Fish and Game Commission
Notice of Receipt of Petition

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to the provisions of Fish and Game Code Section 2073.3, that the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) received on November 25, 2025 a petition from Steven C. Christianson, President, Orca Conservancy to list southern resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) as an endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act.

The petition states that southern resident killer whale (SRKW) is a genetically distinct population of salmon-eating killer whales occurring along the west coast of North America. Killer whale, also known as orca, is the largest member of the dolphin family and well known for its distinct black and white markings. SRKW ranges seasonally throughout the California Current Ecosystem. Data shows that the population frequents the outer coastal waters from Washington to California, including Point Reyes, Cape Mendocino, and Monterey Bay.

SRKW is part of the fish-eating “resident” ecotype and forms a genetically and culturally distinctive population. Resident populations are stable matrilineal pods that feed primarily on salmonids. SRKW relies heavily on Chinook salmon as its primary prey. Transient populations of orca are more likely to rely on marine mammals as primary prey.

Pursuant to Section 2073 of California Fish and Game Code, the Commission referred the petition to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department). Pursuant to Section 2073.5, the department will evaluate the petition and submit to the Commission a written evaluation report with a recommendation. The Commission received the petition on November 25, 2025 and noted receipt of the petition on its December 10-11, 2025 meeting agenda. The Department’s written evaluation of the petition and related recommendation is anticipated to be received in March 2026 and noted on the Commission’s April 15-16, 2026 meeting agenda.

For information about the petition or to submit information to the department relating to the petitioned species, interested parties may contact Craig Shuman, Marine Regional Manager, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, by telephone at (831) 649-2870, by mail at 20 Lower Ragsdale Drive, Suite 100, Monterey, California 93940, or email at r7regionalmgr@wildlife.ca.gov.

California Fish and Game Commission
Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director

December 23, 2025

Item 8

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Please deploy green infrastructure more rapidly
Date:	Friday, January 2, 2026 10:58:36 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding various subjects.

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 | 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: Sidney Hough <sidney.hough@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2025 3:30 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please deploy green infrastructure more rapidly

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

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Noe Valley and am disappointed in San Francisco's

irresponsible handling of stormwater pollution. I am a frequent visitor to the Bay and am frustrated by the destruction that our city is wreaking on its ecosystems, which are already so greatly damaged.

I recently read about SFPUC's "Green Infrastructure Grants for Homes" program. I hope that you will massively and rapidly scale up this program, as well as install a great number of additional rain gardens. We are greatly lacking in green space as well.

Further, I would like more transparency on San Francisco's progress towards 100% trash reduction. Most MRP Permittees claimed to have achieved 100% trash reduction by June 30 this year. We must come together to do our part — especially in light of San Francisco's recent Supreme Court case against the EPA, in which SF appears to have attempted to escape accountability for its waste discharge by blaming other counties for poor water quality. I am more than happy to support effective pollution reduction as a taxpayer.

Regards,
Sidney Hough

Item 9

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Stop the scooters
Date:	Friday, January 2, 2026 10:57:01 AM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding electric scooters.

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 | 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: Josephine Lucchesi <josinsf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2025 7:42 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; events@walksf.org; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Stop the scooters

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

Unfortunately, while some have given this new mobility option an enthusiastic reception, others have bemoaned incidents of scooters

blocking sidewalks, breaking traffic ordinances and causing accidents. In response, a number of cities, from West Hollywood, Calif., to Winston-Salem, N.C., are simply banning the scooters once they arrive. Others have proactively blocked scooter companies from introducing the service, such as Columbia, S.C., which enacted a one-year ban on the vehicles in January.

WHEN will YOU RESPECT Seniors!??

We are in serious danger with you being lax about stopping them on SIDEWALKS!!!!!

Blessings, Josephine

Item 10

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: Urgent: Suspend Work on Judah and La Playa, Re-evaluate and Modify Intersection Pilot
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:40:12 AM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Mari Eliza, regarding the Municipal Transit Agence (MTA) N Judah Layover Pilot project.

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 | 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: Mari Eliza <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 1:25 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Urgent: Suspend Work on Judah and La Playa, Re-evaluate and Modify Intersection Pilot

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 SFMTA

From your constituent Mari Eliza

Email zrants@gmail.com

Subject Urgent: Suspend Work on Judah and La Playa, Re-evaluate and Modify Intersection Pilot

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors and SFMTA Board,

It has become oppressive to live, work, visit the Sunset District - bad idea after bad idea is being "done TO our community, NOT WITH our community."

This letter was a petition that has been signed by over 390 Residents, Businesses, and Community Members of the Sunset District:

I join them in collectively requesting an immediate and comprehensive Traffic Impact Assessment of the Judah and La Playa intersection pilot, which was implemented in early 2024.

Why?

Implemented in early 2024, the pilot introduced new traffic barriers, modified traffic flow, and removed essential curbside parking. Serious consequences arise from the road modifications, which have resulted in confusing traffic patterns that create unnecessary detours and increase the risk of unsafe conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists alike, ultimately discouraging people from patronizing small businesses in the area.

Trains are now stored in the center of a busy four-way intersection, even though the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has formally stated:

“The CPUC recommends SFMTA find an alternative location to park their trains to create a safer environment for San Francisco residents and visitors and increase the level of service for motorists at the intersection.”

This situation not only poses safety risks but also obstructs traffic access to Java Beach Café.

Despite this guidance and repeated outreach from merchants and residents, SFMTA proceeded with the pilot without implementing safer alternatives such as the existing switchback option. This pilot has had a demonstrable economic and operational impact on

Java Beach Café, a San Francisco-designated Legacy Business serving the Sunset since 1993. Foot traffic has decreased, customer access has been obstructed, and turnover has declined. These are measurable impacts to a heritage business that reflect broader harm to the entire corridor.

SFMTA Rerouting Measures Are Diverting Customers Away From Java Beach

In addition to the intersection reconfiguration, recent traffic rerouting by SFMTA has significantly restricted access to Java Beach Café and diverted drivers away from the Judah St commercial corridor. These changes reduce visibility, disrupt natural flow, and create barriers that discourage drivers from safely or conveniently reaching the café.

- Limited Southbound Access

The left-turn-only restriction from southbound La Playa onto eastbound Judah cuts off access to Java Beach for drivers approaching from the north.

- Restricted Northbound Access on Lower Great Highway

The reconfiguration prevents safe pull-ins from the northbound lane. Higher speeds and no clear parking access force drivers past the corridor entirely.

- Forced Eastbound Diversions

A “Right Turn Ahead” sign at La Playa and Kirkham diverts vehicles before they reach the corridor.

A “Right Turn Only” sign at La Playa and Judah pushes cars away from Java Beach.

- Detour Signage That Directs Traffic Away

A “Detour to Sunset Blvd.” sign placed at Lincoln sends drivers out of the area, reducing visibility and walk-up customer flow.

The current layout makes it difficult and dangerous for drivers to access Java Beach, often forcing illegal or unsafe U-turns or deterring them from visiting altogether.

The new signage redirecting traffic away from Java Beach Café significantly impacts business. When driving northbound on LaPlaya, there is a 'right turn ahead’ sign @ Kirkham and a ‘right turn only’ sign @ Judah, directing traffic eastbound away from Java Beach.

Driving northbound on the lower Great Highway, there is no right turn onto Judah, and the parking on the right-hand side has been eliminated. This forced rerouting creates barriers that delay drivers and discourage them from stopping at Java Beach.

The 'Detour to Sunset Blvd..' sign on Lincoln also points people away from Java Beach.

When driving southbound on La Playa, there is a ‘left turn only’ sign, pushing traffic eastbound on

Judah, discouraging customers who are continuing to drive north on the lower Great Highway.

When driving westbound on Judah, there is a ‘right turn only’ sign, encouraging drivers to turn right on 47th or 48th Avenues to avoid the traffic

The public process was insufficient, the design is flawed, and the impacts are ongoing. It is time for a full reevaluation.

We demand that SFMTA:

Suspend the current Judah and La Playa pilot and conduct a comprehensive safety and business impact review

Reinstate parallel parking on both sides of Lower Great Highway between Judah and Lincoln to restore direct southern access

Reevaluate the use of the existing switchback for N Judah layovers to remove trains from the intersection

Implement near-term access improvements, including directional signage and restored visibility for small businesses

Determine whether CEQA applies to the Judah and La Playa pilot, including whether a categorical exemption was used and on what basis. If no Initial Study or Environmental Impact Report was conducted, SFMTA must initiate CEQA compliance now.

Thank you,

Item 11

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:	Flight patterns over Treasure Island
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:50:29 AM
Attachments:	2 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters, from Carrie Bergey, regarding flight patterns over Treasure Island.

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

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:	C
To:	9-awp-noise@faa.gov; SFO Noise (AIR); congressional@faa.gov
Cc:	chen@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); C; Teresa Bergey
Subject:	FAA Flight Paths Over 94130 – Request for Review & Mitigation
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2026 6:04:14 PM
Attachments:	FAA Flight Paths Over 94130 – Request for Review & Mitigation 01-02-2025.pdf

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

Carrie Bergey
39 Bruton Street
San Francisco, CA 94130
carriebergey@gmail.com
410-218-7311

January 5, 2025

Federal Aviation Administration
Aircraft Noise Ombudsman – Western-Pacific Region
800 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20591

CC:

The Honorable Nancy Pelosi
90 7th Street, Suite 2-800
San Francisco, CA 94103

The Honorable Alex Padilla
112 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
331 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Mayor London Breed
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: FAA Flight Paths Over 94130 – Request for Review & Mitigation

Dear Federal Aviation Administration Officials and Honorable Representatives,

I am writing as a resident of Treasure Island at **39 Bruton Street, San Francisco, CA 94130**, regarding the severe and ongoing aircraft noise and concentrated overflight traffic directly above our neighborhood.

Our community is subjected to **approximately 200 or more commercial aircraft flights per day**, occurring continuously day and night. These routes are clearly visible on public flight-tracking platforms and create a persistent disturbance that significantly impacts sleep, health, and quality of life.

This level of concentrated air traffic was **never disclosed during residential leasing, relocation, or redevelopment communications**, despite Treasure Island's major public investment, affordable-housing commitments, and veteran relocation programs. Residents moved here with the reasonable expectation of a properly planned and environmentally reviewed residential community.

The current flight corridor functions as a **high-volume aviation freeway**, creating nonstop noise exposure incompatible with residential use. This is not an occasional inconvenience but a constant, measurable, and life-altering environmental burden.

I respectfully request:

1. A formal FAA review of flight paths over ZIP code 94130;
2. Consideration of noise-mitigation routing or altitude adjustments;
3. Coordination with San Francisco officials and airport authorities to protect residents.

Our community includes families, seniors, veterans, and affordable-housing residents who deserve the same environmental protections as other San Francisco neighborhoods. I respectfully request written acknowledgment of this complaint and guidance on next steps toward mitigation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Carrie Bergey

Treasure Island, San Francisco, CA 94130

Carrie Bergey
39 Bruton Street
San Francisco, CA 94130
carriebergey@gmail.com
410-218-7311

January 5, 2025

Federal Aviation Administration
Aircraft Noise Ombudsman – Western-Pacific Region
800 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20591

CC:

The Honorable Nancy Pelosi
90 7th Street, Suite 2-800
San Francisco, CA 94103

The Honorable Alex Padilla
112 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
331 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Mayor London Breed
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: FAA Flight Paths Over 94130 – Request for Review & Mitigation

Dear Federal Aviation Administration Officials and Honorable Representatives,

I am writing as a resident of Treasure Island at **39 Bruton Street, San Francisco, CA 94130**, regarding the severe and ongoing aircraft noise and concentrated overflight traffic directly above our neighborhood.

Our community is subjected to **approximately 200 or more commercial aircraft flights per day**, occurring continuously day and night. These routes are clearly visible on public flight-tracking platforms and create a persistent disturbance that significantly impacts sleep, health, and quality of life.

This level of concentrated air traffic was **never disclosed during residential leasing, relocation, or redevelopment communications**, despite Treasure Island's major public investment, affordable-housing commitments, and veteran relocation programs. Residents moved here with the reasonable expectation of a properly planned and environmentally reviewed residential community.

The current flight corridor functions as a **high-volume aviation freeway**, creating nonstop noise exposure incompatible with residential use. This is not an occasional inconvenience but a constant, measurable, and life-altering environmental burden.

I respectfully request:

1. A formal FAA review of flight paths over ZIP code 94130;
2. Consideration of noise-mitigation routing or altitude adjustments;
3. Coordination with San Francisco officials and airport authorities to protect residents.

Our community includes families, seniors, veterans, and affordable-housing residents who deserve the same environmental protections as other San Francisco neighborhoods. I respectfully request written acknowledgment of this complaint and guidance on next steps toward mitigation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Carrie Bergey
Treasure Island, San Francisco, CA 94130

From:	C
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Dorsey, Matt (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); Tam, Madison (BOS); TIDA, (ADM); projectinquiries@tisf.com; Teresa Bergey; C; 9-awp-noise@faa.gov; SFO Noise (AIR); congressional@faa.gov; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	FAA 200+ Flight Paths Over 94130 – Treasure Island Resident Request for City Action
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 7:55:02 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I am writing as a resident of Treasure Island at **39 Bruton Street, San Francisco, CA 94130**, to request your leadership regarding the severe and ongoing aircraft noise and highly concentrated flight paths directly over our neighborhood.

Our community experiences approximately **200 commercial aircraft per day**, continuously throughout both daytime and nighttime hours. These flight corridors are clearly visible on public flight-tracking platforms and have created a persistent, life-altering impact on residents' sleep, health, and overall quality of life.

This level of concentrated air traffic was **not disclosed during residential leasing, relocation, or redevelopment communications**, despite the major public investment, affordable-housing commitments, and veteran relocation programs that brought families, seniors, and veterans to Treasure Island.

The current flight corridor functions as a **high-volume aviation freeway**, creating nonstop noise exposure incompatible with residential use. Residents are experiencing chronic sleep disruption, stress, and loss of peaceful enjoyment of their homes.

I respectfully request your support in:

• Requesting a formal FAA review of flight paths over ZIP code 94130
• Advocating for noise-mitigation routing or altitude adjustments
• Installation of Permanent / Portable Aircraft Noise Monitoring Terminals (NMTs)
• Coordinating City, FAA, and airport authorities to protect affected residents

Our community deserves the same environmental protections afforded to other San Francisco neighborhoods. Your leadership would make a meaningful difference to families who are struggling with daily and nightly noise exposure.

Thank you for your time and service to our city. I respectfully request written acknowledgment and guidance on next steps.

Sincerely,
Carrie Bergey
39 Bruton Street
San Francisco, CA 94130
carriebergey@gmail.com

410-218-7311

Item 12

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: Reject the RV Ban - File No. 250655, Ord. No. 122-25
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:02:03 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Deborah Gatiss, regarding:

> **File No. 250655, Ord. No. 122-25** - Ordinance 1) amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; 2) amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; 3) urging SFMTA to develop a fair review process and to develop further exceptions to the two-hour restriction as may be needed to support the public interest; 4) amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; 5) amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and 6) 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 | 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: Deborah Gatiss <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 4:54 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Reject the RV Ban

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

Please reject the 2-hour restriction on RV parking, introduced by Mayor Lurie. This approach, which targets working class San Franciscans and punishes people just trying to survive in this city, is not only a tired and recycled idea. It comes at the worst possible time, when immigrants and people of color are already facing unprecedented attacks from out federal government.

When people's RVs are towed, they lose their only form of shelter. There are over 1,400 people in San Francisco living in their vehicles, and the City lacks a significant amount of shelter beds and capacity to offer families, people with disabilities and seniors when they are seeking it. The 2024 Point-In-Time Count found that 90% of families experiencing unsheltered homelessness live in their vehicles. Currently, there are over 850 people on the family shelter waitlist and not enough deeply affordable housing, which is why many individuals and families end up living in RVs.

People who live in RVs are not going to disappear or all leave the city; implementing a citywide ban would only push people into tents and deeper instability. Without enough housing resources, this plan will result in more people living on the streets or stuck in shelter without pathways to housing.

If you want to help people living in RVs, focus on providing them with real housing solutions. Towing and displacement helps no one.

Sincerely,

Deborah Gatiss

Deborah Gatiss
debsgatiss@gmail.com
711 Post Street

San Francisco, California 94109

Item 13

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. 240701, Ordinance No. 258-25 Reparations Fund - 2 letters
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:11:23 PM
Attachments:	2 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 2 letters from members of the public regarding:

File No. 240701, Ordinance No. 258-25 - Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Reparations Fund.

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 | 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:	Heather Ferreira
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc:	Press Office, Mayor (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Chan, Connie (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)
Subject:	Concerns Regarding Equity and Inclusion in Proposed Reparations Framework
Date:	Wednesday, December 31, 2025 2:57:49 PM

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 express concern regarding the recently signed ordinance establishing a Reparations Fund limited to a single racial group.

While I acknowledge and respect the historical injustices faced by Black Americans, I am troubled by the precedent this ordinance sets by excluding other communities who have also experienced documented discrimination, displacement, and systemic harm. Many cultural and ethnic groups— including Indigenous peoples, Latino communities, Asian Americans, immigrants, and others—have endured forced relocation, redlining, labor exploitation, and long-term economic barriers that continue to impact families today.

Equity should mean fairness and inclusion for all, not selective acknowledgment. Creating a framework that recognizes harm based solely on race risks deepening division rather than fostering unity and shared accountability. If restitution is being considered as a moral and legal response to historical injustice, then it should be applied through an inclusive, transparent process that evaluates harm across communities rather than singling out one group.

I strongly believe that public policy should aim to bring people together, not separate them by race. An equitable approach would consider socioeconomic impact, displacement history, and generational harm across all affected populations.

I urge you to reconsider or expand this framework to reflect a more inclusive and unifying approach to justice—one that recognizes the suffering of all communities and upholds the principle of equal treatment under the law.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Heather Ferreira

From: Wesley Armes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Reparations Bill
Date: Monday, January 5, 2026 11:32:52 AM

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

Good Afternoon All,

Over the past several years, I had figured that a government body would eventually pass a reparations bill. Now that one has passed, I have questions about how it applies to someone like me, I am in a very unique situation as far as race goes. Most would call my race Melungeon. I tried finding a contact email for the mayor, and found one for this body first. I also looked for legal details of the bill and could not find anything about it.

This is what is being quoted by online news agencies,

"The mayor says she wants to be among the first elected officials to “truly deliver” what she argues is owed after generations of slavery and injustice. But here’s the catch: San Francisco doesn’t have the money. So now, City Hall is looking to Congress — and taxpayers nationwide — to bankroll the plan.

The stated goal? $5 million per person.
Supporters claim this level of compensation could begin addressing the pain, trauma, and long-term damage caused by slavery and its aftermath."

Injustice of slavery, the long term damage. That is where my inquiry is focused.

I am white, you can find me on social media. White as any white person is white. However, I can show documentation through ancestry DNA records, birth records and family tree records. My fourth great grandma was a slave. She and some of her fellow slaves had been impregnated by their owner, my 4th great grandpa. Some in the family tree bred toward black genetics and others were light skinned and bred toward the white. I am a direct descendant in one of the lines that white washed. However, some of the traits are there. For me it is my hair and my tolerance of the sun. The hair should be self explanatory, tolerant of the sun... I do not burn as a white guy. I turn brown when I get too much sun.

Because of that history, even though I am white, I was born and raised in the ghetto. Well, in Appalachia here, I was born and raised in a holler. I am successful now, but I am one of the few success stories in my family. Most in my family would attribute where they are now, because of challenges that were put in place four to six generations ago and beyond. I got away from the area, established myself in an area where people did not know my family history. Even though I claim my genetics and am proud of it, I'm a hobby genealogist. It might not be surprising how many people think, "well he is just a white guy trying to claim black roots" and are quite dismissive.

So, my question. Someone in my situation. Someone with proof, as in birth records and genetics to show that I am descended from a slave. Could a white person such as myself, if I were to live in your city, be eligible for the same reparations?

Injustice of slavery and long term damage.

--
Wesley L. Armes
304-380-6823
wesleyarmes@gmail.com

Item 14

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); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 251202 Vaillancourt Fountain - 18 letters
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:23:03 PM
Attachments:	18 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 18 letters, from members of the public and various organizations, regarding:

> File No. 251202 - Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the Statutory Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act issued by the Planning Department on October 31, 2025, for the proposed project to remove the Embarcadero Fountain by Armand Vaillancourt (Vaillancourt Fountain), located on Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0233, Lot No. 035, proposed by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to address significant public safety hazard at Embarcadero Plaza by disassembling and removing the Vaillancourt Fountain to storage. (District 3) (Appellant: Susan Brandt-Hawley of Brandt-Hawley Law Group, on behalf of Docomomo US/Northern California (Docomomo NOCA)) (Filed December 1, 2025)

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 | 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:	Janet Gracyk
To:	BOS Legislation, (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 251202
Date:	Thursday, January 1, 2026 5:06:28 PM
Attachments:	Re Vaillancourt, CGLHS.pdf

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

Please see the attached letter.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Janet Gracyk
President
CGLHS.org

Board of Directors

Janet Gracyk
President
Petaluma

John Martin
Vice President
Alameda

Keith Park
Past President
Martinez

Patrick O'Hara
Treasurer
Atascadero

Danny Hughes
Membership Officer
Los Angeles

Jesse Lattig
Recording Secretary
Los Angeles

Nancy Carol Carter
Director-at-Large
San Diego

Stacy Farr
Director-at-Large
Oakland

Rich Freitas
Director-at-Large
San Francisco

Tanisha Herr
Director-at-Large
Pacific Palisades

Joel Michaelson
Director-at-Large
Santa Barbara

Haley O'Connor
Director-at-Large
Los Angeles

Libby Simon
Director-at-Large
Pasadena

Steven Keylon
Eden Editor
Palm Springs

CALIFORNIA GARDEN & LANDSCAPE HISTORY SOCIETY

January 1, 2026

Rafael Mandelman, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear President Mandelman and members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

We urge you to overturn the Planning Department's decision to issue a CEQA determination of Statutory Exemption for the proposed removal of the Vaillancourt Fountain. The department's decision continues the city's disingenuous march towards demolition of the fountain, an iconic piece in San Francisco's public art collection, and a designated historic landmark. The exemption is inappropriate because no meaningful change has been documented in the condition of the fountain since a formal conditions assessment report was released in June 2025. The CEQA exemption is the latest in a series of actions, led by the Department of Recreation and Parks, to avoid a meaningful public process for the redesign of Embarcadero Plaza that includes the fountain in its future. Given the shadow of impropriety that taints the Planning Commission's decision, we urge you to reverse their finding.

We express our strong support for the preservation and restoration of the Vaillancourt Fountain and Embarcadero Plaza, a landscape of exceptional cultural and historical significance. This site, designed by renowned landscape architect Lawrence Halprin, stands as a testament to the modernist era and embodies Halprin's vision of dynamic urban parks that celebrate both the beauty of cities and the vibrancy of their communities. The plaza was conceived as a grand urban space, with the fountain serving as a bold and fitting counterpoint to the plaza's broad expanse and the surrounding environment. The plaza also marks the beginning of Market Street, sharing material continuity and design intent with the corridor and reflecting Halprin's vision for a connected public realm. As the beginning point of a seam unifying intersecting urban grids, demolition of Embarcadero Plaza and the Vaillancourt Fountain would erase an essential physical and symbolic link between the waterfront, San Francisco's central spine, and its cultural and urban legacy. Halprin's influential ideas and designs continue to shape the field of landscape architecture today.

The Vaillancourt Fountain, created by Armand Vaillancourt through an international competition, is an impressive sculpture that transcends its initial context. While some have associated the fountain with the now-demolished elevated freeway, it also evokes the natural forms of cliffs and waterfalls. Its playful and interactive character invites visitors to engage with the space in new and meaningful ways. The careful integration of fountain and plaza was a central aspect of the design, and the fountain has become a beloved modern landmark, resilient and layered with cultural and historical meaning.

We respectfully urge the Board to pause and reconsider any decision to dismantle the fountain. There are alternative solutions that honor the creativity of this landmark and the shared history it

represents. The city's aspiration to be recognized for its rich, diverse, and stimulating cultural environment would be undermined by the demolition of the Vaillancourt Fountain.

The California Garden & Landscape History Society asks you to overturn the Planning Department's decision to issue a CEQA determination of Statutory Exemption for the proposed removal of the Vaillancourt Fountain. We support the retention and restoration of Vaillancourt Fountain, and we agree with Docomomo's statement that "The future of Embarcadero Plaza and the Vaillancourt Fountain must be determined in the San Francisco tradition; transparently, equitably, and factually, free of carefully steered narratives and revisionist history."

Sincerely yours,

Janet Gracyk
President
California Garden & Landscape History Society

From:	Morten Jensen
To:	BOS Legislation, (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 251202 Support for the Appeal JRDV Morten Jensen
Date:	Friday, January 2, 2026 7:52:46 AM
Attachments:	File No. 251202 jrdv morten jensen 010126.pdf

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors

This is Morten Jensen an architect and urban designer urging you **to support the Appeal.**

I have worked for many decades in the San Francisco Bay Area on prominent planning projects and know the difference between a careful professional planning process and hasty decision-making. The original approval and construction of the Embarcadero Freeway Viaduct was an example of hasty decision-making that precipitated years of controversy, economic pain and environmental degradation.

Late last year it came to my attention that in some circles there is a mistaken belief that it is not possible to create the greatest possible public space at the most consequential location in the City of San Francisco without presupposing the removal of the fountain. I believed this was wrong and therefore created an alternative design titled **Embarcadero Reimagined** showing how the fountain can be incorporated into a design that brings pedestrians to the upper retail levels of Embarcadero Center and anchors it to the Ferry Building Marketplace. A press release showing this design is linked here: https://jrdv.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Embarcadero-Reimagined-JRDV-Dec-9-2025_01.pdf A 3-minute narrated video showing the design is linked here https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined-jrdv-video/

This design alternative demonstrates that a comprehensive design for all of Embarcadero Plaza and Sue Bierman Park is possible without erasing the layers of history, but by better connecting and activating the spaces.

Sincerely,

Morten Jensen

Morten Jensen
Architect, President
JRDV Urban International

DK +45 31 53 44 51
US +1 415 699 7171
morten@jrdv.com
View Our Work

COPENHAGEN
Bloxhub
Bryghuspladsen 8, 3.
DK-1473 Copenhagen

SHANGHAI
Jingan Kerry Center
1228 Yan'an Zhong Rd,
Bldg 3, 22F

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA
560 14th Street
Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94612

January 1, 2026

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: File No. 251202 Support for the Appeal of the Statutory Exemption under the California Environmental QSuality Act on October 31, 2025 for the proposed project to remove the Embarcadero Fountain by Armand Vaillancourt (Vaillancourt Fountain)

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is Morten Jensen an architect and urban designer urging you to **support the Appea**l.

I have worked for many decades in the San Francisco Bay Area on prominent planning projects and know the difference between a careful professional planning process and hasty decision-making. The original approval and construction of the Embarcadero Freeway Viaduct was an example of hasty decision-making that precipitated years of controversy, economic pain and environmental degradation.

Late last year it came to my attention that in some circles there is a mistaken belief that it is not possible to create the greatest possible public space at the most consequential location in the City of San Francisco without presupposing the removal of the fountain. I believed this was wrong and therefore created an alternative design titled *Embarcadero Reimagined* showing how the fountain can be incorporated into a design that brings pedestrians to the upper retail levels of Embarcadero Center and anchors it to the Ferry Building Marketplace. A press release showing this design is linked here: https://jrdv.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Embarcadero-Reimagined-JRDV-Dec-9-2025_01.pdf In addition, A 3-minute narrated video showing the design is linked here https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined-jrdv-video/

This design alternative demonstrates that a comprehensive design for all of Embarcadero Plaza and Sue Bierman Park is possible without erasing the layers of history, but by better connecting and activating the spaces.

Sincerely,

Morten Jensen
Architect President

JRDV Urban International

BLOXHUB
Bryghuspladsen 8, 3. DK-1473
Copenhagen Denmark Europe

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA
560 14th Street, Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94612

JINGAN KERRY CENTER
1228 Yan'an Zhong Rd, Bldg 3, 22F
Shanghai, PRC

www.jrdv.com
US +1 415 699 7171
DK +45 31 53 44 51

From:	Alexis
To:	BOS Legislation, (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support letter for the CEQA appeal from Armand Vaillancourt
Date:	Friday, January 2, 2026 1:24:46 PM
Attachments:	Letter of support for the Appeal_2025.pdf

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

To Whom It May Concern,

Here is my father Armand Vaillancourt's letter of support for CEQA's appeal.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Alexis Vaillancourt

From:	Liz Waytkus
To:	BOS Legislation, (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	File No. 251202
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2026 2:24:24 PM
Attachments:	01052026 Docomomo Vaillancourt CEQA.pdf

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

Dear colleagues,

Attached you will find Docomomo US letter of support for appeal File No. 251202 stating the misuse of an emergency exemption for CEQA related to the removal of the Vaillancourt Fountain.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Liz Waytkus
Executive Director

Docomomo US
P.O. Box 230977
New York, NY 10023
t: 203-671-6609
www.docomomo-us.org

do_co_mo_mo_US
moving modern forward.

Board of Directors
Katie Horak
PRESIDENT
Meredith Arms Bzdak
PRESIDENT-ELECT
Todd Grover
VICE-PRESIDENT
Eric Keune
VICE-PRESIDENT
Flora Chou
TREASURER
Barbara Yanni
SECRETARY

Jesús (Chuy) Barba Bonilla
Nina Chmura
Zoe Detweiler
T. Gunny Harboe
Tyler Jones
Robert Meckfessel
Tonia Moy
Theodore Prudon
Robert Pullum
Michelangelo Sabatino
Monica Schaffer
Barry Solar
Robert Thomas
Bradford J. White

Liz Waytkus
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Docomomo US Chapters
Chicago/Midwest
Colorado
DC
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Michigan
Mid Tex Mod
Minnesota
New England
New Orleans/Louisiana
New York/Tri-State
Northern California
North Texas
Oregon
Philadelphia
Southern California
Western Washington
Wisconsin

Friend Organizations
CF3 Cincinnati
Houston Mod
Indiana Modern
Landmark Columbus
Modern STL

January 5, 2026

City Hall
BOARD of SUPERVISORS
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689

RE: File No. 251202

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the thousands of members represented by Docomomo US and Docomomo International, we write to urge you to retain and preserve the Vaillancourt Fountain—one of San Francisco's most recognizable and nationally significant works of public art—by supporting the appeal challenging the City's "emergency" designation to remove and store the fountain.

Historic Modern landscapes such as the Vaillancourt Fountain and Embarcadero Plaza are integral to San Francisco's cultural identity and to a broader understanding of the diversity and evolution of our shared public spaces.

With broad public support for renovating and reinvigorating Armand Vaillancourt's monumental fountain, it is evident that City officials manufactured a false sense of urgency to justify unilateral action. Docomomo US remains steadfast in our support for this nationally significant work and urge the City to complete the legally required environmental review.

We respectfully ask that you uphold the protections afforded under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Vaillancourt Fountain, which was formally deemed a historic resource on October 29, 2025. We further urge you to allow the CEQA process to proceed as intended and to fully consider preservation alternatives rather than rushing toward removal.

Sincerely,

Liz Waytkus
Executive Director

Todd Grover
Vice President, Advocacy

From: Charles Eilhardt
To: Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc: info@docomomo-noca.org
Subject: Public Comment for SFBOS, SFRPD, SFAC meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 9:39:21 AM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the urban renewal era.

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• Be responsible with public money by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.
• Explore real design alternatives that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/____.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzozOTRkNDZiNzNhOTA5MzQ3NzU0MTA4MWI3NDU3YjY1OTo3OjkyZDc6OGZlM2IjZjJkZDY4ZmFmOTA5NTc2NGFhZWNlMzhhYTExMzM4YjA0MTMzMTQ0MmQ1NmI0NTZjNTRlNzQ3ZTE4YjpwOlQ6Tg.
• Actively engage with relevant experts, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.
• Require full transparency from project sponsors, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)
• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance
• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)
• Embarcadero Donor Presentation
• Prospect List for Mayor and DDC
• 20250729 PDT Meeting slides.pdf
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Project Delivery meeting notes
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Fundraising Committee meeting notes

Thank you.

Charles Eilhardt
Mobile: 510-697-8413
Sent from my iPad

From:	Tom Walker
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Vaillancourt Fountain
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 9:57:04 AM

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

The Vaillancourt Fountain is a powerful work of art perfectly reflective of the turbulent time and place it was made for. Restored and reimagined as the centerpiece of a new Embarcadero park, it will lift the entire project to greatness. Let’s do something extraordinary here.

Tom Walker
San Francisco

From: dlsq
To: Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc: info@docomomp-noca.org
Subject: Public Comment for SFBOS, SFRPD, SFAC meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 10:15:41 AM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the urban renewal era.

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• Be responsible with public money by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.
• Explore real design alternatives that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo4ODUyN2ZiNTZjMTMxNmEwODQxNGJmNjM2YjdkOTY0OTo3OjlmZjQ6NmIyMWI1NjkzNTY3ZjQ1OTdmYTc3MjBiOGQ1NmI0OWYyZjViOGZiOTJkOGRiZjFlM2RkYjViZTY0ZWNhYmU2NTp0OlQ6Tg.
• Actively engage with relevant experts, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.
• Require full transparency from project sponsors, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)
• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance
• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Thank you.

Dennis Sullivan

From:	Mona Marks
To:	Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc:	info@docomomo-noca.org
Subject:	Public Comment for SFBOS, SFRPD, SFAC meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 10:16:44 AM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,
The Vaillancourt Fountain is a San Francisco landmark and an important piece of art. It would be a crime to destroy it and would be a mistake and would serve no logical reason to eliminate it. Do not let this be "the East Wing fiasco" of San Francisco.

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the urban renewal era.

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• Be responsible with public money by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.
• Explore real design alternatives that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/.
• Actively engage with relevant experts, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.
• Require full transparency from project sponsors, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)

• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance
• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)
• Embarcadero Donor Presentation
• Prospect List for Mayor and DDC
• 20250729 PDT Meeting slides.pdf
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Project Delivery meeting notes
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Fundraising Committee meeting notes

Thank you.
Mona Marks

From: Rita Devlin Marier
To: Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc: info@docomomo-noca.org
Subject: Public Comment for SFBOS, SFRPD, SFAC meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 10:58:30 AM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the urban renewal era.

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• Be responsible with public money by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.
• Explore real design alternatives that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoxNDE5NzM5MTRhNzdlMjUwMjdjNTFiNDc5YjAyMGMxNDo3OjI3YzY6YjkyMGJjNzAzZWExNDYzZTJjNTU0NTY5ZjUxZjNjZWZlYWQ2YjQyOTMwZWZmMzdjY2ViYmRkODFiNDY2ODllYzpwOlQ6Tg.
• Actively engage with relevant experts, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.
• Require full transparency from project sponsors, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)
• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance
• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)
• Embarcadero Donor Presentation
• Prospect List for Mayor and DDC
• 20250729 PDT Meeting slides.pdf
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Project Delivery meeting notes
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Fundraising Committee meeting notes

Thank you.
Rita Devlin Marier
San Francisco

Envoyé de mon iPhone

From: Splyffotweny
To: Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc: info@docomomo-noca.org
Subject: Public Comment for SFBOS, SFRPD, SFAC meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 1:04:21 PM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the urban renewal era.

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose the plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review.
Instead, I urge you to:

• Be responsible with public money by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.
• Explore real design alternatives that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo3NWM2ZWM3YzNiNDMxM2FhZjRjN2E1ZjIlZTBhOTEyYTo3OmNhYWY6YTdmMWNkNTljN2I2MmI0MjA5MjNjODY1YmMwYjgzZDI0YmMyNmI1Yzg2YjVhODY5MGQ0MGI1ZjlhMmNkOWMyODpwOlQ6Tg.
• Actively engage with relevant experts, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.
• Require full transparency from project sponsors, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)
• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance
• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)
• Embarcadero Donor Presentation
• Prospect List for Mayor and DDC
• 20250729 PDT Meeting slides.pdf
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Project Delivery meeting notes
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Fundraising Committee meeting notes

Thank you.
Kit Lofroos

From:	Michele Gloor
To:	Collins, Charles (ART); Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	Preservation of Vaillencourt Fountain Public Comment for SFBOS, SFAC, SFRPD meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 1:26:25 PM

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

SF Board of SuperPublic Comment for SFBOS, SFAC, SFRPD meetings + Immediate Disclosure Requestisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the urban renewal era.

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year.

The Vaillancourt Fountain, with its water, is a strong, beautiful, participatory joy & landmark for residents, visitors & passersby. It is unique & my favorite in my long experience of fountains. It needs to be restored, cared for & preserved, not destroyed. Its loss would be deeply regretted in the future.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• **Be responsible with public money** by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.

• **Explore real design alternatives** that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/.

• **Actively engage with relevant experts**, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.

• **Require full transparency from project sponsors**, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)

• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance

• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance

• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance

• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:

• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR

• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR

• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR

• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment

• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version

• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities

• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)

Thank you for your time, hard work & attention to this & many other important matters.

In peace & hope,

Michele Gloor

1271 11th Ave. Apt. 1, San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Rachel Hope Crossman
To: Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc: info@docomomo-noca.org
Subject: Public Comment for SFBOS, SFRPD, SFAC meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 3:51:46 PM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

Preserve the Villaincourt Fountain! I remember going there as a teenager, visiting from across the Bay and awed by the spectacle of chunky sculpture and water. Art is valuable, public art is a necessity of a civilized country. Please open your intellects and realize this.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• Be responsible with public money by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.
• Explore real design alternatives that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/____.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzowYzM3Nzc4ZGU4MjRlNzZmNmU4YTAxNDM3MTFjNjcwYzo3OjNiZGU6OTBjODA2MGYxNzE4MGQ4YzkzMGNkZjExODg4Nzg3YzdjYmZiZTRlODg1MGU3NWJlYTlmNzViYTFhNTgyOTQwYzpwOlQ6Tg.
• Actively engage with relevant experts, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.
• Require full transparency from project sponsors, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)
• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance
• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)
• Embarcadero Donor Presentation
• Prospect List for Mayor and DDC
• 20250729 PDT Meeting slides.pdf
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Project Delivery meeting notes
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Fundraising Committee meeting notes

Thank you.

From:	Mary Jane Large
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Jan. 13 BOS hearing re Valillancourt Fountain - File No. 251202
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 5:14:52 PM
Attachments:	BOS Vaillancourt PDF Final.pdf

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

Attached please find in PDF format comments by the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association on the above-referenced matter. As its president, I ask that these comments be added to the official public record in this matter and be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your attention to this matter, Mary Jane Large

BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
P.O. Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
BCNA@bcnasf.org
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Marcy Albert
Michele Hennessey
Mary Jane Large
Philippe Sonne

MEMBERS AT LARGE

David Albert
Bob Harrer
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Diana Taylor

January 7, 2026

Rafael Mandelman, Board President
and Members of the Board of Supervisors
c/ o Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: File No. 251202-Hearing re the Statutory Exemption under CEQA to the removal from Embarcadero Plaza and storage of the Vaillancourt Fountain

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors:

The Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA) serves the residents and businesses in the Barbary Coast, the historic northeast waterfront along the Embarcadero from Bay Street to Clay Street. Over the years our members, particularly those residing in the southern end of our neighborhood, have come to view the Embarcadero Plaza (the Plaza) and Sue Bierman Park (the Park), as their "backyard". This sentiment led the leadership of BCNA to actively participate in the planning and funding of the children's playground in the Park. This attachment to the Plaza and the Park has continued, as these spaces are so central and vital to our neighborhood, and to the thousands of other San Francisco residents, downtown workers and out-of-town visitors who enjoy their openness and proximity to the waterfront

As an all-volunteer neighborhood association, BCNA does not have the personnel or resources to express an informed opinion on the narrow legal issue now before the Board of Supervisors surrounding the definition of an "emergency" sufficient to support an exemption from CEQA review of the Arts Commission's decision to deaccession, disassemble and remove the Vaillancourt Fountain from the Plaza. However, BCNA and its members do have the first-hand knowledge and experience to challenge the concluding statement of the Brandt-Hawley Law Group's appeal letter on behalf of Docomomo NOCA that

"The City must openly analyze preservation alternatives and engage in bona fide community engagement regarding the overall renovation project"

As the San Francisco residents most immediately impacted by what does or does not happen at the Plaza and the Park, BCNA members turned out in large numbers at two community meetings held by the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) on the Plaza/Park renovation. Attendance at both of those community meetings can best be described as "standing room only", and the break-out stations around the meeting rooms provided ample opportunity for one-on-one discussions with DRP staff, as well as with representatives of BXP, the City's private sector partner in the Plaza/Park renovation. The future of the Vaillancourt Fountain was the subject of active discussion from the very first meeting. Our members also responded to DRP's

online survey regarding the design elements and proposed usages desired by community members in the Plaza and the Park, including the fate of the Fountain. Our community's engagement with the Fountain issue continued at the two meetings held by the Arts Commission on the Vaillancourt issue, with BCNA Board members presenting in-person comments at both meetings. We note that members of Docomomo NOCA also appeared and spoke at both Arts Commission meetings.

BCNA therefore believes that ample opportunity for "bona fide community engagement" on the overall renovation project, including its public-private partnership aspects and on the fate of the Fountain specifically, has been provided by both DRP and the Arts Commission. Any allegation that adequate opportunity for such engagement has not occurred is not factually supported and should not be a factor in the Board's decision on this appeal.

We appreciate that at the time of its construction, the Fountain was an inspired choice to provide an artistic counterpoint to the massive freeway that then surrounded it. However, the Embarcadero Freeway is long gone, and the Fountain has fallen into such disrepair and deterioration that it must now be surrounded by extensive fencing to prevent it from being a severe safety and environmental hazard to visitors to the Plaza. Yet the announced costs of repairing the Fountain and maintaining its ongoing operations would appear to be prohibitive for a city facing a reported budget deficit in excess of $800 million and the need to begin extensively cutting vital community services. In our view, it serves no one to require the continued existence of an artwork of which there cannot practically or safely be any real appreciation of what remains of its artistic/architectural value. BCNA therefore continues to support DRP's plan to remove the Fountain as part of the Plaza/Park renovation, and the Arts Commission's decision to deaccession, dismantle, remove and store the components of the Fountain. **Given the realities of San Francisco's financial status and the resultant lack of a practical avenue to finance refurbishment of the Fountain, Docomomo NOCA's appeal, regardless of its legal merits, can only serve harmfully delay the Fountain's inevitable removal or worse, to doom the Plaza to the presence of a deteriotated and obscured Fountain.**

Sincerely,

BCNA Board of Directors, by
Mary Jane Large, President
maryjanelarge@me.com
916.952.4913

Cc via email:

Eoanna Harrison Goodwin AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Project Manager, Capital and Planning Division
Department of Recreation and Parks
eoanna.goodwin@sfgov.org

Supervisor Danny Sauter, District 3
Tita Bell, Chief of Staff, Office of Supervisor Danny Sauter

From:	Tomohiko Aono
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	Save Vaillancourt Fountain
Date:	Wednesday, January 7, 2026 11:04:42 AM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors:

I request that you move to preserve artist Armand Vaillancourt's fountain by integrating it with the future of Embarcadero Plaza. Like the Ferry Building across the street, may it serve as a testament to adaptation and resilience in an evolving urban landscape, a celebration of San Francisco's history and culture for the benefit of generations to come.

Sincerely,

Tomo Aono
District 7 resident

From:	Peter Tannen
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Preserve Embarcadero Plaza & Vaillancourt Fountain
Date:	Wednesday, January 7, 2026 5:38:20 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to urge San Francisco to preserve Embarcadero Plaza and Vaillancourt Fountain in the proposed Embarcadero Plaza and Sue Bierman Park Renovation Project.

The concrete and brick Embarcadero Plaza with its iconic Brutalist fountain is a historically significant SF modernist landmark. They were built as part of the Market Street Development Project, designed by Lawrence Halprin, Mario Ciampi, and J. Carl Warnecke. Many historic preservation and landscape history professionals have identified it as a contributing property within a larger significant Modern-era landscape. The San Francisco Planning Department and the California Office of Historic Preservation concur with these evaluations.

The striking Brutalist Vaillancourt Fountain was designed to hide the Embarcadero Freeway and its sounds. It was designed for public participation, inviting people to step under its large overhangs, climb atop stairwells and catwalks to see unique skyline views. While it has outlived its original context, this significant landscape and sculpture have value worth preserving.

The Embarcadero Plaza and fountain have a long history of frequent use for civic engagement and public demonstrations. Lawrence Halprin drew inspiration from an expansive brick plaza designed for civic and political activities in Italy at Siena's Piazza del Campo. Today it is still used for civic engagement and public demonstration.

For skateboarders, Embarcadero Plaza is an iconic, world-class park that has been one of the most famous skating spots in the world. Skateboarding evolved in relation to the specific forms and materials in this particular plaza, such as the bricks and the low concrete band around Vaillancourt Fountain.

San Francisco should preserve Embarcadero Plaza's brick paving and distinctive footprint, and preserve Vaillancourt Fountain, with recirculating water.

I hope that the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department and San Francisco Arts Commission recognize the historical and cultural significance of Embarcadero Plaza and Vaillancourt Fountain. I urge these bodies to preserve them.

Yours truly,

Peter S. Tannen

From: Miguel Santos
To: Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eganna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc: info@doccomomo-noca.org
Subject: Public Comment for SFBOS, SFRPD, SFAC meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:40:04 AM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the urban renewal era.

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• Be responsible with public money by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.

• Explore real design alternatives that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpjMzU0MGZjYWI3OWU4NDBiYjIzOWRjZjI5NjJmNGJmZTo3OmMwN2Q6Yjl1ODFiYjgwZmU0NWY5YzYxOTRmNGE3M2U3ODgxODk1MmNmZTE4ODdmN2U3MTk1M2lwN2ZmZWRjZjcyNDNhMjp0OlQ6Tg.

• Actively engage with relevant experts, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.

• Require full transparency from project sponsors, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)
• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance
• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)
• Embarcadero Donor Presentation
• Prospect List for Mayor and DDC
• 20250729 PDT Meeting slides.pdf
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Project Delivery meeting notes
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Fundraising Committee meeting notes

Thank you.

Miguel R Santos
491 Linden Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

From: Jack Bush
To: Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc: info@docomomo-nosa.org
Subject: Public Comment for SFBOS, SFRPD, SFAC meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:05:40 AM

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

On behalf of the Napa Skateboarding Association, I Jackson Tucker Bush delineate To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the urban renewal era.

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• Be responsible with public money by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.
• Explore real design alternatives that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces. An example alternative from an established architecture firm can be found at https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://jrdv.com/embarcadero-reimagined/____.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzphNjY2OWU4N2FjZWE2NTQyODdjMzhhNzIwZmQ3YjZmMjo3OjI4NDA6MmY1M2FiMjNhZDM4OTU5NmIwNGJhYjM4ODhkM2JhNmY0NDY1MGZhY2QxNmMxNmUzODJlYzYwZTQ1MzdjOTA0OTpwOlQ6Tg.
• Actively engage with relevant experts, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.
• Require full transparency from project sponsors, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)
• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance
• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance
• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)
• Embarcadero Donor Presentation
• Prospect List for Mayor and DDC
• 20250729 PDT Meeting slides.pdf
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Project Delivery meeting notes
• The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Fundraising Committee meeting notes

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Jake Watters
To:	Collins, Charles (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Cc:	info@docodocomomo-noca.org
Subject:	Public Comment for SFBOS, SFAC, SFRPD meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:46:39 AM

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

To SF Board of Supervisors, SF Arts Commission, SF Recreation & Parks,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to removing the large fountain at Embarcadero plaza. I was born and raised in San Francisco and have many fond memories of the fountain growing up. Many critics have pointed out that it is out of date without its freeway backdrop, but when I was growing up in the 90s- it felt like an icon. The erratic lines and forms were endlessly intriguing and I remember it as an important landmark from weekly visits to the farmer's market with my mother (back before it was at the newly renovated Ferry Building).

Aside from my personal memories of the fountain, I fear that the proposed redevelopment is yet another step in the replacement of a sometimes messy but culturally vibrant and diverse city with a generic space optimized for the frictionless flow of capital. San Francisco is a beautiful and alluring place precisely because it is messy. The eclectic amalgamation of different eras and styles of architecture perched on a barely tameable topography is an important reminder of all the people who have had a hand in creating such an important global city- a city that looms large in the international imagination despite its small footprint. This variety provides endless delight and discovery to its citizens and visitors. I think the fountain at the embarcadero is an invaluable asset to the city's fabric and the skilled landscape architects at HOK should be capable of keeping the fountain in place while designing a new plaza that better functions.

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's plan for this project feels like a step backward, reminiscent of the plaza's namesake urban renewal era. Or more recently Mayor Ed Lee's tax deal with Twitter, their subsequent flight from the city and continued issues with blight in the mid-market- is kowtowing to private business

interests the most cost effective way for the city to effect meaningful and lasting change to the city? I understand the BPX has offered to pay for design services and some construction costs- is it really fair for them to build an amenity for their properties that the city is then left to maintain?

Embarcadero Plaza, designed by Lawrence Halprin, is a historic site that has been part of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District since 2016. It's a vital public space, symbolizing our city's history and serving as a crucial site for civic engagement and free expression for decades, including this year. I agree that the plaza is somewhat underutilized but having a large open space for civic engagement at this location is important. I even wager if the Tuesday and Sunday markets were shifted to JH Plaza, that the plaza would be better utilized across the rest of the week.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an internationally recognized landmark, representing our diverse history, our connection with Canada and Quebec, and the location of countless community and activist gatherings. San Francisco Planning recognized it as a historic resource on October 29, 2025.

I oppose this plan for blank-slate urban redevelopment and the use of an artificial emergency to bypass public review. Instead, I urge you to:

• **Be responsible with public money** by right-sizing this project and finding a better approach for the $15–30+ million in public and private funds during this time of economic uncertainty.

• **Explore real design alternatives** that go beyond the 2024 proposal from private interests. This must include serious consideration of adaptive reuse and drawing inspiration from acclaimed international public spaces.

• **Actively engage with relevant experts**, including architects, artists, and recognized art and preservation organizations.

• **Require full transparency from project sponsors**, especially when requesting a behested payments waiver. They must publicly communicate the entire scope, including Embarcadero Plaza South, Sue Bierman Park West, Phase 2, and all planned features like bocce courts, padel courts, a beer garden, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade

Monument.

Please include this as a public comment—either as general public comment or associated with a specific agenda item—for these meetings:

• SF Board of Supervisors - Vaillancourt Fountain Appeal Hearing - January 13, 2026 (File #251202)

• SF Board of Supervisors - Embarcadero Plaza Behested Payments Waiver - next instance

• SF Arts Commission - Civic Design Review Committee meeting - next instance

• SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting - next instance

• SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting - next instance

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:

• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR

• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR

• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR

• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessment

• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version

• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities

• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)

• Embarcadero Donor Presentation

• Prospect List for Mayor and DDC

- 20250729 PDT Meeting slides.pdf
- The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Project Delivery meeting notes
- The most recent Embarcadero Plaza Fundraising Committee meeting notes

Thank you,

Jake Watters

Item 15

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:	File No. 251211 Street Trees - 27 letters
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:32:54 PM
Attachments:	27 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 27 letters, from members of the public and various organizations, 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 | 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:	Shaun Aukland
To:	CPC-Commissions Secretary; Carroll, John (BOS); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Cc:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Opposition & CEQA Objection: File No. 251211 (Street Tree Ordinance)
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2026 12:34:38 PM

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

Dear President So, Chair Melgar, Supervisors, and Commissioners,

I am writing on behalf of FairTrees.org to formally oppose File No. 251211 and to object to the Planning Department's CEQA determination. Please also add this to the legislative file.

1. CEQA Objection. The legislative file states this ordinance is "Not defined as a project... because it would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment." We dispute this finding. The legislation eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Historical data proves that the appeals process has successfully preserved hundreds of mature trees that the City intended to remove (e.g., Mission Verde, 24th St).

If the appeals process prevents tree removal, then removing the appeals process will logically result in the destruction of trees that otherwise would have been saved.

This will have an obvious impact to the city's physical environment. A reduction in urban canopy is a physical change to the environment that increases heat islands and reduces air quality. This requires environmental review, not an exemption. As our orgainzation has communicated before, Enivornment Justice Communities like SOMA, the Tenderloin, Bayview Hunter's Point, and others are largely *losing* canopy, not gaining it. Ongoing projects like the Folsom / Howard Streetscape projects that have removed dozens of trees, and only added marginally.

2. The "Equity" Justification is Not Defined. The "In-Lieu Fee" Loophole The bill allows developers to pay fees to plant trees in "neighborhoods with low canopy" but fails to define that term. Without a data-driven definition (like "Equity Priority Communities"), this creates a slush fund where fees generated in high-need districts like SoMa (2.7% canopy) can be diverted to wealthier areas. We have seen this **over and over**, with the federal Inflation Reduction Act grant, as well as Prop L funds. Our organization has been analyzing canopy data from US Forestry, and can provide this to make this a more data-driven process.

3. SF Citizens Lose Their Last Remaining Voice in Trees: Stripping residents of the right to appeal City decisions removes the only check and balance against administrative overreach, and eliminates due process.. This is not streamlining; it is silencing.

We urge you to CONTINUE this item until the CEQA determination is corrected and these amendments are made.

Sincerely,

Shaun Aukland
FairTrees.org

From:	Ruby Rieke
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 3:30:11 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely, Ruby Rieke Mission District

From:	Shamika Klassen
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 3:31:18 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Dr. Shamika Klassen, Alamo Square Neighborhood

From:	Christine S.
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 3:56:14 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction. The City of San Francisco needs to be adding more trees to beautify the sad streets in SF. I've been trying for 5 years just to get one tree planted after a car crashed into the gorgeous healthy ficus that adorned my street in SOMA. This is shameful. A missed opportunity to have a city that deserves to showoff its natural beauty.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Christine Segalas
District 6 (SOMA)

From:	Anna Papitto
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 4:06:36 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely, Anna Papitto, Noe Valley

From:	Alice Rogers
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 4:21:09 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

As a decades-long tree advocate and FUF member, I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Additionally, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored. We need to get this right.

Respectfully,

Alice Rogers

.....
Alice Rogers
10 South Park St
Studio 2
San Francisco, CA 94107

arcomnsf@pacbell.net

From:	Abigail Kroch
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 4:35:50 PM

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

- Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

  Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

  I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

  Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

  Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

  Sincerely,

  Abigail Kroch, SoMa resident

From:	Shalmali Bane
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 4:51:13 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Shalmali Bane, SOMA west neighborhood

From:	Collin Tharp
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 5:20:42 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Collin Tharp

Potrero Hill

From:	Barklee Sanders
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	contact@fairtrees.org; Shaun Aukland
Subject:	Re: Action Alert: Next Monday, City Hall is voting to strip your tree appeal rights
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 6:14:01 PM

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

Public Records Request under the California Public Records Act (Gov. Code § 7920.000 et seq.) and San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance (Admin. Code Ch. 67) concerning **File No. 251211 ("PermitSF" legislation)**, any amendments affecting **Public Works Code Article 16 (Urban Forestry Ordinance)**, and **City-initiated tree removal appeal rights and "low-canopy" in-lieu fees**.

Pursuant to CPRA and the Sunshine Ordinance, please produce the following records **from January 1, 2024 to present** (or earlier if needed for completeness). I request **electronic copies** (native format where available) and **rolling production** as records are located. If any portion is withheld, please provide a **Vaughn-style index** stating the specific exemption and how it applies.

A. Legislation & Redlines (File No. 251211):

1. All drafts, redlines, margin notes, and working copies of File No. 251211 and any trailer/companion ordinances that amend **Public Works Code Article 16** or address **appeals of City-initiated tree removals** or "final and non-appealable" language.

2. All committee packets, staff reports, fiscal/equity analyses, and "legislative digest" language; including any version posted to or prepared for the **Land Use & Transportation Committee** (meeting agendas and packets).

3. Any **CEQA** memos/determinations related to the ordinance(s) and whether changes to tree-removal appeal rights were assessed as a project impact.

B. Policy Basis for Appeal Changes:
4) Internal/external correspondence (including emails, texts, Slack/Teams messages) among **Mayor's Office, Clerk/BOS, Public Works/BUF, Planning, City Attorney, Board of Appeals, and Department of the Environment** discussing:

- proposals to eliminate or limit public appeals of **City-initiated** tree removals;

- the phrase "**final and non-appealable**" (or similar);

- jurisdiction of the **Board of Appeals** over tree-removal orders;

- comparisons to current practice noted on DPW/BUF pages (notice/hearing/appeal). Please include attachments and calendar invites. Suggested search terms: **"251211" "PermitSF" "Article 16" "tree removal" "appeal" "non-appealable" "BUF" "Board of Appeals" "low canopy" "in-lieu" "fee" "equity" "Posting 30 days."**

C. “Low-Canopy” In-Lieu Fee Targeting:
5) Any definitions, maps, methodologies, or datasets used to define “**low-canopy neighborhoods**,” including draft criteria, environmental burden indexes, CalEnviroScreen overlays, and proposed fund allocation rules.
6) Communications with developers, BIDs, or advocacy groups regarding in-lieu fee substitutions for on-site planting and fund deployment in “low-canopy” areas.

D. Impact & Historical Records:
7) Annual counts (CSV/spreadsheet) for **2018-present**: tree-removal permits initiated by **City departments**, objections received, hearings held, Director decisions, and **appeals filed and outcomes** (including to the **Board of Appeals**). Include any datasets that back Public Works web statements about objections, hearings, and appealability.
8) Records relating to the **Calle 24 / 24th Street ficus** proceedings (BUF recommendations, posted notices, appeals, Board of Appeals actions, and final conditions), used as precedent in policy discussions.

E. Public Notice & Meeting Compliance:
9) Proof of noticing, agenda postings, and public comment instructions for any meetings where the appeal-rights change was discussed (committee and full Board).
10) Any Sunshine/Brown Act compliance reviews or guidance from the **City Attorney** regarding public participation on this subject.

Format, Fees, Timelines:
I request **fee waiver**/no-cost electronic production (CPRA § 7922.530), **rolling releases**, and confirmation within **10 days** (and any extension basis) as required by law. For any redactions/withholdings, identify the **specific code section** and explain how it applies. If records are available on public sites, please provide **direct URLs**.

Departments/Offices to Search:
Clerk of the Board/BOS (including Land Use & Transportation Committee), **Public Works – Bureau of Urban Forestry**, **Board of Appeals**, **Planning Department**, **City Attorney (Supervisor of Records)**, **Department of the Environment**, and **Mayor’s Office**.

Barklee Sanders
Technology Consultant
More about me: barkleesanders.com
Schedule a meeting: https://cal.com/barkleesanders

On Tue, Jan 6, 2026 at 6:26 PM Shaun Aukland <shaun.aukland@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi everyone,

I am writing with an urgent warning. While we have been fighting for *more* trees, the City has quietly fast-tracked legislation that would strip your right to protect the *existing* ones. On **Monday, Jan 12th**, the Land Use Committee will vote on **File No. 251211**.

Buried in Lurie's new "streamlining" bill is a provision that **eliminates the public's right to appeal** tree removals initiated by City departments.

Why care? Currently, if Public Works or another agency wants to cut down mature trees on your block, you have the legal right to file an appeal and force a public hearing. Importantly, the process **works.** It is how residents saved nearly 40 mature trees in the Mission's **Calle 24** district when the City wanted to clear-cut them.

However, under the new law, that right vanishes. The Director's decision to cut would be "final and non-appealable."

This is not "streamlining." It is silencing. The City is effectively saying that it does not trust its citizens to have a voice in the design of their own neighborhoods.

We are also concerned about an "equity loophole": The bill allows developers to pay a fee instead of planting new trees. The fee goes to plant trees in "low canopy neighborhoods" but **leaves this undefined.** As this group knows well, without a strict definition, funds get assigned with little regard for actual canopy cover of environmental burden scores.

Two Fast Ways To Help:

We need to register opposition to these clauses.

Step 1: Copy and Paste this Email. This ensures your opposition is placed in the official file for every Supervisor to see. You may modify it your message to be more personal, if desired.

- **To:** John.Carroll@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org, Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org, Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org

- **Subject:** Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban

  Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

  Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

  I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has

historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely, [Your Name] [Your Neighborhood]

Step 2: Sign the Petition -- Join over 500 neighbors in demanding the Board reject this ban on appeals.

It seems Mayor Lurie and Supervisor Wong want to make it easier to cut trees, even as our city's canopy declines, without an equity plan. Together, we can push back on this.

Best,

Shaun Aukland
FairTrees.org

--

You are receiving this email as a community partner or petition signer at FairTrees.org.
If you would like to unsubscribe from future updates, you can do so here.

From:	Josh Jagerman
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 6:21:27 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Josh Jagerman

From:	Rebecca Hardy
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 6:54:22 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining;" it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hardy, Potrero Hill

From:	Amanda Rodriguez
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 6:57:16 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Amanda Rodriguez

Glen Park resident

From:	Laurel Myers
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 7:46:27 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Laurel Myers, SoMA resident

From:	Andrea Biltagi
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 8:00:01 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Andrea Biltagi

Tenderloin, 94102

From:	Frank Lorch
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 8:34:59 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,
Frank Lorch
Sunset

From:	Mc Mc 1
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	legislative File No. 251211. OPPOSE eliminating public appeal for tree removal
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 11:05:42 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,
Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.
I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.
Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.
Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.
Sincerely,
Mary McFadden
Anza VIsta

From:	Nikhil Gowda
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Wednesday, January 7, 2026 8:48:55 AM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Nikhil Gowda

West SoMa resident and home owner.

From:	Barbara Bagot-López
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	FielderStaff; Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Wednesday, January 7, 2026 10:29:20 AM

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

Hello, Chair Melgar & members of the Land Use Committee.

Please add my comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I OPPOSE the elimination of the public right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process--removing the voice of SF residents--is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

In addition, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please CONTINUE this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,
Barbara Bagot-López
Resident of Bernal Heights and San Francisco for 49 years who appreciates street trees

From:	Loren Craig Harrington
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Wednesday, January 7, 2026 1:18:40 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for File No. 251211.

I am writing to OPPOSE the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please CONTINUE this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,

Craig Harrington
Twin Peaks SF

From:	David Singer
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Wednesday, January 7, 2026 4:30:50 PM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

I am writing to OPPOSE the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Though I appreciate that streamlining is needed, this goes too far, especially in the light of history where the city has failed to plant and maintain trees unless prompted. If the DPW and were doing a fabulous job, perhaps lacking an appeal wouldn’t matter, but they have not been, and so it does, a lot.

I’d like the legislation amended to define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a strict data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores.
Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please CONTINUE this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for File No. 251211.

Thank you, David Singer, SOMA

From: Tisay Baclay
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS)
Cc: Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Subject: Public Comment – File No. 251211 – Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 4:44:04 PM

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

Subject: Public Comment – File No. 251211 – Opposition to Appeals Ban

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **strongly OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. While framed as administrative "streamlining," this provision fundamentally strips communities of their right to be heard and removes meaningful oversight over decisions that directly affect neighborhood health, environmental equity, climate resilience, and quality of life.

Under current law, when Public Works or another City agency seeks to remove mature trees, residents have the legal right to file an appeal and trigger a public hearing. This process is not theoretical - it works. File No. 251211 would eliminate this safeguard entirely.

The right to public participation and due process is not optional. It is protected under the **First and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution**, including the rights to free speech, to petition the government for redress of grievances, and to due process under the law. Fast-tracking legislation that removes appeal rights, especially when initiated by City departments themselves, raises serious constitutional concerns and undermines democratic governance. San Francisco must not become a city where community voices are treated as impediments rather than essential partners.

San Francisco has long been recognized as a leader in **environmental protection, climate justice, and civic engagement**. At a moment when residents are already absorbing sweeping budget cuts across healthcare, social services, outreach, housing stabilization, and environmental programs, this legislation further erodes trust and participation. The question before us is not whether the City can move

faster, but whether it can do so **without abandoning its values**.

Across the city, residents have stepped up beyond expectations - working in partnership with community-based nonprofits, organizing neighbors, and serving as frontline responders to the consequences of disinvestment. We are the ones operating at ground zero, engaging directly with impacted communities and protecting neighborhood-level environmental health. Removing public oversight ignores this lived experience and weakens outcomes.

I am also deeply concerned about an **equity loophole** in the legislation. While the bill allows developers to pay an In-Lieu Fee in place of planting trees, it fails to clearly define “low tree canopy” neighborhoods. Without a strict, data-driven definition that includes **canopy cover metrics and environmental burden scores**, these funds risk being allocated without regard to actual environmental need, undermining the very equity goals the policy claims to advance.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee **CONTINUE this item** until public appeal rights, constitutional protections, and clear environmental equity safeguards are fully restored.

Sincerely,
Teresa Dulalas
Resident - SoMa Pilipinas Filipino Cultural Heritage District 6

From:	Claudia Stern
To:	Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	Shaun Aukland
Subject:	Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:55:13 AM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I have lived and voted in San Francisco since 1985. As a retiree, I now volunteer in the garden (Sutro Park) near my house. I am lucky to have an increasing number of trees on the streets near my home thanks to the Friends of the Urban Forest. These trees reduce heat and noise, provide water absorption during rainy periods, and provide habitat for living creatures. We need more trees to make SF an even better city.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,
Claudia Stern
714 44th Avenue
415 318 6461

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out

more Click Here.

From: Steve Ensminger
To: Carroll, John (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Subject: Public Comment - File No. 251211 - Opposition to Appeals Ban
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:11:20 AM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Members of the Land Use Committee,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for **File No. 251211**.

I am writing to **OPPOSE** the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, I request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please **CONTINUE** this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely, [Your Name] [Your Neighborhood]

From:	Theatre District Neighbors
To:	Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Subject:	Opposition for File No. 251211 tree legislation
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:21:22 AM

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

Dear Chair Melgar and Land Use Committee Members,

Please add these comments to the official legislative file for File No. 251211.

We need more trees to make SF an even better city.

Theatre District Neighbors is writing to OPPOSE the provision in this legislation that eliminates the public's right to appeal city-initiated tree removals. Removing due process is not "streamlining"; it is a removal of critical oversight that has historically saved mature trees from unnecessary destruction.

Furthermore, We request that the legislation be amended to strictly define "low tree canopy" neighborhoods with a data-driven methodology that includes canopy cover and environmental burden scores. Without this definition, the In-Lieu Fee risks becoming a slush fund that fails to serve the neighborhoods with the highest environmental burden.

Please CONTINUE this item until these democratic and equitable protections are restored.

Sincerely,
--

Theatre District Neighbors

P.O. Box 420846

San Francisco, CA 94142-0846

theatredistrictneighbors@gmail.com

(415) 339-8779

https://atasf7.wixsite.com/tdneighbors

From: dweller SF
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS)
Cc: Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: reject File No. 251211 trees
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:20:21 AM

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

94105 Resident (Rincon Hill / South Beach / SoMa)
Strong Opposition to Proposed Amendments in File No. 251211
(Urban Forestry PROPOSED Ordinance Changes)
January 8, 2026

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a resident of **ZIP code 94105** in the Rincon Hill, South Beach, and South of Market (SoMa) area—one of San Francisco's fastest-growing neighborhoods dominated by high-rises and with **critically low tree canopy coverage of approximately 4-5%** (far below the citywide average of 13.7%), including areas like South Beach and parts of SoMa with very little tree cover—I and my family are **vehemently oppose** the proposed amendments in File No. 251211. Our concrete-heavy streets already create severe urban heat islands, poor air quality, and extreme vulnerability to wildfire smoke and heat waves. These changes would exacerbate environmental inequities by letting developers skip on-site tree planting in the very places experiencing intense new development.

Key Reasons for Opposition:

1. **Devastating Blow to Greening in High-Density, Low-Canopy Areas Like 94105**
South Beach, Rincon Hill, and SoMa have some of the lowest street tree canopy in the city—around 4.1% in parts of SoMa—with vast stretches of pavement and towering buildings offering little shade. These areas are priority zones for the **$12 million federal Inflation Reduction Act grant** targeting low-canopy, heat-vulnerable neighborhoods including SoMa to plant **3,500 new street trees**. Allowing developers to pay in-lieu fees instead of planting on-site—or exempting ADUs—would undermine this critical effort, leaving new luxury high-rises without greenery and denying residents immediate cooling and cleaner air amid booming development.
2. **Undermining Our Primary Source of New Trees Amid Severe Budget Crises**
With the City's historic budget deficits—closing an **$800+ million shortfall in FY 2025-26** and facing projections up to **$1 billion** in coming years—Public Works' Urban Forestry programs are chronically underfunded, relying heavily on grants and external sources. **Mandatory tree planting from new development has become the main reliable way San Francisco adds street trees**. Expanding in-lieu fees and exemptions would sever this vital pipeline, stalling greening in fast-developing areas

like mine where every tree is essential.

3. **Exacerbating Life-Threatening Health and Climate Risks**
   Low tree canopy in 94105 leads to temperatures 10–20°F higher than greener neighborhoods, worsened air quality from traffic and freeways, and severe impacts from California's wildfires and droughts—we endured weeks of hazardous orange skies and smoke in 2020. Residents face elevated risks of heat-related illness and respiratory problems. Eliminating appeals for City tree removals erodes oversight, while online-only notices exclude many.
4. **Betraying City Promises and Contradicting Protective Policies Elsewhere**
   These developer-friendly changes prioritize short-term efficiency over accountability, unlike robust appeal processes in cities such as Beverly Hills, Pacifica, Los Altos, Mountain View, Santa Cruz, Saratoga, San Luis Obispo, Santa Monica, and Pasadena. They undermine the Urban Forest Plan, federal Justice40 commitments, and environmental goals—while areas like 94105 suffer from unchecked concrete expansion.

We cannot afford more barren streets in our skyline-dominated neighborhood. My family demands you **reject File No. 251211 entirely** and strengthen mandates for on-site planting and public appeals to deliver real trees where new development is transforming our community.

Regards,

The Fong Family

94105 Resident & Native San Franciscan
Rincon Hill / South Beach / SoMa, San Francisco, CA

Item 16

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. 260035 power outages - 3 letters
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:43:50 PM
Attachments:	3 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 letters regarding:

> File No. 260035 - Hearing to discuss the cause(s), escalation, response, and impacts of the widespread power outages that began on December 20, 2025, and which have disproportionately affected residents and small businesses in the Richmond, Sunset, Presidio, Civic Center, SOMA, and other San Francisco neighborhoods; to understand how a localized substation incident escalated to affect nearly one-third of the City; to assess communication failures and gaps in emergency response protocols; to evaluate economic impacts on small businesses and hardships faced by seniors, persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable residents; to discuss and understand the remedies, claims processes and support being provided to affected residents and businesses; and requesting the Pacific Gas and Electric Company to report.

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 | 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: Jasbir Dhuga
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MahmoodStaff
Subject: Subject Line: Public Question for Hearing File No. 251222 (Grid Resilience & AV Protocols)
Date: Friday, January 2, 2026 8:18:16 AM

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

Target: Department of Emergency Management (DEM) & SFMTA

> "Between 9:40 AM (when power was lost) and 1:09 PM (when the substation fire occurred), the city had nearly 3.5 hours where 7,000 traffic signals were dark. Why was no emergency order issued during this 3.5-hour window to clear autonomous vehicles from the roads *before* the fire department needed to respond to the second emergency?"

Target: PG&E Executives

> "PG&E has stated the substation fire occurred at 1:09 PM, yet outages began at 9:40 AM. Does PG&E acknowledge that the 3.5-hour delay in resolving the initial grid instability created the traffic conditions that subsequently delayed emergency vehicles from reaching the substation fire itself?"

Signed
J.S.Dhuga

From:	Carroll, John (BOS)
To:	M Eilo; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	RE: Transportation needs PUBLIC POWER!
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2026 10:23:53 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thank you for your comment letter.

By copy of this message to the board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org email address, your comments will be forwarded to the full membership of the Board of Supervisors.

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

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

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

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

From: M Eilo <blinkpopshift@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 22, 2025 8:30 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Transportation needs PUBLIC POWER!

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

This is the last straw. End PGE now. Multiple friends were stuck taking multiple busses for hours or paying for rides they can't afford just because we keep letting PGE exist.

In 1996 there was a very similar fire in that same substation that caused a blackout. Did they update infrastructure to prevent it happening again? No. Instead they hiked rates to pay their fucking CEO millions a year and their shareholders a huge return.

I want what Sac has: municipal power. Time to catch up with the times only 75 years late.

From: Kendrick Lewallen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: PG&E power outage personal story
Date: Monday, January 5, 2026 9:41:45 PM

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

Dear supervisors, of San Francisco thank you for your time. I come to you as a constituent of district 6 and I would like to address the negligence of pg&e.

As a tenant living at 1190 Mission St. The entire building was impacted. I have lived in San Francisco for over 14 years as a resident in San Francisco. I've never experienced anything like the power outage that residents experienced across the city. Especially in my neighborhood SOMA even worse the Richmond' district. As you are aware our trinity building 1190 mission street, from December 20 to December 23rd without electricity! PG&E failed us as a community tremendously . The results are, spoiled food, I personally couldn't take care of tasks that needed to be taken care of due to the stress the anxiety that induced not to mention, I have PTSD I watched my mother pass in front of me earlier this year back in August. She also experienced the power outage. She was living off of a respirator, and she was grasping for air. Begging for help, I absolutely felt helpless in that moment near the end of her life..

Furthermore, I continuously called PG&E, vocalizing my frustration, and also bringing up the fact that the community, families and children were suffering immensely! Additionally I also looked around at other buildings surrounding us, seeing the fact my neighbors all had their electricity back, yet we didn't. This was very alarming. I found out after speaking with a security guard in my lobby that our building had a generator that was full,according to her, PG&E would not authorize our available fueled generator. I brought it up to PG&E. I couldn't ever get answers and then the only answer I did get was you can submit a request about the generator to our team that handles this and it will take two days for them to respond while we were in a power outage. This is absolutely a mockery of a company when they can't get back to you about your buildings generator that could have restored power to the entire building.

Why is it that it would take two days for the higher ups to address that issue this doesn't make any sense whatsoever and I believe that PG&E should not exist here in San Francisco because they have plaid guilty to murder. back in 2018 in fact, not that long ago as your are aware the campfire killed 84 people and that was due to PG&E's negligence! Fast forward to 2025, SOMA San Francisco on eighth street a substation caught on fire and could have exploded. Why did the substation catch on fire? No one really knows there are no answers yet and I believe that PG&E probably knows but isn't being transparent with the public about this issue. I'm deeply alarmed by their lack of compassion,their lack of care about the 4000 residence that remained without power for four days while other residents in the city of San Francisco were able to get their electricity back within 24 hours.

This also seems to be a reoccurring issue in the Richmond District. Apparently the Richmond District has been without power multiple times during the month of December 2025..

It’s a shame that I even have to write to you today about this particular issue, but it’s important that we all collectively speak out against PG&E’s lackluster practices. We should have an option to select a different energy provider, considering the negligence of PG&E has been absolutely ridiculous and irresponsible.

This truly mess with many people Christmas plans. Ultimately making many in our community upset. I have heard pg&e won’t properly compensate individuals for their losses.

Moreover, I had to get a hotel room to fill some kind of sanity to I can be productive, needed to charge my phone. I was told that my hotel room would be comped by PG&E. They’ve told me I should call 211 and that 211 should have some type of voucher for us to get a hotel room, however 211 said that they do not offer any type of voucher for hotel rooms to be covered. I also had to get take out multiple times. I spent over $400 because of this outage not to mention I probably have lost $450 worth of food in my refrigerator. I have yet to file a claim with PG&E because I have just been so busy after the power outage. The origin of my personal frustration with this issue is a simple fact I had so much going on at that time and had to get ready for a job that I took in another town temporarily, so it’s been very frustrating to say the least,

I’m sorry that this letter is coming to you so late, but I hope that you guys are able to see that these issues are very important and impact us as a community and we should really consider an alternative to PG&E and PG&E should be held accountable for financial losses of residence

Thanks again for taking the time to read my statement it’s important for everyone’s voice to be heard. Happy new year may this be a better year than last.

Kendrick Lewallen

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); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: 825 Sansome - BOS File 251239 - CU Appeal Project Sponsor Response
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:49:36 PM
Attachments:	image001.png TESLA - 2026-01-02 CUA Appeal Response_ FINAL.pdf

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from Reuben, Junius and Rose, LLP, regarding:

> File No. 251239 - Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the approval of a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code, Sections 210.1 and 303 for a proposed project at 825 Sansome Street (Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0164, Lot No. 003) identified in Planning Case No. 2025-008202CUA, issued by the Planning Commission by Motion No. 21868, dated November 13, 2025, that involves a change of use from the existing Public Parking Garage use with 96 parking spaces and the establishment of a private Fleet Charging use at the upper level (30 private EV chargers), a public Electric Vehicle Charging Location use (principally permitted) at the ground level (18 public EV chargers), and a Private Parking Garage use at the basement level at the subject property, an existing enclosed two-story, multi-level Public Parking Garage with a basement, in the C-2 (Community Business) Zoning District and 65-A Height and Bulk District, Washington-Broadway Special Use District, and Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District; and minor exterior alterations are also included as part of this project. (District 3) (Appellant: Mark Malouf) (Filed December 12, 2025)

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 | 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: Andrew Junius <ajunius@reubenlaw.com>
Sent: Friday, January 2, 2026 3:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lew, Lisa (BOS) <lisa.lew@sfgov.org>; Wong, Jocelyn (BOS) <jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org>; Khoo, Arthur (BOS) <arthur.khoo@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>; mmalouf@teamsters665.org; Gary Lucks <glucks@baylawgroupllp.com>
Subject: 825 Sansome - BOS File 251239 - CU Appeal Project Sponsor Response

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

Attached please find the project sponsor's response to the appeal referenced above.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

REUBEN JUNIUS & ROSE LLP

Andrew Junius
Managing Partner
Office: (415) 567-9000
Direct: (415) 291-7022
Cell: (415) 336-3796
Email: ajunius@reubenlaw.com

San Francisco
One Bush St., Ste. 600
San Francisco, CA 94104

Oakland
456 8th St.
Oakland, CA 94607

San Jose
30 E. Santa Clara St., Ste 360
San Jose, CA 95113

www.reubenlaw.com

PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - Notwithstanding the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act or the applicability of any other law of similar substance or effect, absent an express statement to the contrary hereinabove, this email message, its contents, and any attachments hereto are not intended to represent an offer or acceptance to enter into a contract and are not otherwise intended to bind the sender, Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP, any of its clients, or any other person or entity. The information and any attachments contained in this email and any subsequent email string may

be privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you may have received this email message in error, please notify the sender at the email address above. If you have received this email in error, you are instructed to delete all copies and discard any printouts without reading the information contained within.

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
From: Gary Lucks, JD CPEA, Bay Law Group LLP
Andrew J. Junius JD Reuben, Junius, and Rose LLP
Date: January 2, 2026
RE: File No. 251239 - Appeal of Conditional Use Authorization Proposed 825 Sansome Street Project (2025-008202CUA)
Project Sponsor Response to Appeal

Our firms represent the applicant, Telsa Inc. (Tesla) regarding the Conditional Use Authorization (CUA) appeal by Mark Malouf of the approval of the above-referenced project at 825 Sansome Street in San Francisco (Project). Tesla's opposition to the appeal is set out below.

I. INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 13, 2025, the San Francisco (City) Planning Commission (Commission) approved a Conditional Use Authorization (CUA) of Tesla electric vehicle (EV) charging facility at 825 Sansome Street, San Francisco. That approval included the determination that the Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a Commonsense Exemption under 14 California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) section §15061(b)(3). Mark Malouf has appealed the CUA approval. The Project's CEQA determination (2025-008202ENV) was not timely appealed and is not at issue in this appeal. As set forth herein, the CUA appeal has no merit and must be denied.

Other than a comment from Mark Bleason, representing the Teamsters Union Joint Council 7 opposing the fleet charging portion of the project, no comments were submitted from neighbors, business associations, or historic resources advocates. In his appeal, Mr. Malouf argues that the applicant and the San Francisco Planning Department did not demonstrate that Tesla's request met the findings requirements of Planning Code Section 303 because: (A) The use is not necessary or desirable; (B) the use is incompatible with the adjacent Jackson Square Historic District; (C) the use is detrimental to Neighborhood Convenience and General Welfare; (D) the use relies on an inadequate CEQA analysis. No evidence was cited or included in the statement of appeal. Based on speculative concerns, Mr. Malouf asks the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (Board) to reverse the Commission's approval. As set out herein, there is substantial evidence supporting the Commission's CUA and none of Mr. Malouf's speculative concerns warrant reversal. The CUA appeal has no merit and must be denied.

The following points are discussed in detail below:

- **No expansion or alteration of the building envelope**: The project maintains the historic use of the property as an automobile garage. There will be no expansion of the building or significant physical alterations.

- **Expands Fast Public Charging Infrastructure**: The project will provide 18 publicly available Supercharger stations. Tesla's Superchargers are highly

reliable, achieving an average site-level uptime of greater than 99% across the global network. In San Francisco, Tesla has deployed 80 stalls and 5 locations for public charging access, but more fast charging deployment is needed to serve local EV drivers.

- **No Historic Impacts to Jackson Square District**: Because there will be no physical changes to the building other than minor façade restoration and repair, there is no impact on this historic resource or the adjacent Jackson Square historic District.

- **No Traffic Impacts**: The autonomous vehicles that will be based at this site will be leaving the garage prior to morning peak traffic hours and returning to the garage after peak traffic hours. There will be no impact on traffic in the vicinity.

- **No Outside Street Queuing**: The project is specifically designed so that there is no potential for the autonomous vehicles needing to queue on the street before getting into the garage; there is sufficient queuing space within the building to accommodate all fleet vehicles that need to enter the garage at any given time.

- **Helps Achieve City's Sustainability Goals**: The City's Climate Action Plan establishes a goal for San Francisco to be an all-electric, net-zero emission city by 2040. A key component to meeting this goal will be providing public charging infrastructure access. In addition, this project will add zero emission transportation options for City residents.

II. THE PROJECT

The building, constructed in 1922 as a parking garage, has served the community for more than 100 years. The project continues this parking use with little or no change to the existing structure. Autonomous vehicles are here and changing the way people get around the City. The project allows for a graceful transition for this building, retaining its automobile use history while at the same time upgrading it to accommodate the future of autonomous vehicles.

The Project involves a change of use from the existing Public Parking Garage use with 96 parking spaces and the establishment of a private Fleet Charging use at the upper level, a public Electric Vehicle Charging Location use (principally permitted) at the ground level, and a Private Parking Garage use at the basement level at the subject property, an existing enclosed two-story, multi-level Public Parking Garage.

The 79 reconfigured parking spaces (a net loss of 16 parking spaces) will be allocated as follows:

- 31 new Tesla Fleet Storage Stalls for Private Fleet Parking (no EV chargers, no public access) at the basement level. This parking is to be used as temporary overnight parking to support private EV fleet vehicles.

- 30 new Private Fleet EV Charger Stalls + one standard parking stall at the upper level (no public access).

- 18 Public EV charging stalls at the ground level.

The project will also include 4,350 square feet that will accommodate accessory storage, mechanical room, bathrooms, and office space on the main level and in the basement.

The private EV fleet vehicle and private parking uses would be separated from the publicly accessible EV charging stations. The proposed hours of operations for the public-facing component is 24 hours a day, 7 Days a week. Whereas EV fleet vehicles will be primarily be departing during off-peak congestion hours of the early morning and returning during the late overnight hours. All levels will have audible exit warnings and the upper and basement levels will have gates in the normally closed position.

III. THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S CUA FINDINGS ARE SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Under San Francisco Municipal Code (SFMC) section 303(c), the Planning Commission must approve an application and authorize a Conditional Use if the facts presented are such to establish that:

1. The proposed use or feature, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

2. Such use or feature as proposed will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity, with respect to aspects including but not limited to the following:

    a. The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

    b. The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading and of proposed alternatives to off-street parking, including provisions of car-share parking spaces, as defined in Section 166 of this Code;

c. The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

d. Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs; and

3. Such use or feature as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of this Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan; and

4. Such use or feature as proposed will provide development that is in conformity with the stated purpose of the applicable Use District.

In relevant part, under SFMC section 303(t), the Planning Commission must also approve an application and authorize a Conditional Use for a non-accessory parking for a specific use if the facts demonstrate the absence of potential detrimental effects upon the surrounding area, especially through unnecessary demolition of sound structures, contribution to traffic congestion, or disruption of or conflict with transit services, walking, and cycling SFMC section 303 (t)(1)(C).

SFMC Section 210.1 describes the C-2 Districts: Community Business zoning, outlining its purpose to provide areas for local neighborhood-serving retail, services, and some housing.

As noted in Motion No. 21968, "The Commission finds that this Project is necessary, desirable for, and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood as follows, ***and as set forth in Section 210.1 and 303(c), and 303(t) findings submitted as part of the application***. The proposed use is compatible with the surrounding area, which includes a mix of commercial, office and residential uses and is on balance with the General Plan and Use District. Conditional Use approval to establish private Fleet Charging and Private Parking Garage uses would promote sustainability by supporting cleaner transportation options, reducing vehicle emissions, and enhancing public health. By locating the charging infrastructure within an existing garage, all work will be completed within the existing building envelope with no major exterior alteration. Department staff believes the Project would be desirable for and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and recommends." (emphasis added).

A. <u>The Use Is Desirable and Necessary</u>

As explained in the application materials referenced in the finding supporting approval of the CUA in Motion No. 21968, the Project's installation of a private EV fleet charging station within an existing parking garage will result in a development that is both necessary

and desirable for, and compatible with, the surrounding neighborhood and community. Key reasons include:

Enhancing Accessible and Clean Energy Transportation in Downtown and adjacent neighborhoods. The facility will support EV ride-hailing services in a greater concentration for the downtown core. This will provide convenient, emissions-free mobility to bring people to landmark locations like sports entertainment venues such as the Chase Center, and tourism spots such as Union Square and Fisherman's Wharf. It will also serve as a dedicated spot for the local community to charge and park their personal electric vehicles, promoting broader adoption of clean transportation fostering sustainable urban mobility and supporting community-driven electrification initiatives. This project supports to City's adopted goals related to sustainability, electrification of transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, as outlined in the San Francisco Climate Action Plan and Clean Transportation Program.

Expanded Public Supercharging Infrastructure: The site will introduce (18) new public EV charging stalls on the main level, offering reliable and accessible charging solutions to benefit local residents and businesses alike. This will provide convenient EV charging infrastructure to the neighborhood.

Distributing EV charging stations across San Francisco is crucial to serve San Francico EV drivers. Currently there is significant unmet demand for fast-charging public EV chargers. The City is underserved compared to other similarly situated cities in the Bay Area. As of this writing, there are 80 total operational public Superchargers in San Francisco. Tesla's estimates show that the Supercharger infrastructure would need to more than double over the next few years to serve the city's needs. Moreover, Tesla provides the most reliable fast charging network with uptime over 99%. EV drivers, depending on vehicle type, can recover up to 200 miles in 15 minutes at a Tesla Supercharger stall allowing for a quick and seamless charging experience.

By locating the charging infrastructure within an existing garage, the project avoids any expansion or alteration of the building envelope, preserving neighborhood character and minimizing impacts such as noise, traffic, or visual intrusion.

Existing Building Design Features Suitable for Fleet Operations: The lower level of the parking garage is reserved exclusively for queuing of Tesla fleet vehicles, eliminating the possibility for vehicles to queue on the street while they wait to get into the garage. The number of fleet queuing stalls (30) to fleet charging stalls (30) is an exact one-to-one ratio, providing sufficient buffer for fleet vehicles to wait onsite before they need to charge. Given this off-street queuing capacity within the building itself, the potential for additional traffic congestion is eliminated.

The nature, scale, and scope of the proposed use are consistent with the neighborhood's character and zoning controls. While the project introduces a non-residential use, it does not exceed the size limitations of the zoning district and the additional findings under 303(c)(1)(A-C) are not required. Even if they were, the project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity as discussed in Section B (below). The nature, scale, and scope of the proposed use are consistent with the neighborhood's character and zoning controls because the project is located within an existing parking garage and reduces the number of available parking spaces. The project promotes the efficient use of existing urban infrastructure and supports citywide policies encouraging electric vehicle adoption and private sector participation in emissions reduction.

Mr. Malouf notes that "Tesla has not demonstrated why this specific site is necessary when industrial areas better suited for Fleet Charging operations exist throughout the City." This is not part of the required findings. Moreover, Mr. Malouf also notes that "Fleet Charging use serves corporate fleet needs, not neighborhood needs - it provides no benefit or service to local residents or businesses." This is not part of the required findings. Moreover, the project is not intended to function as a fleet vehicle dispatch center. Instead, it represents one of multiple locations throughout the City that would support private fleet vehicle charging and temporary parking. Distributing facilities across several smaller sites allows the operator to reduce vehicle travel distances when vehicles are needed and avoid concentrating fleet activity in a single location. In contrast, a single centralized facility particularly in an industrial area, could result in concentrated traffic demand longer deadhead trips and increased vehicle miles traveled as vehicles would need to travel longer distances to reach users.

<u>The Use Is Compatible with the Adjacent Jackson Square Historic District</u>

It is hard to imagine a project that would have less of an impact on the adjacent historic district than this one. The garage will remain a garage. There will be virtually no changes to the exterior of the building - except to restore and maintain its historic elements. As explained in the application materials referenced in the finding supporting approval of the CUA in Motion No. 21968, the project does not involve demolition or alteration of any primary structural or architectural features, nor does it affect the façade or public view of any potentially historic elements. The EV charging infrastructure will be installed internally, in parking areas that do not contribute to the historic fabric of the site or surroundings.

Mr. Malouf claims, without support, "Fleet charging operations for Autonomous Vehicles-with constant vehicle queuing, 24/7-are fundamentally incompatible with the district's historic residential and small-scale commercial character." The project would be located entirely within an existing parking structure that provides three separate entrances and exits. This configuration is well suited for the proposed uses as it allows each user to operate independently with dedicated access points. Private fleet vehicles would be able to

enter and exit through their own gates without waiting for or interacting with the general public. In addition, the ability for fleet vehicles to automatically trigger access gates in advance would reduce or prevent on street queuing and minimize the potential for traffic impacts on adjacent City streets.

The Project is located at 825 Sansome and is adjacent to, but not located within, the Jackson. Even if the project were located within the district, it would have no impact because all construction and activity associated with the project would be inside the parking structure with no changes proposed outside of the building. From a historic resource standpoint, this project has absolutely no impact whatsoever.

B. <u>The Use Is Not Detrimental to Neighborhood Convenience and General Welfare</u>

The operations will not detrimentally affect neighborhood convenience or general welfare, specific to requirements listed in SF Planning Code Sec 303.2. On the contrary, it stands to enhance urban mobility and efficiency.

As explained in the application materials referenced in the finding supporting approval of the CUA in Motion No. 21968, the proposed installation of private EV fleet charging stations within an existing parking garage will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. Nor will it be injurious to property, existing improvements, or potential development nearby. The project has been designed to function entirely within the limits of the current garage and will comply with all applicable safety and operational standards. Specifically:

a. *The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures*:

The project involves the reuse of an existing parking garage without any expansion of the building footprint. The existing multi-level parking garage has sufficient capacity and circulation space to accommodate the proposed equipment without expansion of the building footprint or structural alterations. All EV chargers will be installed where current parking exists, preserving the size and shape of the facility and avoiding the need for new structures. The internal arrangement of chargers and electrical infrastructure will be designed to maintain safe vehicular and pedestrian circulation throughout the garage.

There will be no alterations to the overall size or shape of the structure, in accordance with Section 303.2.A. By converting the existing parking facility to an EV-exclusive parking garage. The anticipated traffic patterns will remain

comparable to those associated with the current private parking operations, in accordance with Section 303.2.B.

As the project focuses solely on repurposing the existing parking garage, there will be no changes to landscaping, open space, or loading zones, consistent with Section 303.2.D.

b. Accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading:

The inclusion of private vehicle fleet charging is expected to generate only a modest increase in short-term vehicle turnover, which the garage is equipped to accommodate given its existing vehicular access, egress, and internal circulation design. Fleet vehicles will be departing the project site on a full battery in the early morning (Approximately 4:00AM - 7:00AM), which is prior to the high traffic morning hours. Fleet vehicles are also expected to return to the project site in late evening hours (Approximately 9:00PM - 11:00PM), which is well past the expected evening peak traffic hours. Both departing and returning hours are periods of low to minimal congestion.

The private fleet chargers will be used by a controlled number of known vehicles with predictable schedules, minimizing traffic variability. Off-street parking remains adequate as all chargers are located within existing parking areas, No changes are needed to loading zones, which remain functional and accessible.

c. Safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor:

EV charging equipment and EVs produce no combustion emissions in stark contrast to vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, thereby aligning with the provisions of Section 303.2.C. This is especially true within the garage structure. Unlike garages that services combustion vehicles, the project will not result in generating carbon monoxide emissions which are a known Proposition 65 chemical listed for causing reproductive harm, specifically birth defects.

The project includes best practices for glare reduction, such as downward-directed lighting (if applicable) and the use of low-lumen status indicators. The chargers produce no dust or odor, and all electrical work will meet current building and fire safety codes. The installation will include appropriate ventilation where needed and emergency shut-off features for safety.

Tesla fleets currently operate with Full Self Driving [FSD] (Supervised), which results in 7x fewer minor collisions than the U.S. Average. The FSD

(Supervised) system is uniquely trained on billions of real-world, anonymized driving data collected from millions of Tesla vehicles globally. This will reduce the likelihood of collisions caused by human error, which can result in a safer neighborhood to live and work. A cumulative total of over 7 billion FSD (Supervised) miles and counting have been driven in Tesla vehicles, which is 70x times larger than the over 100 million autonomous miles driven by the competitors that operate in San Francisco.

In addition, the fleet EV vehicles are also much quieter than vehicles with internal combustion engine, resulting in minimal noise disruption to the local neighborhood which will fall below City noise thresholds.

d. Treatment given, as appropriate to aspects such as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting, and signs:

Because the project is entirely within an existing parking structure, no modifications to landscaping, open space, or screening are necessary. Existing lighting will remain, and any additional lighting installed for safety or signage will comply with Planning Code illumination standards and not contribute to light pollution. Signage will be limited to wayfinding and charger operation instructions, conforming to the San Francisco Sign Code. There are no new impacts to public-facing aesthetics or service areas.

Mr. Malouf argues, with no evidence, that "[t]his site along with the Waymo operations site 200 feet away will create continuous robotaxi fleet vehicles circulating including congestion, that impacts the neighborhood. Planning Staff did not consider such concentration. Round-the-clock operations disrupt neighborhood peace and livability at all hours."

The nearby Waymo parking facility has been in operation since 2021 and therefore constitutes part of the existing baseline condition considered by the City in its evaluation. CRA reviewed traffic volume data obtained from Replica along Pacific Avenue and surrounding streets and found no evidence of a substantial increase in traffic volumes associated with the introduction of Waymo operations. This information supports the conclusion that similar fleet related uses in the area have not resulted in measurable adverse traffic effects.

<u>The City Approved the CUA based on an Adequate CEQA Analysis</u>

As noted above, the City's CEQA Exemption Determination for the Project (2025-008202ENV) was signed and dated October 28, 2025. Once signed and dated, this document constitutes an exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Per chapter 31, an appeal of an exemption

determination to the Board of Supervisors shall be filed within 30 days after the approval action occurs at a noticed public hearing. [1] No appeal of the CEQA Exemption Determination has been filed and the deadline to appeal has past. As such, the City's CEQA findings for the Project are not at issue in this appeal.

Even if it were timely appealed, substantial evidence supports the determination that the project is exempt under CEQA because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility of a significant effect on the environment.[2]

Under CEQA, traffic level of service metric (measuring traffic congestion) is not used for evaluating transportation impacts.

In addition, Planning Department Transportation staff determined that no specific transportation analysis was required for the Project because:

> The proposed project is expected to generate only a modest increase in short-term vehicle turnover, similar to the existing use as a vehicle parking garage. The proposed project is equipped to accommodate its related EV vehicle trips given its existing vehicular access, egress, and internal circulation design. According to the sponsor team, the private fleet chargers will be used by a controlled number of known vehicles with predictable schedules, minimizing traffic variability. No changes are needed to adjacent loading zones. The project frontage is not along a bicycle or transit route. All levels will have audible exit warnings for pedestrians and other vehicles.

Mr. Malouf claims that the "CEQA analysis fails to examine cumulative impacts of concentrated AV fleet charging in the area. CEQA requires assessment of the combined effects of multiple similar projects-this has not been done and there is no mention of Waymo or Tesla in the CEQA analysis. Proper environmental review must analyze the concentration of fleet operations before approval, including the impact of a Telsa robotaxi charging location only 200 feet from Waymo's existing AV facility."

As discussed above, the nearby Waymo parking facility is part of the existing baseline condition considered by the City in its evaluation and supports the conclusion that similar fleet related uses in the area have not resulted in measurable adverse traffic effects.

---

[1] CEQA Exemption Determination.
[2] CEQA Exemption Determination, citing CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3)).

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: San Francisco's TIC Owners Are the City's Working Class Trying to Stay Afloat
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:58:18 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Kelley Trahan, regarding Tenancy-in-Common (TIC) ownership and condominium conversion.

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 | 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: Kelley Jeanne Trahan <kelleytrahan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 3:26 PM
To: Conner, Kate (CPC) <kate.conner@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Segal, Ned (MYR) <ned.segal@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco's TIC Owners Are the City's Working Class Trying to Stay Afloat

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

Hello,

Choosing Tenancy-in-Common (TIC) homeownership is not a choice of preference. For thousands of San Franciscans, it is a financial necessity and the only attainable entry point into homeownership.
Despite this, current city policies deny these residents the same stability, legal protections, and financial security afforded to condo and single family home owners.

These owners did not opt for a complex legal structure and inherent insecurity because they preferred it over a single-family home; they chose it because decades of under-building have made San Francisco’s housing market prohibitively expensive for the average worker.

The current system effectively penalizes the resident rather than the seller. TIC buyers have the lowest median income of any homeowner class in the city. By restricting conversion, the city is effectively penalizing those who worked hardest to stay and invest in San Francisco.

Current policies, such as the 2013 moratorium and the suspension of the lottery, were intended to protect the rental stock. However, for buildings that are already owner-occupied TICs, maintaining these restrictions does not create more rentals—it only creates more precarious lower income homeowners.

To address this inequity, city leaders should immediately resume the condo conversion lottery for buildings with high owner-occupancy and establish an "Equity Bypass" to allow low- and middle-income owners to convert units without decade-long wait times.

Homeownership is the most effective tool for long-term housing stability and generational wealth building. When a TIC is converted to a condo, that equity is instantly unlocked, providing families with the collateral needed to fund education, start small businesses, or retire without extremely high market rate rental costs. By denying conversion, the city is effectively stifling the upward mobility of its lower middle class and keeping them in a state of perpetual financial vulnerability.

The current system creates a glaring inequity in how housing stock is preserved. In neighborhoods like Noe Valley, wealthy buyers often purchase duplexes and merge them into single-family mansions, adding a "guest suite" to technically comply with density rules while never actually intending to rent that space. It is a striking double standard: the city rewards the creation of luxury mansions while punishing middle-class residents for maintaining density in multi-unit buildings.

Ultimately, San Francisco’s restrictive conversion policies have ceased to be a shield for renters and have become a ceiling for lower and middle class homeowners. By maintaining the status quo, the city is choosing to trap its most resilient residents in a legal limbo that prioritizes rigid bureaucracy over genuine housing security.

It is time for city leaders to stop penalizing those who have found creative ways to stay in the city they love. Resuming conversions is not just a policy adjustment; it is a necessary step toward a fairer housing market that honors the investment of its workers and ensures that the dream of stable homeownership is not reserved solely for the wealthy.

Thank you,
Kelley Trahan
94110

Item 19

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: Notification of SFDSA Leadership Transition and Ongoing Legislative Priorities
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2026 2:08:47 PM
Attachments:	Notification of SFDSA Leadership Transition and Ongoing Legislative Priorities.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached from the San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association (SFDSA) regarding leadership transition within the SFDSA.

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 | 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: Past President <pastpresident@sanfranciscodsa.com>
Sent: Monday, January 5, 2026 2:03 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Miyamoto, Paul (SHF) <paul.miyamoto@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notification of SFDSA Leadership Transition and Ongoing Legislative Priorities

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

Please read attached letter.

Best regards,

Ken Lomba
SFDSA Past President
Office: 415-696-2428

SAN FRANCISCO DEPUTY SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

"Serving the Deputy Sheriffs' of San Francisco since 1952"

PRESIDENT	VICE-PRESIDENT	TREASURER	SECRETARY	SERGEANT-AT-ARMS
Danilo Quintanilla	Vacant	James Irving	Vacant	Sotie Santos

January 5th, 2026

Via Electronic Mail

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Notification of SFDSA Leadership Transition and Ongoing Legislative Priorities

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to inform you that I have chosen not to run for another term as President of the San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association (SFDSA). I have officially transitioned the position to our newly elected President, **Danilo Quintanilla**, who will now be serving as the Association's lead representative.

It has been an honor and a privilege to work with each of you over the last eight years. I am deeply grateful for the collaboration, dialogue, and support we have shared in our mutual commitment to public safety and service to the residents of San Francisco. Although I will no longer serve as President, I will remain on the SFDSA Board in the role of Past President and will continue to assist and support the organization wherever I can.

As I transition out of this role, I would also like to highlight two important SFDSA initiatives currently before the Board:

1. **Administrative Code Update – Inclusion of the Office of the Sheriff**
   The SFDSA has worked diligently to advance legislation that would add the Office of the Sheriff to the City's Administrative Code, ensuring consistent codification among elected offices. All other elected officials currently have Administrative Code language reflecting their departments; the Sheriff's Office is the sole exception.

P.O. Box 77590 San Francisco, CA 94107
Phone: (415) 696-2428 www.SanFranciscoDSA.com Fax: (415) 658-7210

We drafted proposed language and introduced it through Supervisor Dorsey's Office, and we greatly appreciate the support and guidance his team has provided. Sheriff Miyamoto has reviewed the draft, is aware of the process, and is fully supportive of this addition. The language is now under review with the City Attorney's Office. We would be honored to have your co-endorsement as this measure moves forward.

2. Administrative Code Update – Sheriff's Vehicle and Equipment Procurement
In partnership with Supervisor Mandelman's Office, we have been working to mirror the administrative framework recently adopted for the San Francisco Fire Department regarding expedited procurement of vehicles and equipment. A comparable structure for the Sheriff's Office would significantly enhance our ability to obtain essential tools and resources needed to better serve the public. We respectfully request your support on this effort as well, in the interest of public safety and operational efficiency.

For your convenience, President **Danilo Quintanilla** can be reached at:

- **Cell:** 415-866-0246
- **Office:** 415-696-2428
- **Email:** president@sanfranciscodsa.com

Thank you again for the opportunity to work alongside you during my tenure. I look forward to continuing to support the SFDSA and our ongoing collaboration to strengthen public safety in San Francisco.

Respectfully,

Ken Lomba
Past President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association

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:	FW: Resident comment - Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) Program
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:22:05 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Linda Tong, regarding the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) Program.

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 | 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: Linda <kaihua.linda.tong@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 5, 2026 10:27 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Resident comment

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

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of San Francisco, and I resided near the 16th and Mission intersection.

I would like to advocate for San Francisco to revive and expand the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) Program at 16th & Mission.

San Francisco previously operated a LEAD pilot program from 2017-2019 that specifically targeted the 16th Street/Mission BART station, allowing police to redirect low-level drug offenders to treatment and social services instead of jail. Research found that participants had significantly fewer arrests and spent roughly 41 fewer days in jail per year while gaining access to housing and treatment.

However, the pilot ended when state grant funding expired, and the city never made it permanent. The program could be revived and strengthened by allocating dedicated city funding, improving police training to increase officer buy-in, and integrating LEAD with existing resources like Drug Court and the Restore shelter-to-treatment program.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Linda Tong

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:	FW: Urgent: Suspend Work on Sloat, Re-evaluate and Modify "Quick Build"
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:27:46 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Mari Eliza regarding a San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) quick-build project on Sloat 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 | 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: Mari Eliza <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 1:24 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Urgent: Suspend Work on Sloat, Re-evaluate and Modify "Quick Build"

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 SFMTA

From your constituent	Mari Eliza
Email	zrants@gmail.com
Subject	Urgent: Suspend Work on Sloat, Re-evaluate and Modify "Quick Build"
Message:	Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors and SFMTA Board,

It has become oppressive to live, work, visit the Sunset District - bad idea after bad idea is being "done TO our community, NOT WITH our community."

This letter was a petition that has been signed by over 549 Residents, Businesses, and Community Members of the Sunset District:

I join them in collectively requesting an immediate and comprehensive Traffic Impact Assessment of the Sloat Boulevard Quick-Build Project, which recently began construction along Sloat Boulevard from the Great Highway to Skyline Boulevard.

Why?

The project proceeded without any meaningful outreach to the residents or businesses that rely on this corridor daily. Many community members were unaware of the scope, timeline, or impacts before construction began. Whether outreach was insufficient, unclear, or missed entirely, the outcome is the same: the Sunset District did not receive a transparent or accessible process.

The changes made so far—including a two-way bikeway, significant parking removal, and reconfigured loading and access zones—were presented as safety improvements. However, the actual consequences have been profoundly detrimental:

Community Impacts

- Loss of approximately 50 parking spaces, reducing access for families, seniors, workers, and local visitors.

- Significant hardship to local businesses, including Java Beach at the Zoo (at 2650 Sloat), a community-serving café operating since 2008.

- Reduced access for older adults and mobility-limited residents visiting the United Irish Cultural Center (UICC), a 501c3 nonprofit, the first Irish social center in the United States built entirely by volunteer labor and community contributions, promoting and preserving Irish culture in the City since 1971.

- Low observed bicycle usage along this segment raises questions about whether the design matches actual travel patterns.

- A lack of balance between safety goals and the essential functioning of neighborhood-serving establishments.

- Additionally, the rerouting of vehicles to Sunset Boulevard and the loss of the southbound road to Skyline, has significantly decreased the amount of exposure to an important local business: Java Beach Cafe.

What We Are Asking For
We support safe streets. We support multimodal transportation. But these goals must be achieved in a way that respects the needs of the community that lives and works here and future generations. We therefore request that the City:

1. Reevaluate the current Sloat Boulevard design, including exploring a Fell-Street-style configuration that protects cyclists while restoring needed access and parking.

2. Conduct an evaluation study, using real usage and access data to determine whether modifications are required.

3. Add Green Zones (short-term parking/loading) in front of businesses like Java Beach at the Zoo to restore basic customer access.

4. Engage in direct, substantive community outreach with Sunset District residents, businesses, and the UICC before further changes are made.

5. Implement substantial support or mitigation strategies for businesses and institutions that face significant and measurable negative impacts as a result of the project.

Our Position
We ask the City to work collaboratively with the community to ensure that transportation improvements do not come at the expense of accessibility, cultural continuity, or neighborhood vitality.

NOTE: SFMTA claims that no parking is eliminated due to repaving of a parking lot at Sloat & Skyline - but that lot already exists - this is NOT new parking - and this lot is used for Christmas trees and a pumpkin patch ... so this is a significant net loss of parking.

Thank you,

Item 22

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 support keeping the Commission on the Environment as a Governance Body
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:31:43 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Robert Hall 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 | 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: Robert Hall <bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 10:34 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please support keeping the Commission on the Environment as a Governance Body

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 that 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.

Robert Hall
bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net
1946 Grove St. Apt. 6
San Francisco, California 94117

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); De Asis, Edward (BOS); BOS-Operations; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Support a Great Highway Compromise Ballot Measure
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:35:48 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Marina Roche regarding the Great Highway/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 | 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: Marina Roche <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Monday, January 5, 2026 11:01 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Wong, Alan (BOS) <alan.wong@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support a Great Highway Compromise Ballot Measure

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

Message to the Supervisors, Dr. Tsai, Kunal and Mayor Lurie

From your constituent Marina Roche

Email marinaroche@icloud.com

Subject Support a Great Highway Compromise Ballot Measure

Message:

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I respectfully urge you to support and co-sponsor Supervisor Alan Wong's ballot measure to allow San Francisco voters to decide on a Great Highway compromise: reopening the road to vehicles on weekdays while preserving car-free use on weekends.

This compromise reflects the will of the people, restores fairness to the decision-making process, and addresses mounting financial and community impacts created by the permanent weekday closure.

Why this measure deserves your support:

1. Voters were never given a real choice.
The compromise option was not included in the prior yes-or-no ballot measure. Claims that the compromise has already been voted on are incorrect. Supervisor Wong's proposal gives voters the option they were denied in 2024.

2. The outcome of Prop K was influenced by misinformation.
Many voters living far from the Great Highway were presented with inaccurate and incomplete information, while the most impacted community, District 4, lost long-standing rights to transparent environmental and traffic review.

3. Traffic conditions have worsened citywide.
Thousands of vehicles have been diverted onto Sunset Boulevard, 19th Avenue, and residential north-south routes, increasing commute times to schools, hospitals, work, and the airport. Daily commuters know traffic is not "fine."

4. Small businesses are losing revenue.
District 4 merchants report declining sales and customer access due to congestion and parking removals. These losses ripple through San Francisco's local economy at a time when small businesses are already struggling.

5. The closure has increased - not reduced - City costs.

Contrary to claims of savings, sand removal has more than doubled. What was previously scheduled twice monthly now occurs weekly, requires additional labor, and includes hand-shoveling around installed structures—driving up expenses dramatically.

6. The Great Highway remains essential infrastructure.
Emergency vehicles and City trucks use it daily. Prior to closure, over 100,000 vehicles per week relied on this corridor, demonstrating its continued utility.

7. Environmental impacts have worsened.
Unrestricted foot traffic over sand dunes has damaged native plants and harmed the protected habitat of endangered Snowy Plovers. The current condition is not environmentally sustainable.

8. Claims about frequent full closures were false.
In 2024, sand removal occurred 14 times—not 65 days—and at least two lanes remained open in nearly all cases. The highway was functional and manageable.

This ballot measure does not force a single outcome—it lets voters decide. Supporting it affirms democratic choice, fiscal responsibility, and shared use of public space.

We ask for your leadership in helping place this compromise on the ballot and allowing San Franciscans to make an informed decision that balances mobility, recreation, environmental stewardship, and economic health.

Please stand with voters. Please co-sponsor this measure.

Respectfully,

SUN and the people

Marina Roche

Item 24

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:	Lobbying activity in San Francisco government - 3 letters
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:44:47 PM
Attachments:	3 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 3 letters, from members of the public, regarding lobbying activity in San Francisco government.

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 | 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: Michael Gaines
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 10:26:27 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 the City Attorney

From your constituent Michael Gaines

Email mvgaines1@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Kathleen Gee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 7:54:30 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 the City Attorney

From your constituent Kathleen Gee

Email kathygee606@att.net

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

From: Mari Eliza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA
Date: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 1:25:26 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 the City Attorney

From your constituent Mari Eliza

Email zrants@gmail.com

Subject No Taxpayer Funding of Groups that Coordinate with and then Lobby SF Government/ SFMTA

Message:

Dear Mayor Lurie, SFMTA Board Members and Board of Supervisors,

It is ironic that the City funds non-profit organizations who then use those funds to lobby the city.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF both actively plan projects with SFMTA and then lobby SFMTA and San Francisco government on behalf of those same projects. And both receive substantial funding from the city.

As a taxpayer I am opposed to funding special interest organizations that lobby against my interests. It is unethical and irresponsible to approve contracts to activist groups who lobby public officials and agencies.

Walk SF received $311,274 from FY 2022-2024 and San Francisco Bike Coalition has received $2,788,151 from FY 2022-2025 from SFMTA. And there is $425,736 still owed to the San Francisco Bike Coalition under its current contract with SFMTA.

The distrust of the Board of Supervisors is high; there were clear conflicts of interest with the previous mayor.

Similarly, trust in SFMTA has diminished due to prior leadership's lack of transparency and fiscal irresponsibility. They funded activist groups such as San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF who bully seniors, people with disabilities, and many other groups who are just trying to get by.

The quality of life of the majority of hard working, taxpaying San Franciscans has decreased over the last several years due to the work of the SFMTA and the BoS.

I urge you to terminate SFMTA’s contracts with San Francisco Bike Coalition and Walk SF effective immediately.

Sincerely,

Item 25

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 4 letters
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:49:47 PM
Attachments:	4 letters.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached 4 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 | 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:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); 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)
Subject:	Re: San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie signs measure to create reparations fund for Black residents
Date:	Friday, January 2, 2026 11:05:55 AM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

https://abc7news.com/post/san-francisco-mayor-daniel-lurie-signs-measure-create-reparations-fund-black-residents-initial-funding/18340758/

Are we reading this well? This just sounds awfully misguided, a rather moronic direction that clearly the past administration could have foolishly taken. However, something I wasn't expecting from this one, being more moderate and so far showing a lot more common-sense.

Isn't this all blatantly illegal and unconstitutional?

Why making it about race? What about other non-Black groups who also were displaced or negatively impacted by past city laws?

Regardless, our city is broke, spends and wastes too much on welfare and other so-called "non-profits". We can't afford to raise taxes either as they're already so high. Not now. Not anytime soon or in the future either.

So, why passing this bill? Whether funded or not, Isn't this all sending the wrong signals? Our city needs recovery, not another doom loop! Not another humiliation on the national stage either.

Please show a little more respect for taxpayers, and their hard-earned taxpayer dollars. Spend wisely, not foolishly and uncontrollably.

Happy new year!

https://nypost.com/2025/12/31/us-news/san-francisco-mayor-quietly-signs-black-reparations-bill/

https://nypost.com/2025/12/18/us-news/san-francisco-moves-to-create-reparations-fund-despite-legal-concerns/

https://nypost.com/2023/01/16/sf-reparations-panel-proposes-5m-lump-sum-payment-to-eligible-residents/

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	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)
Subject:	URGENT - Resurgence of illegal encampments, crackheads, mentally ills, trash, filth, graffitis, all over Lower Nob Hill...
Date:	Saturday, January 3, 2026 9:30:47 AM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

I'd like to bring to your attention the resurgence of illegal encampments, crackheads, mentally ills, trash, filth, graffitis, all over Lower Nob Hill…

In short - We just can't have that.

Please clean this up and remove all encampments and remove all individuals disturbing quality of life from our neighborhood.

Locations include but aren't limited to:

- Polk St from Macalister to Sacramento St
- Larkin St from Macalister to Sacramento St
- Leavenworth St from Macalister to Sacramento St
- Polk/Pine
- Polk/Bush
- Polk/Post
- Austin St
- Fern St
- Hemlock St
- Daniel Burnham Ct
- Cedar St
- Myrtle St
- Alice B Toklas Pl
- Olive St
- Willow St
- Larch St

Sidewalks belong to everyone. Why are you letting these homeless, crackheads and tents infringe the pedestrians' right of way?

Why are our streets so full of trash, filth, every single day? Why can't DPW just do its one and only goddamn job and honor our street and sidewalk cleaning schedule?

How are so many buildings, public and private, covered in graffitis, when the authors appear to always be the very same: Dialate, ARSON, etc… can't SFPD just catch them once and for all to prevent further vandalism?

Where are the long-promised SFPD car and beat patrols in our neighborhood? In the Polk St corridor? Community ambassadors are insufficient, powerless, rather useless and ineffective deterrents. We need proper enforcement from

now on.

We’re at the dawn of a new year, let this be a chance for a much needed reset.

We need peace, order, and the rule of law to prevail, for once in this city. We need to finally see our hard earned taxpayer dollars at work for once in this city.

Clean up this mess, please!
Get to work.

Happy New Year!

JD

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	DPW, (DPW); McCormick, Patrick (POL); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); SauterStaff; SFPD Northern Station, (POL); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	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); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); SherrillStaff; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); info@lowerpolkcbd.org; Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com
Subject:	Re: URGENT - Homeless Encampments, Tents, Crackheads, Trash, Filth, Graffitis, all over Lower Polk
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2026 9:09:52 AM

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

Still an open issue as of this Monday morning. Please address/resolve the matter once and for all.

REMOVE ALL ENCAMPMENTS NOW.

CLEAN UP OUR STREETS.

> On Jan 4, 2026, at 09:49, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> URGENT - Homeless Encampments, Tents, Crackheads, Trash, Filth, Graffitis, all over Lower Polk
>
> Areas include but aren’t limited to:
>
> - 1415 Van Ness Ave
> - 000/100/200 Blocks of Fern St
> - Fern/Larkin (Tents blocking sidewalks despite signs clearly displaying this is a no lodging zone)
> - Bush/Van Ness Ave (Disgusting Graffitis and Illegal Postings
> - 1000/1100/1200/1300 Blocks of Sutter St
> - Van Ness/Sutter
> - Hemlock St
> - Cedar St
> - Myrtle St/Alice B Toklas
> - Willow St
>
> IMMEDIATE RESPONSE/RESOLUTION REQUIRED.
>
> Please advise.

From:	Julien DeFrance
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	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)
Subject:	Re: San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie signs measure to create reparations fund for Black residents
Date:	Monday, January 5, 2026 10:47:36 AM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisors,

Could you please comment on this?

Thanks.

> On Jan 2, 2026, at 11:05, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Dear Mayor and Supervisors,
>
> https://abc7news.com/post/san-francisco-mayor-daniel-lurie-signs-measure-create-reparations-fund-black-residents-initial-funding/18340758/
>
> Are we reading this well? This just sounds awfully misguided, a rather moronic direction that clearly the past administration could have foolishly taken. However, something I wasn't expecting from this one, being more moderate and so far showing a lot more common-sense.
>
> Isn't this all blatantly illegal and unconstitutional?
>
> Why making it about race? What about other non-Black groups who also were displaced or negatively impacted by past city laws?
>
> Regardless, our city is broke, spends and wastes too much on welfare and other so-called "non-profits". We can't afford to raise taxes either as they're already so high. Not now. Not anytime soon or in the future either.
>
> So, why passing this bill? Whether funded or not, Isn't this all sending the wrong signals? Our city needs recovery, not another doom loop! Not another humiliation on the national stage either.
>
> Please show a little more respect for taxpayers, and their hard-earned taxpayer dollars. Spend wisely, not foolishly and uncontrollably.
>
> Happy new year!

https://nypost.com/2025/12/31/us-news/san-francisco-mayor-quietly-signs-black-reparations-bill/

https://nypost.com/2025/12/18/us-news/san-francisco-moves-to-create-reparations-fund-despite-legal-concerns/

https://nypost.com/2023/01/16/sf-reparations-panel-proposes-5m-lump-sum-payment-to-eligible-residents/

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)
Subject:	FW: Proposal for Public Service Initiative: Addressing Audio Fatigue on MUNI
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:54:40 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from Peter Sherman regarding relief from audio fatigue on public transit.

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 | 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: Pete S. <shermanp147@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 3, 2026 8:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Subject: Proposal for Public Service Initiative: Addressing Audio Fatigue on MUNI

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 and the SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council,

I am writing to you as a frequent MUNI passenger and San Francisco resident to address a growing quality-of-life issue on our public transit system: the pervasive use of short-form video apps (such as TikTok, YouTube Shorts, and Instagram Reels) played on high volume without headphones.

While our city thrives on technological innovation, the constant barrage of loud, overlapping audio in the confined space of a bus or light-rail vehicle has created a significant "audio fatigue" for commuters. It disrupts the peace of the traveling environment and, for many, constitutes an avoidable invasion of their personal space.

The Proposal

I am requesting that the Board and the SFMTA leadership formally reach out to the major technology companies headquartered or operating within our region. Specifically, I propose that the City asks these platforms to implement Public Service Announcements (PSAs) or in-app notifications that encourage "Commuter Courtesy."

These notifications could:

* Prompt users to silence their audio or use headphones when the app detects movement consistent with public transit.
* Run brief "Digital Citizenship" campaigns highlighting the importance of respect for shared public spaces.
* Remind users that audio fatigue affects the mental well-being of fellow passengers and transit operators alike.

Why San Francisco?

As the global hub for these tech platforms, San Francisco is in a unique position to lead this conversation. By partnering with these companies to foster a culture of "Analog Respect" in a digital world, we can make our transit system more welcoming and less stressful for everyone —especially for those who rely on MUNI for a quiet moment of reflection during their daily commute.

I believe a formal letter from your offices to the leadership of these companies would carry significant weight in encouraging them to take responsibility for how their products impact the physical world.

Thank you for your time and for your dedication to improving the San Francisco commuter experience.

Sincerely,

Peter Sherman

38R Geary daily rider

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)
Subject:	FW: Please do not pit tenants against transit riders in 2026
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 3:00:48 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below from a member of the public regarding public transit funding.

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 | 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: Samantha Mach <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 8:54 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please do not pit tenants against transit riders in 2026

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for all the work that you have done to ensure Muni's continued success. Getting to a place of agreement on the details of a parcel tax is hard, and the proposal recently announced by the SFMTA shows a lot of consideration and improvement from earlier versions that were presented to the public. However, I am concerned that creating new passthroughs to rent-controlled tenants will be an existential problem for the measure at the ballot box.

San Francisco's rent control system exists to protect tenants – many of whom are low-income, elderly, or otherwise vulnerable – from sudden and unaffordable rent increases. Under the current rent ordinance, landlords can already increase rent for rent-stabilized tenants at a fixed rate. This preserves housing stability, affordability, and prevents displacement while still allowing landlords to keep up with rising costs.
I have heard that the Mayor's Office is considering using this measure to carve out an exception to the rent ordinance that would allow landlords to pass through costs associated with this tax to rent-stabilized tenants above the current legal limit. This would be a serious mistake.

Creating new passthroughs for rent-stabilized tenants creates a significant risk to the measure's electoral success.

As a Muni supporter, I do not want to be in a position where transit funding is framed as coming at the expense of rent-stabilized tenants, pitting renters against transit riders in campaign messaging. That framing would fracture a natural base of support and make winning significantly harder. Many of the people most passionate about saving Muni are renters themselves. If this measure for transit funding is seen to depend on weakening long-standing tenant protections, potential volunteers like me are far less likely to engage, organize, and turn out voters.

Just as importantly, this approach would undermine the fairness goals of this proposal by shifting costs onto those least able to pay. It would expose low-income renters – many of whom rely most heavily on Muni – to new and unpredictable housing cost increases. In effect, it would ask the people who depend on public transit the most to pay extra to save it, on top of the rising fares and service cuts we are already experiencing.

I urge you to maintain full rent control protections and clearly prohibit any new passthroughs to rent-controlled tenants. Doing so would strengthen the measure and improve its chances of success at the ballot box.

Samantha
California

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: FW: MUNI - Morning commute and 38/38R
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 3:04:50 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below, from Sooyoung Chung, regarding public transit issues.

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 | 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: Sooyoung Chung <schung032@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 5:38 PM
To: Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; Barnett, Benjamin (MTA) <Benjamin.Barnett@sfmta.com>; alexander.jonlin@sfmta.com
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: MUNI - Morning commute and 38/38R

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

Hello,

I'm writing an email to SFMTA and the SF board in hopes to get a response on what SF is doing to resolve the issues stated below.

I've been an avid San Francisco public transportation user for about 7 years now. Since October '25, I have faced multiple issues with the 38/38R during my morning commute.

1. The buses are so crowded that only 50% of the passengers waiting are able to board
2. I have encountered an active crack pipe user right in front of me in a crowded bus attempting to use the pipe in the bus with no repercussions.
3. A homeless man covered in a feces covered comforter walked into the crowded creating a bio hazard inside. Even with all windows open, the entire bus smelled like poop until he left. People were evacuating the bus when he entered since he was visibly covered in brown stains that smelled like poop.
4. Smelly homeless people drinking and yelling obscene words in the crowded bus, making it difficult to sit next to them.

I wish I could say I feel at ease when riding the Muni, but I've noticed I am slowly becoming fearful of riding the buses. I've had to shift my work schedule and use a different route moving forward.

I can normally tolerate the realities of a city, however, this is unacceptable for people who are trying to commute to work during rush hour. We have nowhere to go aside from accepting the foulness or waiting for the next crowded bus.

Please find a solution for the constant issues on the 38 / 38R and let me know how I can stay up to date with the news and measurable impact.

Thanks so much for your work and hope to hear back soon.

Sooyoung Chung
(650) 815 9971

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); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Public Comment at yesterday"s Board of Supervisors Meeting - For the Record - File No. 251247
Date:	Thursday, January 8, 2026 3:16:37 PM
Attachments:	BOS - Jan 6th 2026 - Public Comment.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from Zach Sharpe, 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 | 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: Zach Sharpe <zach@luminalt.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 4:46 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment at yesterday's Board of Supervisors Meeting - For the Record

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

Hi Board of Supervisors,

I made a public comment at the Board of Supervisors Meeting yesterday and didn't get to make my full statement in the allotted 2 minutes. That said, I would like to submit my comment, attached below, for the record.

Thanks,

Zach

--

Zach Sharpe, *Solar Consultant*
Luminalt
Solar Electric and Clean Energy Storage
Design Build
10 Carolina Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
CSLB#845219
C: (415) 819-5967