

FILE No. 230283

Petitions and Communications received from March 9, 2023, through March 16, 2023, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on March 21, 2023.

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

From the Office of the Mayor, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100, submitting an Acting Mayor Notice designating Supervisor Catherine Stefani as Acting-Mayor effective Tuesday, March 14, 2023, at 10:00 p.m. until Friday, March 17, 2023, at 11:59 p.m., and further designating Supervisor Rafael Mandelman as Acting-Mayor effective Saturday, March 18, 2023, at 12:00 a.m. until Monday, March 20, 2023, at 11:54 p.m. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the Office of the Mayor, making the following (re)appointments to the following bodies. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 4.114

- Port Commission
 - Ed Harrington term ending - May 1, 2024

Reappointments pursuant to Charter, 3.100(18) Section 7.102

- Juvenile Probation Commission
 - Margaret Brodtkin - term ending January 15, 2027
 - Johanna Ruth Lacoé - term ending March 18, 2027

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1.3, submitting Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms. 3 Contracts. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Planning Department, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 36.4(c), submitting the January 2023 Interagency Plan Implementation Committee Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Department on the Status of Women, submitting a monthly update on the Status of Abortion Rights. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Ethics Commission, submitting the Summary of Matters Discussed and Actions Taken at the Ethics Commission regular meeting of March 10, 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the CCSF Pooled Investment Report as of February 28, 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the San Francisco Police Department, submitting a presentation for the Committee of Whole at the Board meeting of March 14, 2023, regarding an Update on Findings and Recommendations Regarding Law Enforcement Practices. File No. 200777. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From Barry Minkin, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From members of the public, regarding home ownership. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From the various organizations, regarding a proposed Resolution urging the Recreation and Park Department and its Commission to immediately adopt flexible criteria for its acquisition of potential open space and green recreation, parklet and pocket park sites in the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill. File No. 230278. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the Dolores Heights Improvement Club, regarding an Ordinance that amended the Administrative Code to require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) to submit to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor a plan to implement a program to provide unsheltered persons in San Francisco with access to shelter and permanent supportive housing (“Place for All Program”). File No. 220281. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Eileen Boken, regarding various subjects. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Kate Robinson, submitting a letter of support for Tracey Mixon for the Homelessness Oversight Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Christine Chiang, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From the Lower Polk Community Benefit District, regarding a proposed Resolution supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 1505, introduced by Assembly Member Freddie Rodriguez, maintaining \$250,000,000 in funding for a state Seismic Retrofitting Program for Soft Story Multifamily Housing in California. File No. 230278. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From a member the public, regarding algal bloom in the San Francisco Bay. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From members of the public, regarding the expiration of the Public Health Emergency Orders. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Richard Skaff, regarding ADA compliance for parklets. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From K. Miller, regarding various subjects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding Community-based Ambassador programs. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Monica D, regarding various subjects. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Wynship Hillier, regarding the Behavioral Health Commission. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding various subjects. 5 Letters Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From members of the public, regarding the treatment of cats and dogs in Seoul, South Korea. 7 Letters Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From members of the public, regarding the Valencia Placemaking Pilot. 32 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Ordinance to amend the Administrative Code to permit law enforcement officials to respond to a federal immigration officer's request for voluntary notification that a person will be released from local custody, for adults who have been convicted of a felony for the sale, possession for sale, or transport for sale, of Fentanyl, and been held to answer for a felony for the sale, possession for sale, or transport for sale, of Fentanyl. 48 Letters. File No. 230161. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From members of the public, regarding the City Budget. 50 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Ordinance to appropriate \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023. File No. 230157. 52 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From members of the public, regarding a Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, September 19, 2023, at 3:00 p.m., to hold a public hearing on the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative updates; a proposed Resolution accepting the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan of the African American Reparations Advisory Committee. File Nos. 230078 and 230109. 55 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Ordinance to appropriate \$27,640,247 of General Fund General Reserves to the Police Department; de-appropriating \$31,151,450 from permanent salaries, mandatory fringe benefits, and overtime for increased overtime budget in the Police Department in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023. File No. 230158. 275 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: FW: Acting Mayor | 3.14-3.20
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 2:55:38 PM
Attachments: [Stefani Mandelman 03.14.23-03.20.23.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached communication from Mayor London N. Breed, designating Supervisor Catherine Stefani as Acting-Mayor effective Tuesday, March 14, 2023, at 10:00 p.m. until Friday, March 17, 2023, at 11:59 p.m. Further designating Supervisor Rafael Mandelman from Saturday, March 18, 2023, at 12:00 a.m. until Monday, March 20, 2023 at 11:54 p.m.

In the even the Mayor is delayed, Supervisor Mandelman will continue to be Acting-Mayor until her return to California.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Paulino, Tom (MYR) <tom.paulino@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2023 2:23 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Subject: Acting Mayor | 3.14-3.20

Hello Madam Clerk,

Please see the attached letter designating Supervisor Catherine Stefani as Acting-Mayor effective Tuesday, March 14, 2023 at 10:00 p.m. until 11:59 p.m. on Friday, March 17, 2023 and further designating Supervisor Rafael Mandelman as Acting-Mayor effective Saturday, March 18, 2023 at 12:00 a.m. until 11:54 p.m. on Monday, March 20, 2023.

Cheers,

Tom Paulino

He/Him

Liaison to the Board of Supervisors

Office of the Mayor

City and County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

March 10, 2023

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100, I hereby designate Supervisor Catherine Stefani as Acting-Mayor effective Tuesday, March 14, 2023 at 10:00 p.m. until 11:59 p.m. on Friday, March 17, 2023. I further designate Supervisor Rafael Mandelman as Acting-Mayor effective Saturday, March 18, 2023 at 12:00 a.m. until Monday, March 20, 2023 at 11:54 p.m.

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

Sincerely,

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

London N. Breed
Mayor

cc: Mr. David Chiu, City Attorney

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Mayoral Nomination - Port Commission
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 2:37:00 PM
Attachments: [Clerk's Memo 3.13.2023.pdf](#)
[Ed Harrington Appointment Letter PORT.pdf](#)
[Ed Harrington CV.pdf](#)
[Ed Harrington Form 700.pdf](#)
[RE Revised appointment Memo required RE For Review Appointment to the Port Commission-Ed Harrington .msg](#)

Dear Supervisors,

On March 13, 2023, the Office of the Mayor submitted the attached complete nomination package. Please see the attached memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instructions.

Thank you,


Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 13, 2023
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Mayoral Nomination - Port Commission

On March 13, 2023, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete nomination package. This nomination is subject to confirmation by the Board and not effective until the Board takes action.

Nomination to the Port Commission, Charter, Section 4.114:

- **Ed Harrington** - term ending May 1, 2024

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.2, the Clerk of the Board shall refer the motion to the Rules Committee and work with the Rules Committee Chair to schedule a hearing.

c: Matt Dorsey - Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney
Tom Paulino - Mayor's Legislative Liaison
Tyra Fennel - Director of Commission Affairs

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

March 13, 2023

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.114 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby make the following appointment of Ed Harrington to the Port Commission for a term ending May 1, 2024, filling the seat formerly held John Burton, who resigned on January 17, 2023.

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

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

Sincerely,

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



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

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 16, 2023
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject:  Mayoral Reappointments - Juvenile Probation Commission

On March 15, 2023, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete reappointment packages pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). Appointments in this category are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (April 14, 2023).

Reappointments to the Juvenile Probation Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 7.102:

- Margaret Brodtkin - term ending January 15, 2027
- Johanna Ruth Lacoë - term ending March 18, 2027

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

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

If you wish to hold a hearing on any of the above reappointments, please let me know in writing by Wednesday, March 22, 2023. Once we receive notice, we will work with the Rules Chair to schedule the hearing.

c: Matt Dorsey - Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney
Tom Paulino - Mayor's Legislative Liaison

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

March 14, 2023

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Section 7.102 & Charter Section 3.100(18) of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following reappointments:

Margaret Brodtkin to the Juvenile Probation Commission for a four year term ending January 15, 2027.

Johanna Ruth Lacoë to the Juvenile Probation Commission for a four year term ending March 18, 2027.

Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how their reappointments represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Sincerely,

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

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

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 3 Letters Regarding 12B Waiver Requirements Request Forms
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:43:00 PM
Attachments: [3 Letters Regarding 12B Waiver Requirments Request Forms.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 3 Letters Regarding 12B Waiver Requirements Request Forms.

Regards,

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

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

From: [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CMD12B0002280 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (ADM) Department Head (Sailaja Kurella)
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 5:04:07 PM
Attachments: [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)



Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002280 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (ADM) Department Head (Sailaja Kurella).

Summary of Request

Requester: Taraneh Moayed

Department: ADM

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

Supplier ID: 0000046493

Requested total cost: \$2,500,000.00

Short Description: Request to Increase Previously Approved Waiver to 12B Requirements for 3rd Party Storage and Logistics Services

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4084644_LxCDCxYMiB8ITHzjVo4Y

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2023-03-16 10:57:47 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0002280	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Taraneh Moayed	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Sailaja Kurella	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2023-03-13 15:36:53	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	ADM
		Requester Phone:	+14155546212
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Taraneh Moayed
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Request to Increase Previously Approved Waiver to 12B Requirements for 3rd Party Storage and Logistics Services

Supplier ID:	0000046493	Requested Amount:	\$0.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	Modification – Prior Waiver NOT Approved in ServiceNow	Increase Amount:	\$1,000,000.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$1,500,000.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$2,500,000.00

Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000021358
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2021-05-01
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2024-04-30

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

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

(a) Pacful Inc

(b) 3rd Party Storage and Logistics Services

(c) In March 2020, OCA commenced to procure bulk Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and other scarce resources on behalf of 60+ City departments, including DPH. This inventory was procured under the City's February 25, 2020 COVID-19 Declared COVID Emergency and was used by City to respond to the pandemic. Beginning July 1, 2021, CCC and DPH were required to vacate Moscone Center. Despite efforts by City's Department of Real Estate to secure warehousing space, City was not able to find the adequate space required to manage its inventory through the end of the pandemic. As a result, on March 12, 2021, OCA issued an emergency solicitation to 3PL providers in the Bay Area. OCA received 4 offers, one of which was withdrawn. Of the remaining three offers, two would not offer services beyond warehousing and receipt of goods and, as such, were deemed non-responsive. On or about April 8, 2020, CCC and DPH selected Pacful Inc., the only remaining responsive bidder. Neither Pacful nor any of the other bidders were 12B Compliant.

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

This was an emergency contract in response to the COVID pandemic. We expected it to last one year. The pandemic extended beyond what was anticipated and so was the contract in response. Now with the COVID emergency declaration having ended, OCA is using Admin Code Section 21.24 which grants City departments the authority to extend a contract beyond what is permitted by its solicitation term in order to ensure critical business operations. Once this contract has ended, we do not expect to continue working with this vendor.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Tamra Winchester	CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Extension of COVID emergency declaration. Approved under Admin Code Section 21.24.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved
---------------	----------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Reason for Determination:

Approved under 12B.5-1(d)(1) authority.

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:

The purpose of this contract was to secure warehousing and logistical services for managing CCC's and DPH's Covid response inventory for the duration of the pandemic. These storage and delivery services were critical to CCC and DPH being able to continue their response to the pandemic. Since then, DEM and DPH have continuously drawn down on their Covid response inventory. However, they are now requesting an additional 12 months to complete exhausting their remaining inventory.

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

Original Purpose: To secure warehousing and logistical services for managing CCC's and DPH's Covid response inventory for the duration of the pandemic. These storage and delivery services were critical to CCC and DPH being able to continue their response to the pandemic. To ensure CCC and DPH have adequate time to plan the relocation of the inventory from Moscone to its new location, and the distribution of that inventory to CCC clients and DPH staff once the move has been completed, City was required to have a contract in place by May 1, 2021. As such, the parties did not have adequate time for Pacful to submit for 12B review and approval. Based on the forgoing reasons, OCA requested that CMD waive the 12B Equal Benefits requirements for this contract.

Current Purpose: These storage and delivery services were critical to CCC and DPH being able to continue their response to the pandemic. Since then, DEM and DPH have continuously drawn down on their Covid response inventory. However, they are now requesting an additional 12 months to complete exhausting their remaining inventory. If they are not able to do so, they will have nowhere to which to move the inventory.

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

In March 2020, OCA commenced to procure bulk Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and other scarce resources on behalf of 60+ City departments, including DPH. This inventory was procured under the City's February 25, 2020 COVID-19 Declared COVID Emergency and was used by City to respond to the pandemic. Beginning July 1, 2021, CCC and DPH were required to vacate Moscone Center. Despite efforts by City's Department of Real Estate to secure warehousing space, City was not able to find the adequate space required to manage its inventory through the end of the pandemic. As a result, on March 12, 2021, OCA issued an emergency solicitation to 3PL providers in the Bay Area. OCA received 4 offers, one of which was withdrawn. Of the remaining three offers, two would not offer services beyond warehousing and receipt of goods and, as such, were deemed non-responsive. On or about April 8, 2020, CCC and DPH selected Pacful Inc., the only remaining responsive bidder. Neither Pacful nor any of the other bidders were 12B Compliant.

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

This contractor has a limited relationship with the City. Taking into account City's need to extend this contract for one more does not defeat the intent of 12B.

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 = CMD12B0002280
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Sailaja Kurella	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	2023-03-13 15:54:47		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 26bfc2311b25e55086e5c918624bcbee
Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2023-03-13 15:52:36	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Draft	2023-03-13 15:52:33	2023-03-13 15:54:47	2 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 15:54:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Dept. Head approval	2023-03-13 15:54:47	2023-03-13 15:54:47	0 Seconds	true
2023-03-13 15:54:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Draft	2023-03-13 15:54:47	2023-03-13 17:03:24	1 Hour 8 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 17:32:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2023-03-13 17:32:41	2023-03-14 07:56:46	14 Hours 24 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 17:03:26	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2023-03-13 17:03:24	2023-03-13 17:32:41	29 Minutes	true
2023-03-14 07:56:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Completed	2023-03-14 07:56:46			false
2023-03-13 17:32:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2023-03-13 17:32:41	2023-03-14 07:56:46	14 Hours 24 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 17:03:26	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2023-03-13 17:03:24	2023-03-13 17:32:41	29 Minutes	true
2023-03-14 07:56:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Completed	2023-03-14 07:56:46			false
2023-03-13 15:52:36	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Draft	2023-03-13 15:52:33	2023-03-13 15:54:47	2 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 15:54:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Draft	2023-03-13 15:54:47	2023-03-13 17:03:24	1 Hour 8 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 15:54:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002280	Dept. Head approval	2023-03-13 15:54:47	2023-03-13 15:54:47	0 Seconds	true

From: [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CMD12B0002275 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 3:57:08 PM
Attachments: [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)



Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002275 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

Summary of Request

Requester: Nathaniel Wong

Department: DPH

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

Supplier ID: 0000012673

Requested total cost: \$1,400.00

Short Description: Online training for Laguna Honda Hospital staff recertification

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4080424_62U2gRqeDoA5YzUpB2Gn

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2023-03-16 10:58:59 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0002275	Request Status:	Rejected by CMD Analyst
Requested for:	Nathaniel Wong	State:	Rejected
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2023-03-10 14:47:19	12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
		Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 271-6158
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Nathaniel Wong
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Online training for Laguna Honda Hospital staff recertification

Supplier ID:	0000012673	Requested Amount:	\$1,400.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$1,400.00

Document Type:	Direct Voucher	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	02450261
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2023-03-10
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2023-06-30

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

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

(a) QUALITY CARE HEALTH FOUNDATION

(b) Online training from Quality Care Health Foundation is related to skilled nursing in intermediate to long term facilities.

(c) This supplier is the industry trade organization that offers the specific training related to staff and nursing skill building and is necessary for the Laguna Honda Hospital's (LHH) recertification.

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

Supplier has not been able to comply but offers training and meetings across the country.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst: Tamra Winchester CMD Director: Stephanie Tang

CMD Analyst Decision: Rejected Select the reason for this request:

CMD Analyst Comments: A recent interpretation of the Chapter 12B Equal Benefits Ordinance has concluded that fees associated with memberships, conferences, educational presentations, training sessions, or publications that are unavailable from another source and are provided by a governmental, professional, or trade organization or association do not meet the definition of "contract" in the Chapter 12B Equal Benefits Ordinance. Compliance is encouraged, not required. A waiver is not necessary.

CMD Director

CMD Director: Stephanie Tang 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:

This supplier is the trade association that offers training in a specific skilled industry - skilled nursing in long term facilities and related operations.

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

LHH is seeking recertification and this is the specific industry's trade association that offers online training to the skilled nursing in long term facilities for adults that include intellectual disabilities or the elderly.

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

This organization is part of the specific trade association/foundation that offers training across the country.

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 = CMD12B0002275
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	2023-03-10 15:28:58		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 9255fe701be5ed1086e5c918624bcb96
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2023-03-10 15:29:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Dept. Head approval	2023-03-10 15:28:58	2023-03-10 15:28:58	0 Seconds	true
2023-03-10 15:28:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Draft	2023-03-10 15:27:58	2023-03-10 15:28:58	1 Minute	true
2023-03-10 15:29:01	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Draft	2023-03-10 15:28:58	2023-03-10 15:56:23	27 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2023-03-10 15:56:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2023-03-10 15:56:23	2023-03-13 15:36:19	2 Days 22 Hours 39 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 15:36:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2023-03-13 15:36:19			false
2023-03-10 15:28:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Draft	2023-03-10 15:27:58	2023-03-10 15:28:58	1 Minute	true
2023-03-10 15:56:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2023-03-10 15:56:23	2023-03-13 15:36:19	2 Days 22 Hours 39 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 15:36:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2023-03-13 15:36:19			false
2023-03-10 15:29:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Dept. Head approval	2023-03-10 15:28:58	2023-03-10 15:28:58	0 Seconds	true
2023-03-10 15:29:01	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002275	Draft	2023-03-10 15:28:58	2023-03-10 15:56:23	27 Minutes	true

From: [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: CMD12B0002177 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 12:23:23 PM
Attachments: [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)



Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002177 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

Summary of Request

Requester: Dereje Geleta

Department: DPH

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

Supplier ID: 0000048714

Requested total cost: \$8,000,000.00

Short Description: 3M Health Information Systems, Inc provides encoder software for use in the SFDPH EPIC Electronic Health Record.

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4079846_Iw3QadRC9F5yqolTM3qb

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2023-03-16 10:59:35 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0002177	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Dereje Geleta	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2023-02-13 11:49:59	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 271-6152
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Dereje Geleta
		Watch list:	Dereje Geleta, Robert Longhitano

Short Description:

3M Health Information Systems, Inc provides encoder software for use in the SFDPH EPIC Electronic Health Record.

Supplier ID:	0000048714	Requested Amount:	\$8,000,000.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$8,000,000.00
Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000027643
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2023-04-01
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2031-12-31

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

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

3M Health Information Systems, Inc will provide encoder software for use in the Department of Public Health EPIC electronic health record and standalone use. The software provided by the contractor will perform HIM coding of inpatient and outpatient procedural coding including, MS-DRG and APR -DRG reimbursement formulary, APC core grouping calculations and other payer formulary calculations, and clinical documentation integrity (CDI). The software also supports standard and customer user defined reporting. The coding provides an increased granularity on patient characteristics that provide better predictive model for resource use and outcomes. It also allows patients information to accurately reflect in billing, research, and quality measure of services. These services are necessary in order to maintain existing legacy applications and to provide enhancements as needed to such systems in order to maintain their effectiveness and achieve full functionality.

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

We have requested the supplier to comply with 12B and the supplier declined.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Tamra Winchester	CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	No compliant source can provide encoder software that is compatible with existing legacy applications.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved
---------------	----------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Reason for Determination:
Approved under 12B.5(d)(1) authority

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:

These services are necessary in order to maintain an effective medical records billing and coding system. In addition the vendor will provide all upgrades and maintenance services maintain the applications effectiveness and achieve full functionality. The system must also be updated as required in order to be in compliance with all regulatory changes that may be present in the industry.

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

The supplier is not compliant with Chapter 12B . We have requested the supplier to comply and the supplier has declined.

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

DPH conducted RFP#SFGOV000006765 and there was only one responsive bidder, which was 3M Health Information System, Inc.

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

3M is an industry leader of product and service and it is essential for DPH to have this service.

We have requested 3M to comply and they have declined due to legacy plans in place at the company . 3M has indicated to the Department that:

"...3M offers the same benefits for opposite- and same-sex domestic partners of employees and their eligible dependents as it offers to married spouses of employees and their eligible dependents. This does not apply to closed legacy plans such as pension and retiree medical which are plans no longer offered to any new hires."

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

Yes

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 = CMD12B0002177
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	2023-03-10 11:50:20		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 340d91bc1b8da95086e5c918624bcb1d
Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2023-03-10 11:50:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Draft	2023-03-10 11:50:20	2023-03-10 12:22:34	32 Minutes	true
2023-02-13 11:50:01	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Draft	2023-02-13 11:49:59	2023-03-10 11:50:20	25 Days	true
2023-03-13 15:34:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2023-03-13 15:34:07	2023-03-13 15:59:38	25 Minutes	true
2023-03-10 12:22:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2023-03-10 12:22:34	2023-03-13 15:34:07	3 Days 2 Hours 11 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2023-03-10 11:50:25	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Dept. Head approval	2023-03-10 11:50:20	2023-03-10 11:50:20	0 Seconds	true
2023-03-13 15:59:41	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Completed	2023-03-13 15:59:38			false
2023-02-13 11:50:01	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Draft	2023-02-13 11:49:59	2023-03-10 11:50:20	25 Days	true
2023-03-10 12:22:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2023-03-10 12:22:34	2023-03-13 15:34:07	3 Days 2 Hours 11 Minutes	true
2023-03-10 11:50:25	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Dept. Head approval	2023-03-10 11:50:20	2023-03-10 11:50:20	0 Seconds	true
2023-03-13 15:59:41	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Completed	2023-03-13 15:59:38			false
2023-03-10 11:50:26	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Draft	2023-03-10 11:50:20	2023-03-10 12:22:34	32 Minutes	true
2023-03-13 15:34:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0002177	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2023-03-13 15:34:07	2023-03-13 15:59:38	25 Minutes	true

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: January 2023 Annual Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) Report
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 9:38:00 PM

Dear Supervisors,

I thought I would send again with Administrative Code, Section 36.4(c).

SEC. 36.4. ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS.

(c) **Submission to Relevant Committee of the Board of Supervisors.** The Annual Progress Report shall also be submitted to the committee of the Board of Supervisors responsible for land use matters, which Committee may schedule a public hearing. Further, the Board urges the Planning Department Director and/or his or her designee who chairs the Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee for each Area Plan to be available to provide a briefing and answer questions about the Report at the appropriate Board of Supervisors committee hearing.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:51 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Entezari, Mehran (BOS) <Mehran.Entezari@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: January 2023 Annual Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) Report

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached Interagency Plan Implementation Committee Report from the Planning Department, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 36.4(c).

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Snyder, Mathew (CPC) <mathew.snyder@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 4:33 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Langlois, Lily (CPC) <lily.langlois@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; Chen, Olivia (ADM) <Olivia.Chen@sfgov.org>
Subject: January 2023 Annual Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) Report

Good Afternoon Supervisor Melgar and Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 36.4(c), the Planning Department is transmitting this year's Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) Report for review by the Land Use and Transportation Committee. Pursuant to Subsection (c), the Committee may request a hearing on the Report.

This report provides a progress report on implementing several of City's Area Plans, which are part of the City's General Plan; more specifically, the Report provides information on the delivery of community benefits/ infrastructure projects through the collection and spending of Area Plan impact fees and CFD revenue.

Please let myself, Lily Langlois of the Planning Department, or Olivia Chen of the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning know if you have any questions or comments. We are also happy to provide the Land Use and Transportation Committee with an informational presentation at one of your upcoming meetings.

The Report is attached and can be found at the link below.

Mat Snyder

[January 2023 IPIC Report](#)

Mat Snyder, Senior Planner
Citywide Planning
San Francisco Planning Department

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7460 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

INTERAGENCY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 2023



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	
Area Plan Reports.....	7
Balboa Park.....	8
Background and Highlights.....	8
Map	10
Expenditure Plan.....	12
Eastern Neighborhoods	14
Background and Highlights.....	14
Project Descriptions	14
Map	20
Expenditure Plan.....	22
Market and Octavia	29
Background and Highlights.....	29
Project Descriptions	30
Map	37
Expenditure Plan.....	40
Rincon Hill.....	47
Background and Highlights.....	47
Background and Highlights.....	47
Project Descriptions	15
Map	50

Front cover photo credits (from upper left clockwise): Treat Plaza, Department of Public Works; Portsmouth Square, Recreation and Parks Department; Gene Friend renovation design, Recreation and Parks Department; Upper Market Street design, Department of Public Works

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

SoMa	53
Background and Highlights.....	53
Project Descriptions	54
Map	59
Expenditure Plan.....	61
Transit Center	67
Background and Highlights.....	67
Project Descriptions	68
Maps.....	72
Expenditure Plan.....	74
Visitacion Valley	78
Background and Highlights.....	78
Maps.....	80
Expenditure Plan.....	82

INTRODUCTION

The Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) is responsible for overseeing the implementation of eleven Area Plans, which taken together, are expected to have created 44,500 housing units and 60,000 jobs over the next twenty to twenty-five years.

To help implement these Area Plans, the City created geographically based impact fees to fund infrastructure projects that serve the Plans' new growth.


Since the creation of IPIC, the City has collected \$256 million dollars of infrastructure-related impact fees and expects to collect \$610 million over the next ten years, of which \$397 million is anticipated in the next five. This assumes development projects that are in the pipeline continue to move forward through construction, albeit at a slower pace.

The Area Plans that IPIC implements includes Eastern Neighborhoods (comprised of separate Area Plans, Mission, Central Waterfront, and Showplace Square / Potrero), Market Octavia, Rincon Hill, SoMa (comprised of separate Area Plan for East SoMa, Central SoMa, and Western SoMa), Transit Center District, Balboa Park and Visitacion Valley.

In general, each Plan Area funds projects under the following five categories:

1. Transit
2. Complete Streets
3. Recreation and Open Space
4. Child Care
5. Administration

MAP OF PLAN AREAS



OVERVIEW

IPIC's duties include identifying capital projects within the Area Plans for implementation, recommending funding amounts for these projects, facilitating intra-departmental collaboration, coordinating with the Area Plans' Community Advisory Committees (CACs), and producing this annual report. The IPIC is chaired by Planning Department and includes representatives from the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), San Francisco Public Works Department (PW), Recreation and Parks Department (RPD), San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), the Department of Early Childhood (DEC), Office of Public Finance (OPF) Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance, and Capital Planning Committee, among other agencies.

This report serves as the annual progress report required by Administrative Code Article 36.4.

EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS

Advancing racial and social equity is an integral part of capital planning in San Francisco, both generally and how it applies to IPIC. Infrastructure projects implemented through IPIC are generally identified through area plans and their implementation documents. Most of the adopted area plans fall within Priority Equity Geographies, areas with a higher density of vulnerable populations including but not limited to people of color, seniors, youth, people with disabilities, linguistically isolated households, and people living in poverty or unemployed.

Per Ordinance No 199-19, all city departments are required to complete a Racial Equity Action Plan. Phase 1 was completed December 2020 and is focused on internal programs and policies. Many city departments are now working on Phase 2 which is focused on external programs and policies. Phase 2 will also address ways to advance racial and social equity in the decision making around capital planning. Some specific examples for how implementing agencies are advancing equity in the programming of impact fee revenue and the delivery of capital projects are described below.

SFMTA has an Equity Strategy that addresses and monitors transit needs of equity communities in conjunction with their biennial budget process. Analysis conducted through this strategy informs SFMTA's ongoing capital planning. San Francisco Public Works, similarly, prioritizes underserved areas for in much of their right-of-way planning, such as tree planting and curb ramp improvements. The Recreation and Parks Department has developed and continually refines equity geographies, which are fully integrated into their process of identifying and prioritizing capital projects.

Furthermore, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (ORCP) has implemented a racial equity budget tool as a part of the annual capital budget process. Through a survey and one-on-one meetings with department staff, the budget tool helps ORCP to prioritize requests for funding and better understand how ORCP can best support departments' racial equity work. By the time infrastructure projects are on IPIC's roster of projects to fund for construction, most projects will have been evaluated with an equity lens. When looking at the geographic distribution of IPIC funded infrastructure projects, roughly 70% fall within Communities of Concern or within 250-feet of their boundaries.

IPIC BUDGET CYCLE PROCESS

Each year, the IPIC updates capital plans for each Area Plan and makes recommendations for impact fee expenditure. Each summer, the Planning Department generates updated development impact fee projections based on known development projects and an assumed rate of planned growth. The updated projections provide a working 'budget' for each area plan. The IPIC and the CACs review the previous year's Board endorsed capital plan and updated impact fee projections. The IPIC then updates the status of ongoing projects, revenue projections, and anticipated future projects. Over the fall, the IPIC and the CACs (and other means of community input) develop an area-specific expenditure plan for each plan area through an iterative process. The community provides recommendations regarding community priorities. The IPIC provides input on project readiness and the next steps to move community priorities forward. The expenditure plans are fiscally constrained by projected revenue for each area.

TRENDS, OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Slowing Of Revenue

For a fourth year in a row, revenue came in more slowly than anticipated; this trend was noticed first three years ago and continues to be the trend due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the City's recovery, construction costs, and the changing nature of office use. As a result, many infrastructure projects for which funds were appropriated in FY22 and before have not received the funds as originally planned; most of the Expenditure Plans now show "appropriation deficits" through FY22, the most recently completed fiscal year.


In most cases, these "appropriation deficits" also carry forward to the current and upcoming fiscal years, due to downward adjustments to revenue projections. Because revenue has not come in at the pace anticipated and the

need for revenue to catch up to previous commitments, except in a few circumstances, IPIC has decided to fund very few new projects in the next two fiscal years, and proposes pushing out previously programmed projects to FY26 and later.

Community Advisory Committee

Community Advisory Committees (CACs) play an important role in advising the Planning Department and IPIC on the prioritization of impact fee revenue. Over the last year, there have been several vacant seats on the CACs. Having vacancies on the CAC can create challenges of having quorum and limiting the CAC in being able to take a formal action on agenda items. The Planning Department works proactively with the Board and the Mayor's Office to appoint new members and to ensure member terms are up to date.

IPIC BUDGET CYCLE PROCESS



AREA PLAN REPORTS

The following Chapters provide summaries for each Plan Area. Each chapter provides a brief description of highlights from the previous year, a list and description of current and future capital projects, a map of capital projects, and a five-year expenditure plan related to Area Plan fee revenue. The Plan Areas covered in this report are:

- 1. BALBOA PARK**
- 2. EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS**
- 3. MARKET AND OCTAVIA**
- 4. RINCON HILL**
- 5. SOUTH OF MARKET (SOMA)**
- 6. TRANSIT CENTER**
- 7. VISITATION VALLEY**

BALBOA PARK

Background and Highlights

The Balboa Park Station Area Plan was adopted in the spring of 2009. The plan calls for a number of major transportation and public realm infrastructure improvements and 1,780 new housing units. With few of those units built or proposed, the Planning Department projects approximately \$724,000 in impact fee revenue in the Plan Area through Fiscal Year 2028.

The plan is not expected to generate a significant amount of impact fee revenue for two reasons. First, a significant majority of expected new development is proposed on publicly-owned land, which prioritizes affordable housing. Second, the plan area contains generally few privately-owned developable sites. The current projections are based both on actual development projects in the pipeline and expected additional development project in future years. The expected revenues that are generated will be allocated to the appropriate agencies to fund streetscape, open space or other projects in the plan area.

Due to the several ongoing planning efforts and projected funding needs beyond the scale of projected impact fees, the IPIC has been allocating enhancement funds to close funding gaps and complete agency projects that further the goals of the area plan.

Despite the minimal impact fees, the Balboa Park Station Area continues to be a focus of ongoing improvement and future planning to increase the safety, access and mobility improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders particularly along the Ocean and Geneva Corridor. To that end, several transportation plans and projects were recently completed, while still others get closer to implementation. In addition to transportation projects, the Upper Yard project construction began in June 2021. Additional projects are summarized below.

Ongoing Planning

BALBOA RESERVOIR

The Balboa Reservoir Site is a 17-acre parking lot owned by the SFPUC and leased to City College. It lies between Ocean Avenue residences, City College, Riordan High School and the Westwood Park neighborhood. As part of San Francisco's Public Lands for Housing program, a mix of affordable housing, market-rate housing and open space is planned for the site. The Project's Master Plan and Development

Agreement (DA) – the latter establishes the terms of the Balboa Reservoir project between the City and the Project Sponsor – were unanimously approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in May 2020 and August 2020, respectively. The construction of the first phase is expected to start in 2023.

UPPER YARD

The MOHCD is working with SFMTA and BART to develop affordable housing on the Upper Yard of Balboa Park Station. Construction on 131 new affordable homes at the Balboa Park Upper Yard began in June 2021. The completed design will feature not only new affordable housing, but also associated community benefits such as a licensed early childhood education center with an outdoor activity area, a family resource center, and two additional commercial spaces with operators to be determined. The BART drop off area and southern plaza will also be redesigned as part of the project, which formally kicked off in 2016 when a developer team was selected. Construction is expected to conclude summer 2023.

CITY COLLEGE FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

This Master Plan provides a strategy for facilities improvement, renovation, replacement, and new construction over the next 10 years in order to support the Education Master Plan. In March 2019, City College adopted the FMP, and its environmental impact report was certified and adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 24, 2021.

OCEAN AND GENEVA CORRIDOR DESIGN PLAN

Pedestrian safety and access to Balboa Park Station continues to be one of the highest community priorities. The Ocean and Geneva Corridor Design, from Frida Kahlo Way to San Jose, includes concept designs to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety along Ocean Avenue; realign the Ocean/FKW/Geneva intersection; and add bike facilities, bulb-outs, trees, and lighting. Planning and implementing agencies will continue collaborating to secure capital funds for implementation.

FRIDA KAHLO WAY / OCEAN AVE / GENEVA AVE INTERSECTION PROJECT

This project resulted in a planning document in early 2021 (available on its project website – sfmta.com/oceanavesafety) for improving safety, accessibility, and comfort for people traveling through the Frida Kahlo Way / Ocean Ave / Geneva Ave intersection. This document will serve as a jump-off point for future efforts, including a quick-build project to improve traffic safety and transit reliability at and near the intersection in 2023.

GENEVA AVENUE/SAN JOSE AVENUE INTERSECTION STUDY

A planning study was completed in 2020 which included recommendations for relocated M Line stops on San Jose Avenue at Niagara Avenue with large transit bulb-outs. The study also informed the streetscape design for the adjacent Upper Yard housing development which broke ground in 2021. The SFMTA is partnering with SFPW on conceptual engineering for the relocated M Line stops via the broader M Ocean View Transit and Safety Project and will seek funding for detailed design and implementation.

I-280 SOUTHBOUND OFF-RAMP

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) is planning to realign the I-280 Southbound Off-Ramp at Ocean Ave to improve safety along Ocean Ave at the intersection. The SFCTA completed the environmental phase and Caltrans approved the project study report-project report (PSR-PR) in early 2021. The project team recently secured funding for the design phase. SFCTA will release an RFP for design. The design phase is anticipated to start in 2022 and construction phase in 2024.



Balboa Park Projects

1. Unity Plaza
2. Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design
3. Ingleside Library Garden
4. Lee Avenue and Brighton Avenue Extension Plazas
5. Balboa Park Station Area and Plaza improvements
6. Geneva Car Barn

Revenue And Expenditure

Revenue Summary: Actuals Through FY22; Projected FY 23 and forward

	FY 23	FY 24	FY 25	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY28	THROUGH	FY 29 - FY33	THROUGH
	THROUGH FY22	(CURRENT YEAR)	(BUDGET YEAR2)					FY28		FY33
3 GENERAL	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4 TRANSPORTATION / TRANSIT	\$ 1,670,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 74,000	\$ 1,744,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 1,748,000
5 COMPLETE STREETS	\$ 263,000	\$ 81,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 214,000	\$ 477,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 490,000
6 RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	\$ 202,000	\$ 62,000	\$ -	\$ 31,000	\$ 31,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 163,000	\$ 365,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 375,000
9 CHILDCARE	\$ 117,000	\$ 32,000	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 84,000	\$ 201,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 206,000
11 ADMIN	\$ 30,000	\$ 11,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 58,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000
12 Total	\$ 2,282,000	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$ 107,000	\$ 107,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 563,000	\$ 2,845,000	\$ 34,000	\$ 2,879,000
13 Total In-Kind Value	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
14 Total Cash Value	\$ 2,282,000	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$ 107,000	\$ 107,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 563,000	\$ 2,845,000	\$ 34,000	\$ 2,879,000

Transportation / Transit

1 Revenue	\$ 1,670,000	\$ -	\$ 28,000	\$ -	\$ 14,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 38,000	\$ 74,000	\$ 1,744,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 1,748,000
2 Expenditure	\$ 1,667,000	\$ -	\$ 38,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,000	\$ 1,705,000	\$ -	\$ 1,705,000	
3 Transit: Planning and Near-Term Improvements/Enhancement Fund											
MTA											
Transferred	\$ 88,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 88,000	\$ -	\$ 88,000	
Appropriated/not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,000	\$ 38,000	\$ -	\$ 38,000	
4 Plaza (In-Kind)											
IN-KIND											
Transferred	\$ 1,579,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,579,000	\$ -	\$ 1,579,000	
Appropriated/not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
5 Category Balance Per Year	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ (10,000)	\$ -	\$ 14,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 36,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 43,000	
6 Category Cumulative Balance Per Year	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ (7,000)	\$ 7,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 43,000	\$ 43,000	

Complete Streets

7 Revenue	\$ 263,000	\$ -	\$ 81,000	\$ -	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 214,000	\$ 477,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 490,000
8 Expenditure	\$ 294,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 344,000	\$ -	\$ 344,000	
9 Pedestrian, Bicycle and Streetscape Enhancement Fund											
DPW											
Transferred	\$ 260,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 260,000	\$ -	\$ 260,000	
Appropriated/not Transferred	\$ 34,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,000	\$ -	\$ 34,000	
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	
10 Category Balance Per Year	\$ (31,000)	\$ -	\$ 31,000	\$ -	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 145,000	\$ 333,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 146,000	
11 Category Cumulative Balance Per Year	\$ (31,000)	\$ (31,000)	\$ -	\$ 41,000	\$ 82,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 146,000	\$ 146,000	

	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY24 - FY28	THROUGH FY28	FY29 - FY33	THROUGH FY33
12. Revenue	\$ 202,000	\$ -	\$ 62,000	\$ -	\$ 31,000	\$ 31,000	\$ 38,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 365,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 375,000
13. Expenditure	\$ 237,000	\$ -	\$ 27,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,000	\$ 264,000	\$ -	\$ 264,000
14. Recreation and Open Space: Planning and Near-Term Improvements Fund	\$ 233,768	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 233,768	\$ -	\$ 233,768
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated/not Transferred	\$ 3,232	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,232	\$ -	\$ 3,232
Programmed	\$ -	\$ 27,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,000	\$ 27,000	\$ -	\$ 27,000
15. Category Balance Per Year	\$ (35,000)	\$ -	\$ 35,000	\$ -	\$ 31,000	\$ 31,000	\$ 38,000	\$ 136,000	\$ 101,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 111,000
16. Category Cumulative Balance Per Year	\$ (35,000)	\$ (35,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 401,000	\$ 401,000	\$ 111,000	\$ 111,000
Child Care											
17. Revenue	\$ 117,000	\$ -	\$ 32,000	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 84,000	\$ 201,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 206,000
18. Expenditure	\$ 132,000	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ 149,000	\$ -	\$ 149,000
19. OECE Child Care NOFA Program	\$ 89,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 89,000	\$ -	\$ 89,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated/not Transferred	\$ 43,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,000	\$ -	\$ 43,000
Programmed	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ 17,000	\$ -	\$ 17,000
20. Category Balance Per Year	\$ (15,000)	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 57,000
21. Category Cumulative Balance Per Year	\$ (15,000)	\$ (15,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ 32,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 57,000	\$ 57,000
Program Administration											
22. Revenue	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 11,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 58,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 60,000
23. Expenditure	\$ 10,045	\$ -	\$ 23,955	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ 34,955	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ 45,000
24. Admin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated/not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Programmed	\$ -	\$ 23,955	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ 34,955	\$ 34,955	\$ -	\$ 34,955
25. Admin Transfer to Programs	\$ 19,955	\$ -	\$ (12,955)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,000)	\$ 7,000	\$ (6,955)	\$ 13,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 15,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated/not Transferred	\$ 19,955	\$ -	\$ (12,955)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,000)	\$ 7,000	\$ (6,955)	\$ 13,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 15,000
Programmed	\$ -	\$ 19,955	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
26. Category Balance Per Year	\$ 19,955	\$ -	\$ 19,955	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
27. Category Cumulative Balance Per Year	\$ 19,955	\$ (8,045)	\$ 11,910	\$ -	\$ 18,910	\$ 25,910	\$ 38,910	\$ 51,910	\$ 64,910	\$ 79,910	\$ 94,910
RUNNING TOTALS											
28. Revenue Totals	\$ 2,282,000	\$ -	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$ 107,000	\$ 107,000	\$ 136,000	\$ 563,000	\$ 2,845,000	\$ 34,000	\$ 2,879,000
29. Total Expenditures	\$ 2,340,045	\$ -	\$ 355,955	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ 166,955	\$ 2,507,000	\$ -	\$ 2,507,000
30. Annual Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (58,045)	\$ -	\$ 58,045	\$ -	\$ 102,000	\$ 101,000	\$ 136,000	\$ 396,045	\$ 338,000	\$ 34,000	\$ 372,000
31. Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (58,045)	\$ (58,045)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 102,000	\$ 203,000	\$ 339,000	\$ 338,000	\$ 338,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000

EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS

Background and Highlights

The Eastern Neighborhoods (EN) Area Plan (originally comprised of East SoMa, Western SoMa, the Mission, Showplace Square / Potrero, and Central Waterfront (aka Dogpatch)), adopted in early 2009, provided new land use policies and regulations that, among other things, preserved land specifically for production, distribution and repair uses (PDR), made available previously industrial neighborhoods to mixed use development, and set forth policies that require new mixed use and residential neighborhoods be developed as complete neighborhoods.

The original approvals for the Plan included an implementation document that laid out the types of infrastructure improvements that should be pursued along with suggested sources of funding. The Plan included the establishment of the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee, as a key funding mechanism.

Unlike other Area Plans, which included specific lists of capital improvements, the EN Area Plans identifies capital projects on a much more conceptual and programmatic level. For example, the Implementation Document established the goal of constructing one new park and rehabilitating an existing park in each of the EN Neighborhoods.

To further identify and define capital projects, the Planning Department has published several implementation plans. These Plans include The Mission District Streetscape Plan, the Showplace Square Open Space Plan, EN Trips, and the Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan. Because capital improvements were described at a fairly high level in the initial Eastern Neighborhoods approvals, Planning works with the implementing agencies, the CAC, and community to identify and prioritize projects on an ongoing basis.

In the next five years (FY24 through FY28), the City expects to collect about \$30,000,000 in impact fees, which is slightly higher than last year's projections. The additional revenue would be skewed toward the "Complete Streets" category because the increased revenue is projected to come from commercial projects where impact fees are weighed toward the transportation categories.

Ongoing Planning

SF RAILYARDS PROJECT

Adjacent to the Showplace Square / Potrero Plan area, the SF Railyard Project is currently underway. For more information about the SF Railyard Project, please refer to description under the SoMa narrative.

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

The CAC is to be comprised of 11 members (7 appointed by the Board of Supervisors and 4 appointed by the Mayor), however there are only currently 7 members appointed and active recruitment is ongoing for the 4 seats that are opened in District 8, District 9 and for two seats in District 10. The CAC focuses on implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Program and priority projects.

Project Descriptions

16TH STREET / 22-FILLMORE IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 9)

The 16th Street Improvement Project envisions the transformation of the 16th Street corridor into a highly efficient transit corridor along with pedestrian and streetscape improvements between Church Street and 3rd Street. The project is being phased with construction completed on Phase 1 between Potrero Avenue and 3rd Street in 2020 and construction beginning on Phase 2 between Church Street and Potrero Avenue in 2021 and scheduled to be complete in 2023. The project will include transit only lanes, accessible pedestrian signals and visible crosswalks, new bus shelters and boarding islands, bus bulbs for easier/safer boarding, bus priority traffic signals, and new trees and streetscape improvements.

Project Origin:

Original Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document, EN Plan Area Infrastructure Maps, EN Trips. 16th Street is an EN Priority Project.

Project Status and Delivery:

Phase 1 between Potrero Avenue and 3rd Street is complete. Phase 2 began construction in 2021.

Total Costs:

Approximately \$78,000,000 for both phases

IPIC Funds:

\$21,404,000 total

\$20,365,829 transferred

\$1,038,171 appropriated not transferred

22ND STREET GREEN CONNECTION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 12 AND 22)

Streetscape improvements along 22nd Street in the Dogpatch neighborhood between Illinois Street and Pennsylvania includes new pedestrian lighting, paving, corner bulb-outs, new street trees and drought tolerate planting, and decorative cross walk treatments.

Project Origin:

GreenTrust SF 22nd Street Master Plan; EN Area Plan Implementation Maps; Green Connections Plan

As a “Green Connections” project, the streetscape improvements highlight the streets connection to open space and parks and include ecological features. This Project is rooted in a community initiated and sponsored streetscape plan.

Project Status and Delivery:

Complete

Total Costs:

Approximately \$4,600,000

IPIC Funds:

\$3,800,000

POTRERO AVENUE STREETScape (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 13)

The Potrero Avenue project includes, but is not limited to, roadway repaving, new transit only lanes, protected bike lanes, widen sidewalks, corner bulbouts, street trees and other landscaping and amenities.

Project Origin:

EN Area Plan Implementation Maps.

Project Status and Delivery:

Complete.

Total Costs:

Approximately \$25,000,000

IPIC Funds:

\$1,400,000

PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND STREETScape ENHANCEMENT FUND (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 14 AND 27)

This fund was created to enable flexible, nimble, and strategic spending of Eastern Neighborhood transportation dollars in the short term. The funds are to provide Public Works access to funds that can fill the last gaps of projects and/or to prioritize Eastern Neighborhood projects above others for implementation.

Project Origin:

IPIC

Project Status and Delivery:

Funds are available to streetscape, bike and pedestrian projects upon request and after consultation with IPIC and the EN CAC. Eligible projects generally include, but are not limited to, streetscape projects that are being identified in the Central Waterfront Dogpatch Public Realm Plan.

\$650,000 was allocated to 22nd Street Green Connection (see above); \$400,000 has been allocated to Treat Plaza; and \$1,092,000 has been allocated to a the Potrero Gateway Project.

Remaining funds can be used to backfill EN IPIC projects that have not received revenue transfers.

Total Costs:

\$2,939,000 total .

IPIC Funds:

\$2,939,000 total.

DOGPATCH / CENTRAL WATERFRONT AND SHOWPLACE / POTRERO STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 29)

This IPIC line item was created to set aside funds for Central Waterfront and Showplace/Potrero streetscape projects. The Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan was completed and documents the need for streetscape improvements throughout the Dogpatch neighborhood.

Public Works has been working with the community on an ongoing basis to identify and scope projects for implementation. While funds within this project can also be spent on Showplace / Potrero street projects, IPIC and the CAC indicated a desire to have funds spent in Dogpatch as an initial priority given the readiness of Dogpatch projects.

One Dogpatch Public Realm Plan project is the the Minnesota Streetscape project, which will install sidewalks and streetscape elements (trees, lighting, etc.) along the east side of Minnesota from 23rd to 25th Streets in Dogpatch. The project will also make modifications to the existing linear green space known as Minnesota Grove.

Project Origin:

Dogpatch / Central Waterfront Public Realm Plan; Showplace Square Open Space Plan.

Project Status and Delivery:

Public Realm Plan completed 2018. Minnesota Streetscape project was advertised Fall 2022. Construction anticipated to start Spring 2023.

Total Costs:

TBD; \$4,700,000 for Minnesota Streetscape Project.

IPIC Funds:

\$9,448,000 total

\$2,819,964 transferred

\$3,313,036 appropriated not transferred

\$3,315,000 programmed FY27 through FY29

POTRERO GATEWAY PROJECT (PREVIOUSLY REFERRED TO AS "THE LOOP") (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 48)

The Potrero Gateway (previously referred to as "The Loop") project consists of a series of open space and streetscape improvements under and around Highway 101 on 17th Street between Vermont and San Bruno.

Project Origin:

Community sponsored and proposed project.

Project Status and Delivery:

Project anticipated to set Notice to Proceed in Winter 2022.

Total Costs:

\$5,300,000

IPIC Funds:

\$2,542,000 total

\$1,750,000 transferred (\$1,092,000 from FY17 Ped and Bike Fund)

\$792,000 appropriated not transferred

TREAT PLAZA (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 29.1)

The project will improve safety, comfort, and mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders, and motorists. The sidewalk will be extended farther into the intersection, and planters will offer decorative seating, and provide a protective barrier to traffic.

Project Origin:

The Project was envisioned as part of the Mission District Streetscape Plan.

Project Status and Delivery:

Completed. Undergoing long-term plant establishment period.

Total Costs:

\$2,100,000

IPIC Funds:

\$1,411,000

MISSION RECREATION CENTER REHABILITATION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 40)

Located on a through-block facing both Harrison Street and Treat Avenue between 20th and 21st Street, the facility includes an interior basketball court and fitness center along with an outdoor playground located in an interior courtyard and programming rooms in two different facilities: Mission Recreation Center and Mission Arts Center. Mission Rec and Arts Centers are in need of renovation for seismic safety, upgraded access, and replacement of failing structures, systems, and play features. The building will undergo seismic, structural and feasibility studies to identify potential improvements.

Project Origin:

Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document (the document called for one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods areas)

Project Status and Delivery:

Under Development

Total Costs:

TBD

IPIC Funds:

- \$1,000,000 previously transferred [to be deferred and reappropriated in FY29]
- \$940,000 appropriated but not yet transferred [to be deferred and reappropriated in FY30]
- \$1,800,000 new appropriation in FY30

JACKSON PLAYGROUND (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 41)

The renovation of Jackson Playground will ensure the continued operation as an important local and regional resource and create a vibrant and safe open space for children and adults to enjoy for generations to come. The 4.9-acre Jackson Playground is located in Potrero Hill and occupies an entire city block. Jackson Playground includes picnic areas, tennis, and basketball courts, two ball fields, a children’s play area and clubhouse. REC, in collaboration with the Friends of Jackson Park (FoJP) community group, have worked on a design for the renovation of the park. Improvements will include reorientation and renovation of some existing park amenities such as the sports fields, construction of a new playground, and the relocation, renovation, and extension of the historic clubhouse.

Project Origin:

Original Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document (the document called for one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods areas)

Project Status and Delivery:

Environmental review for REC’s preferred plan at Jackson Playground has been completed in June 2022 and concept approval is anticipated in Fall 2022. The park’s renovation will receive funding from the 2020 Health & Recovery G.O. Bond as a Recovery Park, General Fund, Open Space Fund, and private fundraising generated by FoJP.

Total Costs:

\$ 42,600,000

IPIC Funds:

\$8,000,000

\$640,000 transferred

\$1,000,000 appropriated but not yet transferred

\$6,360,000 Programmed FY24 through FY26

GARFIELD SQUARE AQUATICS CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 42)

The project includes the full renovation of the existing pool building into a higher-capacity Aquatics Center by demolishing and replacing the adjacent clubhouse building. The newly reconfigured aquatic center will include a shared entry lobby to access the pool facility and clubhouse, a new multi-purpose courtyard, new and restored murals and, improved park accessibility and new landscaping.

Project Origin:

2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond.

Project Status and Delivery:

Project completed and open to the public.

Total Costs:

\$21,900,000 million

IPIC Funds:

\$8,700,000

JURI COMMONS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 43)

This Let’sPlaySF! project on this small park located within an old railroad right-of-way has been completely renovate the Children’s Play Area, including accessibility and safety improvements and possibly lighting improvements. Additional funds through the 2012 Bond COF program will fund the renovation of the pathway, new irrigation, fencing, planting, and other amenities at the park.

Project Origin:

Identified as a Let’sPlaySF! Site and Community Opportunity Fund project from the 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond

Project Status and Delivery:

Project completed and open to the public.

Total Costs:

\$1,700,000 million

IPIC Funds:

\$1,000,000

CENTRAL WATERFRONT OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 46)

This line item was created to set aside sufficient funds for Central Waterfront open space rehabilitation projects. Projects for which these funds could be used include, but are not limited to parks not under RPD's jurisdiction including but not limited to Woods Yard, the Minnesota Grove, and Warm Water Cove.

Project Origin:

Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document (the document called for one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods areas)

Project Status and Delivery:

This line item was kept flexible to enable further scoping and prioritization with the community.

Total Costs: TBD

IPIC Funds:

\$1,956,000.

ESPRIT PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 47)

The Esprit Park renovation is a partnership project between REC, UCSF and the Dogpatch and Northwest Potrero Hill Green Benefit District. Renovation of this roughly 2-acre park includes drainage and irrigation improvements, refined circulation throughout the park, retaining the urban forest feel, clarifying functional use areas, and providing infrastructure and amenities for different user groups including children, adult fitness community, and off-leash dog walkers.

Project Origin:

Original Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document (the document called for one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods areas); Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan.

Project Status and Delivery:

Concept plans were approved by the Recreation and Park Commission in February 2021. Construction is expected to begin in the Fall of 2022.

Total Costs:

\$8,500,000

IPIC Funds:

\$3,511,000

FRANKKLIN SQUARE PAR-COURSE AND LIGHTING (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 36)

Park improvements included ADA Accessibility, installation of a concrete seat wall to delineate edge of equipment, additional lighting and parcourse equipment as well as replacement of pathway along Bryant Street.

Project Origin: Eastern Neighborhoods

Project Status and Delivery:

project is completed and opened in 2019.

Total Costs: \$235,000 of which \$210,000 was from impact fees and \$25,000 from Addback.

CHILD CARE (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 57)

The Eastern Neighborhood Plan calls for the construction of new child care facilities to meet the needs of future residents and employees. To spend the funds, IPIC delegates the Department of Early Childhood (DEC) - previously known as the Office of Early Care and Education and now combined with First 5 San Francisco to form a new City department - to work with child care operators to identify new opportunities for child care in the plan area, to develop new facilities and increase access. In 2018, DEC issued a Notice of Availability of Funds and selected the Mission Neighborhood Center to receive \$1,200,000 to go toward the acquisition/renovation of a new site at 1240 Valencia Street.

Project Origin:

Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document

Project Status and Delivery:

Ongoing

IPIC Funds:


In general, DEC receives IPIC EN funds on a formulaic basis based on 6.5% on EN impact fees paid by residential projects, and 2% paid by non-residential projects.

Approximately \$4,100,000 has been appropriated through FY 20.



Eastern Neighborhoods

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|--|
| 9. | 16th Street Streetscape Improvements | 42. | Garfield Square Aquatic Center |
| 10. | 2nd Street Improvements | 43. | Juri Commons |
| 11. | Folsom Street / Howard Street Improvements | 44. | Jose Coronado Playground |
| 12. | 22nd Street Green Connections Improvements | 45. | 11th Street Park (New Soma Park) |
| 13. | Potrero Avenue Improvements | 46. | Central Waterfront Recreation and Open Space |
| 16. | Ringold Alley Improvements | 47. | Esprit Park Rehabilitation |
| 25. | Bartlett Street / Mission Mercado Improvements | 49. | Community Challenge Grant |
| 26. | Central Waterfront Short Term Improvements (Bridge Lighting) | a. | Tunnel Top Park |
| 28. | The Loop Street and Open Space | b. | Angel Alley |
| 29. | Central Waterfront/Dogpatch and Showplace Potrero Streetscapes | c. | Connecticut Friendship Garden |
| 34. | Chan Kaajal Park (17th and Folsom) | d. | Fallen Bridge Park |
| 35. | South Park Rehabilitation | e. | Potrero and Dogpatch Greening |
| 36. | Franklin Square Par-Course | 51. | Daggett Park |
| 38. | Potrero Recreation Center Improvements | 52. | Dogpatch Part Plaza |
| 39. | Gene Friend Park Rehabilitation | 53. | Eagle Plaza |
| 40. | Mission Rec Center Rehabilitation | 59. | Potrero Kids Child Care Center |
| 41. | Jackson Playground Rehabilitation | | |



EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS

- 1. Treat Plaza
- 2. Treat Plaza
- 3. Potrero Gateway: San Bruno Intersection Design
- 4. Minnesota Grove

Photo credits: (1-4) Public Works

Eastern Neighborhoods (Mission, SP/Prateno, Central Waterfront/Dogpath) - IPIC Expenditure Plan FY24 - FY28

Revenue And Expenditure

Revenue Summary: Actuals FY23 and prior; Projected FY24 and Forward

	THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
EH - Non-Soma											
HOUSING (Mission)	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 986,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 278,000	\$ 1,380,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,774,000	\$ 5,251,000	\$ -	\$ 5,251,000
TRANSPORTATION / TRANSIT	\$ 14,916,000	\$ 474,000	\$ 3,098,000	\$ 1,046,000	\$ 2,189,000	\$ 298,000	\$ 936,000	\$ 7,566,000	\$ 22,956,000	\$ 1,740,000	\$ 24,696,000
COMPLETE STREETS	\$ 16,064,000	\$ 933,000	\$ 2,157,000	\$ 998,000	\$ 3,310,000	\$ 922,000	\$ 1,094,000	\$ 9,061,000	\$ 26,076,000	\$ 5,401,000	\$ 31,479,000
RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	\$ 26,325,000	\$ 1,384,000	\$ 709,000	\$ 775,000	\$ 4,082,000	\$ 1,414,000	\$ 2,175,000	\$ 9,155,000	\$ 36,664,000	\$ 8,276,000	\$ 44,940,000
CHILDCARE	\$ 3,648,000	\$ 174,000	\$ 163,000	\$ 121,000	\$ 561,000	\$ 394,000	\$ 398,000	\$ 1,347,000	\$ 5,165,000	\$ 1,133,000	\$ 6,292,000
ADMIN	\$ 3,144,000	\$ 208,000	\$ 323,000	\$ 170,000	\$ 666,000	\$ 149,000	\$ 272,000	\$ 1,520,000	\$ 4,872,000	\$ 871,000	\$ 5,743,000
Total	\$ 66,066,000	\$ 4,159,000	\$ 6,466,000	\$ 3,588,000	\$ 12,127,000	\$ 2,977,000	\$ 5,355,000	\$ 30,393,000	\$ 103,156,000	\$ 17,421,000	\$ 118,411,000

	THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
Revenue	\$ 2,541,000	\$ 986,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 278,000	\$ 1,380,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,774,000	\$ 5,251,000	\$ -	\$ 5,251,000

Housing

	THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
Expenditure											
Mission	\$ 1,589,000										
Transferred											
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 533,000										
Programmed	\$ 776,000	\$ 986,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 278,000	\$ 1,380,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,774,000	\$ 3,486,000	\$ -	\$ 3,486,000
Total	\$ 2,898,000	\$ 986,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 278,000	\$ 1,380,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,774,000	\$ 5,608,000	\$ -	\$ 5,608,000

Expenditure - Non-Soma	\$ 2,898,000	\$ 986,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 278,000	\$ 1,380,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,774,000	\$ 5,608,000	\$ -	\$ 5,608,000
Category Balance Per Year - Non-Soma	\$ (357,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (357,000)	\$ -	\$ (357,000)
Category Cumulative Balance Per Year - Non-Soma	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
Revenue And Expenditure												
Transportation / Transit												
Revenue Non-Soma		\$ 14,935,000	\$ 474,000	\$ 3,098,000	\$ 1,046,000	\$ 2,158,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 936,000	\$ 7,866,000	\$ 22,956,000	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 24,656,000
Expenditure												
9	16th Street / 72nd Filmore Improvements											
	MTA											
	Transferred	\$ 20,385,829								\$ 20,385,829		\$ 20,385,829
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 1,038,171								\$ 1,038,171		\$ 1,038,171
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 21,424,000								\$ 21,424,000		\$ 21,424,000
12	22nd Street Green Connections											
	DPW											
	Transferred	\$ 150,000								\$ 150,000		\$ 150,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 150,000								\$ 150,000		\$ 150,000
13	Potrero Avenue Streetscape*											
	DPW											
	Transferred	\$ 1,418,000								\$ 1,418,000		\$ 1,418,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 1,418,000								\$ 1,418,000		\$ 1,418,000
14	Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Streetscape Enhancement Fund											
	DPW											
	Transferred	\$ 290,000								\$ 290,000		\$ 290,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 290,000								\$ 290,000		\$ 290,000
15	Transit Enhancement Fund - Non-Soma											
	MTA											
	Transferred	\$ 290,000								\$ 290,000		\$ 290,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed	\$ 170,000								\$ 170,000		\$ 170,000
	Total	\$ 460,000								\$ 460,000		\$ 460,000
Expenditure Non-Soma		\$ 23,432,000	\$ 474,000	\$ 3,098,000	\$ 1,046,000	\$ 2,158,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 936,000	\$ 7,866,000	\$ 23,432,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 23,682,000
Category Balance Per Year - Non-Soma		\$ (6,516,000)	\$ 474,000	\$ 3,098,000	\$ 1,046,000	\$ 2,158,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 936,000	\$ 7,866,000	\$ (476,000)	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,014,000
Category Cumulative Balance Per Year - Non-Soma		\$ (6,516,000)	\$ (6,042,000)	\$ (2,944,000)	\$ (1,898,000)	\$ (1,740,000)	\$ (1,450,000)	\$ (476,000)	\$ (476,000)	\$ (476,000)	\$ 796,000	\$ 156,000

* this amount may be adjusted in the future due to potential savings which could then go to other projects

Eastern Neighborhoods (Mission, SP-Potrero, Central Waterfront/Dogpatch) - IPIC Expenditure Plan FY24 - FY28

Revenue And Expenditure

Complete Streets

		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
Revenue Non-Soma		\$ 16,084,000	\$ 933,000	\$ 2,157,000	\$ 998,000	\$ 3,210,000	\$ 922,000	\$ 1,654,000	\$ 9,081,000	\$ 26,078,000	\$ 5,401,000	\$ 31,479,000
Expenditure												
22	DPW	2nd Street Green Connections	Transferred	\$ 3,000,000						\$ 3,000,000		\$ 3,000,000
			Appropriated not Transferred									
			Programmed									
			Total	\$ 3,000,000						\$ 3,000,000		\$ 3,000,000
25	DPW	Bartlett Street/ Mission Mercado	Transferred									
			Appropriated not Transferred									
			Programmed									
			Total									
26	DPW	Central Waterfront Short Term Pedestrian Improvements	Transferred	183,000						183,000		183,000
			Appropriated not Transferred									
			Programmed									
			Total	\$ 183,000						\$ 183,000		\$ 183,000
27	DPW	Pedestrian Bicycle, and Streetscape Enhancement Fund *	Transferred	183,000						183,000		183,000
			Appropriated not Transferred									
			Programmed									
			Total	\$ 183,000						\$ 183,000		\$ 183,000
28	DPW	Potrero Gateway (previously "The Loop")	Transferred	2,939,000						2,939,000		2,939,000
			Appropriated not Transferred									
			Programmed									
			Total	\$ 2,939,000						\$ 2,939,000		\$ 2,939,000
			Transferred	200,000						200,000		200,000
			Appropriated not Transferred									
			Programmed									
			Total	\$ 200,000						\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000

Revenue And Expenditure		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
29	Central Waterfront(Dogpatch), Shawplace/Potero Streetscape Project	DPW										
	Transferred	\$ 2,819,964								\$ 2,819,964		\$ 2,819,964
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 3,313,086								\$ 3,313,086		\$ 3,313,086
	Programmed	\$ -		\$ 2,777,000	\$ 475,000	\$ 3,252,000	\$ 3,252,000	\$ 3,252,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 3,315,000
	Total	\$ 6,133,000		\$ 2,777,000	\$ 475,000	\$ 3,252,000	\$ 3,252,000	\$ 3,252,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 9,448,000
29.1	Treat Plaza	DPW										
	Transferred	\$ 1,011,000								\$ 1,011,000		\$ 1,011,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
	Programmed	\$ -										
	Total	\$ 1,011,000								\$ 1,011,000		\$ 1,011,000
29.2	EN Complete Streets Unprogrammed	DPW										
	Transferred	\$ -										
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
	Programmed	\$ -		\$ 4,094,000	\$ -	\$ 4,094,000	\$ -	\$ 4,094,000	\$ 8,499,855	\$ 8,499,855		\$ 8,499,855
	Total	\$ -		\$ 4,094,000	\$ -	\$ 4,094,000	\$ -	\$ 4,094,000	\$ 8,499,855	\$ 8,499,855		\$ 8,499,855
29.3	Mission Street Trees	DPW										
	Transferred	\$ -										
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
	Programmed	\$ -		\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000		\$ 60,000
	Total	\$ -		\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000		\$ 60,000
	Expenditure Non-Soma	\$ 13,468,000		\$ 69,000	\$ -	\$ 4,094,000	\$ 2,777,000	\$ 4,889,855	\$ 11,811,855	\$ 25,277,855	\$ 63,000	\$ 25,340,855
	Category Balance Per Year - Non-Soma	\$ 2,593,000	\$ 833,000	\$ 2,097,000	\$ 998,000	\$ (784,000)	\$ (1,855,000)	\$ (3,186,855)	\$ (2,820,855)	\$ 800,445	\$ 5,389,000	\$ 6,138,145
	Category Cumulative Balance Per Year - Non-Soma	\$ 2,593,000	\$ 3,531,000	\$ 5,628,000	\$ 6,626,000	\$ 5,842,000	\$ 3,987,000	\$ 800,145	\$ 800,145	\$ 800,145	\$ 6,138,145	\$ 6,138,145

		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
Revenue And Expenditure												
Revenue Non-Soma												
		\$ 26,125,400	\$ 1,384,000	\$ 709,000	\$ 775,000	\$ 4,082,000	\$ 1,414,000	\$ 2,175,000	\$ 9,155,000	\$ 36,664,000	\$ 8,276,000	\$ 44,940,000
Expenditure												
34	17th and Folsom Park											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 3,160,000								\$ 3,160,000		\$ 3,160,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 3,160,000								\$ 3,160,000		\$ 3,160,000
36	Franklin Square Par-Course											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 210,000								\$ 210,000		\$ 210,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 210,000								\$ 210,000		\$ 210,000
38	Potrero Recreation Center											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 1,080,000								\$ 1,080,000		\$ 1,080,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 1,080,000								\$ 1,080,000		\$ 1,080,000
40	Mission Recreation Center*											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 1,000,000								\$ 1,000,000		\$ 1,000,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed	\$ 940,000								\$ 940,000		\$ 940,000
	Total	\$ 1,940,000								\$ 1,940,000		\$ 1,940,000
41	Jackson Playground*											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 640,000								\$ 640,000		\$ 640,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed	\$ 1,000,000								\$ 1,000,000		\$ 1,000,000
	Total	\$ 1,640,000								\$ 1,640,000		\$ 1,640,000
42	Garfield Square Aquatic Center											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 8,738,000								\$ 8,738,000		\$ 8,738,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 8,738,000								\$ 8,738,000		\$ 8,738,000
43	Juri Commons											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 1,000,000								\$ 1,000,000		\$ 1,000,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 1,000,000								\$ 1,000,000		\$ 1,000,000
46	Central Waterfront Recreation and Open Space**											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 1,956,000								\$ 1,956,000		\$ 1,956,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 1,956,000								\$ 1,956,000		\$ 1,956,000
47	Esprit Park											
	RPD											
	Transferred	\$ 3,511,000								\$ 3,511,000		\$ 3,511,000
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 3,511,000								\$ 3,511,000		\$ 3,511,000

Eastern Neighborhoods (Mission, SP/Proteno, Central Waterfront/Dogpatch) - IPIC Expenditure Plan FY24 - FY28

		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
48	Potero Gateway (previously "The Loop")										
	DWP										
	Transferred	\$ 458,000									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 792,000									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 1,250,000									
	ADMIN										
	Transferred	\$ 825,000									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 200,000									
	Programmed	\$ 200,000									
	Total	\$ 1,225,000									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 2,370,000									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 2,370,000									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 850,000									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 850,000									
51	Daggett Park (In-Kind)										
	Transferred	\$ -									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ -									
52	Dogpatch Art Plaza (In-Kind)										
	Transferred	\$ 28,830,000									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,405,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 26,425,000									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 799,623									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (90,623)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 709,000									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,058,000									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 775,000									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ (2,283,000)									
	Programmed	\$ -									
	Total	\$ 819,377									
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 3,102,377									

Eastern Neighborhoods (Mission: SFPotero, Central Waterfront(Dogpatch)) - IPIC Expenditure Plan FY24 - FY28

		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	FY 33
Revenue And Expenditure												
Program Administration												
Revenue Non-Soma		\$ 3,144,000	\$ 208,000	\$ 323,000	\$ 170,000	\$ 606,000	\$ 149,000	\$ 272,000	\$ 1,520,000	\$ 4,872,000	\$ 871,000	\$ 5,743,000
Admin		\$ 2,991,750								\$ 2,991,750		\$ 2,991,750
Appropriated not Transferred		\$ 500,000								\$ 500,000		\$ 500,000
Programmed		\$ 1,991,750	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 83,000	\$ 83,000	\$ 176,968	\$ 460,991	\$ 1,060,991	\$ 351,291	\$ 1,413,842
Total		\$ 3,991,750	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 83,000	\$ 83,000	\$ 176,968	\$ 460,991	\$ 1,413,842	\$ 351,291	\$ 4,905,592
Admin Transfer to Programs - Non-Soma		\$ 1,192,804								\$ 1,192,804		\$ 1,192,804
Appropriated not Transferred		\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
Programmed		\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
Total		\$ 1,192,804	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,192,804	\$ -	\$ 1,192,804
Expenditure Non-Soma		\$ 4,784,554	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,623	\$ 83,000	\$ -	\$ 176,968	\$ 460,991	\$ 5,345,146	\$ 351,291	\$ 5,696,396
Category Balance Per Year - Non-Soma		\$ (1,640,554)	\$ 108,000	\$ 223,000	\$ 69,377	\$ 529,000	\$ 149,000	\$ 95,032	\$ 1,099,409	\$ (473,146)	\$ 517,769	\$ 44,604
Category Cumulative Balance Per Year - Non-Soma		\$ (1,640,554)	\$ (1,532,554)	\$ (1,309,554)	\$ (1,240,177)	\$ (711,177)	\$ (563,177)	\$ (473,146)	\$ (473,146)	\$ (84,386)	\$ (84,386)	\$ (84,386)
68 Revenue Totals		\$ 66,006,000	\$ 4,159,000	\$ 6,466,000	\$ 3,388,000	\$ 12,127,000	\$ 2,977,000	\$ 5,435,000	\$ 30,393,000	\$ 101,156,000	\$ 17,421,000	\$ 118,411,000
69 Total Expenditures		\$ 76,577,377	\$ 1,286,000	\$ 975,623	\$ 3,436,623	\$ 8,659,377	\$ 2,977,000	\$ 5,435,001	\$ 21,483,624	\$ 101,347,000	\$ 2,535,183	\$ 103,882,184
70 Annual Surplus (Deficit)		\$ (12,139,377)	\$ 2,873,000	\$ 5,490,377	\$ (48,623)	\$ 3,467,623	\$ -	\$ (1)	\$ 8,909,376	\$ (357,000)	\$ 15,346,817	\$ 14,528,816
72 Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)		\$ (11,923,377)	\$ (8,395,377)	\$ (3,435,000)	\$ (3,487,623)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (0)	\$ (0)	\$ (0)	\$ 14,885,816	\$ 14,885,816

MARKET AND OCTAVIA

Background and Highlights

The Market and Octavia Area Plan has been in effect since May 2007. The Plan envisions a neighborhood that functions holistically as a truly urban place by providing mixed-use infill development and affordable housing, buildings and open spaces that foster a unique sense of place, and a street and public realm experience that is inviting to pedestrians and cyclists and provides balanced transportation options.

The Plan included zoning actions to encourage the development of mixed-use infill projects. From 2015 through the end of 2021, about 2,384 net new units have been added in the Plan Area; of these, about 420 units are affordable Below Market Rate (BMR) rental or ownership units, representing roughly 17 percent of new units delivered in the last five years. Another 43 development projects, totaling approximately 4,496 units, were in the Planning Department’s development pipeline as of the end of 2021, including those currently under construction.

In support of this growth and the Plan Area vision, the Plan also included a list of programmatic and discrete community improvements (Market and Octavia Plan, Appendix C), many of which are underway or have been completed, and some have not commenced or are ongoing in nature. These improvements and others that support the goals and objectives of the Plan draw on a number of funding sources, which are detailed below. More information, visit the Plan Area website: <http://sf-planning.org/market-octavia-area-plan>

COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUNDING

Projects in the Plan Area are subject to the Market and Octavia Community Infrastructure Fee. The revenue from this fee must be allocated to projects within the Plan Area for transportation, complete streets, recreation and open space, childcare, and program administration in the proportion set out in the Planning Code.

Projects in the Van Ness and Market Special Use District (SUD) may be subject to two additional impact fees, one for housing and one for infrastructure projects.

Funds collected under the Van Ness and Market SUD Infrastructure fee are required to be allocated to the same funding categories as the area plan fees, but revenue must be prioritized for community improvement projects located within and adjacent to the SUD. Revenue from this fee is projected at a total of \$21,400,000 over the next five years. A new community facilities fee was established in 2020 to fund community facilities in and adjacent to the plan area.

In addition to impact fee revenue, other funding sources have been identified for Plan Area improvements, including revenues from the sale of the Central Freeway parcels. Parcel sales to date have yielded a total of \$56,000,000. Most of these revenues have been spent on a series of community amenities adjacent to the Central Freeway, including the West SoMa skate park and dog run, and the McCoppin Hub Plaza. An additional \$12,700,000 has been dedicated to maintaining a state of good repair for Van Ness Avenue. In addition, proceeds from the sale of remaining parcels are projected to yield a total of between \$2,000,000 and \$5,000,000; these sales may take place in 2023 or at another point in the future. The funds from these sales have not yet been programmed but must be dedicated to transportation and streetscape improvements in the Market and Octavia area.

Ongoing Planning

THE MARKET AND OCTAVIA COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee (MO CAC) is a representative body that provides advice to the City regarding implementation of the Market and Octavia Area Plan and the Plan’s community improvements. The Market Octavia CAC aims to have a varied composition of renters, owners, small business advocates, and members of other neighborhood groups. The Market and Octavia CAC is composed of nine members of the public, appointed by the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor. The CAC currently has seven seated members, and is engaged in ongoing recruitment to fill the other two seats. The Market Octavia Community Advisory Committee approved the five-year expenditure plan on November 14, 2022, which includes support for expenditures on streetscape, transit, and bicycle infrastructure projects.

OCTAVIA BOULEVARD COMMEMORATION PROJECT

In 1989, the Loma Prieta earthquake damaged the Hayes Valley elevated Central Freeway section, giving opportunity to a grassroots city-wide campaign to remove the freeway. A Citizens Task Force pushed for the damaged freeway to be replaced by a street level boulevard, and in 1999, San Franciscans voted to tear down the freeway and replace it. The final Octavia Boulevard opened in 2005, symbolizing a win for a citizen-driven mission to create community on an underutilized site. In 2018, a portion of impact fees collected in the Market and Octavia Plan area were allocated towards a planning process to gather community input on a design proposal to commemorate this event. A final conceptual design was selected through a community process in 2021 led by the Parks Alliance. The Parks Alliance

is working with the community to refine the design and outline steps for implementation. For more information on the Commemoration Project, please visit the website: byebyefreeway.org

Project Descriptions

LIGHT RAIL SERVICE ENHANCEMENT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 4)

The Light Rail Vehicle enhancement will allow MTA to run two-car trains on lines currently running only one-car trains; vehicle availability is one of the major reasons MTA must run one-car trains on some lines.

Additional vehicles will also allow MTA to provide more targeted demand-based service deployments, such as like the Cole Valley and Castro shuttles. As the max load point in the city's rail system, the Muni stations and stops in the Market and Octavia Area benefit greatly from additional capacity due to these shuttles. These additional vehicles may eventually allow the SFMTA to run up to four car trains from the Embarcadero to West Portal and three car trains on the N Judah line.

Project Origin:

SFMTA

Project Status and Delivery:

Underway

Total Costs:

\$5,250,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$5,250,000

\$1,713,913 transferred

\$3,536,085 appropriated not transferred

VAN NESS BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) – VAN NESS AND MISSION PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 6 AND 36)

The Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project will provide rapid bus service along the Van Ness corridor. Impact fee revenues will be used to support related pedestrian improvements including station and platform work in the portion of the corridor contained in the Plan Area.

Project Origin:

SFMTA

Project Status and Delivery:

Construction complete and BRT operational.

Total Costs:

approx. \$309,300,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$1,500,000

VALENCIA PROTECTED BIKE LANES (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 8)

Project implemented a quick build project to plan, design, and construct upgraded protected bikeways on Valencia Street from Market Street to 15th Street, following the recommendations of the Hub Public Realm Plan. Implementation from 19th Street to Cesar Chavez is scheduled in 2020 and implementation from 15th to 19th Streets is scheduled in 2021. Valencia Street has changed rapidly with the COVID-19 pandemic and utilization of the Shared Spaces Program. SFMTA is currently installing immediate improvements along the corridor and assessing bigger and bolder ideas for the future of the corridor and implementation of this project from 15th Street to Cesar Chavez.

The project will design protected bikeways in conjunction with community outreach, including extensive analysis of curb management and turn restrictions to ensure that Valencia Street works for all users.

Project Origin:

Hub Public Realm Plan

Total Costs:

\$15,859,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$4,650,000 total

\$1,000,000 transferred

\$3,650,000 appropriated not transferred

WESTERN ADDITION CBTP IMPLEMENTATION (MAP / EXPENDITURE LINE ITEM NO. 9)

Implement medium-term project efforts identified in the Western Addition Community Based Transportation Plan. This includes traffic-calming and pedestrian safety corridor treatments on Golden Gate Avenue, Turk Street and Laguna Street, pedestrian countdown signals at selected intersections, and pedestrian rapid flashing beacons at mid-block crossings on the former Octavia Street ROW corridor.

Additionally, the SFMTA is dedicating \$27,000,000 to Traffic Signal Upgrades in the Western Addition Area.

For more see the Western Addition CBTP recommendations at <https://www.sfmta.com/projects/western-addition-community-based-transportation-plan-wacbtcp>.

Project Origin:

Western Addition Community Based Transportation Plan (SFMTA CIP)

Project Status and Delivery:

Design commenced in 2019. Construction is planned for completion in summer of 2023.

Total Costs:

\$3,711,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$725,000 total

\$330,000 transferred

\$395,000 appropriated not transferred

HUB TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS FUND (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10)

To fund projects consistent with the Hub Public Realm Plan and SFMTA Capital Improvements Plan to ensure that transit and transportation services are enhanced to support significant growth in the Hub area over the next several years, including Local Muni Bus Transit Signal Priority devices that will improve transit reliability.

Projects will be scoped by SFMTA on a rolling basis, with input from the MO CAC, and are anticipated to include substantial enhancements to the Van Ness Muni Station and circulation improvements in the Hub area to reduce traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian conflicts in the area. Some of this fund will be used to purchase and deploy Transit Signal Priority (TSP) devices and communications equipment in the Hub area.

Project Origin:

Hub Public Realm Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Ongoing

Total Costs:

TBD

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$11,574,000 total

\$304,000 transferred

\$5,515,860 appropriated not transferred

\$5,754,000 programmed FY26 through FY28

LOCAL MUNI BUS TRANSIT SIGNAL PRIORITY (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10.1)

To purchase and deploy Transit Signal Priority (TSP) devices and communications equipment for intersections on the Local Muni Bus TSP network and to replace aging traffic signal controllers and cabinets within and servicing the plan area. This project will improve travel time and service reliability for Muni riders.

Project Origin:

SFMTA

Project Status and Delivery:

Project is on-going with intersections in the Market-Octavia area scheduled for TSP implementation. Project is continuing implementation along the 14 Mission and 22 Fillmore lines serving the plan area.

Total Costs:

\$38,700,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$196,000 (transferred)

PAGE STREET NEIGHBORWAY PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 26)

The Page Street Neighborway (formerly the Page Street Green Connection project) is a series of efforts to transform Page Street into a safer and more pleasant place to walk and bike to neighborhood destinations and nearby parks and provide landscaping and greening opportunities as appropriate.

'Phase One' of the project comprises capital improvements for the segment of the corridor within the Market & Octavia Plan Area (from Market Street to Webster Street), including multiple corner bulbouts, a raised intersection at Buchanan, and sidewalk landscaping.

Related pilot circulation and bikeway changes include: traffic diversion at Webster and Octavia streets; one-way conversion from Octavia to Laguna; Class II, III and IV bikeway facilities on Page Street; parking/turn restrictions on Haight Street; and the implementation of the Page Slow Street Project from Gough to Stanyan Streets.

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Contract was awarded in August 2021. Completion expected by Summer 2024.

Total Costs:

\$2,700,000 (Phase One)

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$1,250,000 total (transferred).

UPPER MARKET PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 30 AND 30.1)

SFMTA's Upper Market Street Safety Project is substantially funded by impact fee revenue for work along Market Street extending from Octavia Boulevard to Castro Street. Improvements include sidewalk bulbouts and ADA accessibility upgrades (most locations are implemented currently with painted pedestrian safety zones), signal timing and hardware improvements, landscaping and public realm enhancements, enhanced transit access, and bicycle improvements including enhanced bike lanes west of Buchanan and a physically protected bikeway from Buchanan/Duboce to Octavia Boulevard.

Additional related project elements that have yet to receive approval include potential circulation changes (turn restrictions, new protected turn phases) and implementation of a comprehensive curbspace management plan.

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Construction began in July 2020. Project expected to be completed in 2023.

Total Costs:

\$10,000,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$4,305,257

13TH STREET BIKE IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 39.2)

This project will create protected bikeways on 13th Street from Folsom Street to Valencia Street, following the recommendations of the Hub Public Realm Plan. The project will provide an important bike connection from Valencia Street to the existing protected bike lanes on 13th St, substantial signal modifications, and key pedestrian safety elements. This project does not include long-term elements of the Hub Public Realm Plan design, including sidewalk widening, re-paving, lighting, and green infrastructure.

Project Origin:

Hub Public Realm Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Design in 2020; Construction is planned to commence in 2023; Completion by 2024

Total Costs:

\$9,388,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$175,000 appropriated not transferred

LIVING ALLEYS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 24)

The Living Alleyways is an ongoing effort led by Public Works to engage residents in re-imagining the area’s extensive network of alleyways as an alternative transportation network and opportunity for community-scale places for public life. This program may utilize impact fee revenue through Public Works to design, build, and maintain living alleyway projects in their neighborhoods.

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Area Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Design underway. Project anticipated to be advertised Winter 2023.

Total Costs:

\$4,500,000 over 10 years

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$4,500,000 total

\$1,500,000 transferred

\$2,500,000 appropriated not transferred

\$500,000 programmed in FY 26

SIDEWALK GREENING PROGRAM (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 33)

The Sidewalk Greening Program (formerly the Street Tree Planting Program) is an initiative to facilitate new community-maintained street trees and sidewalk gardens throughout the Plan Area.

Utilizing a portion of these funds, Public Works will partner with non-profit organizations and interested community members to implement tree planting and sidewalk landscaping installation. Additional tree planting and establishment activities will be performed by Public Works Urban Forestry (BUF) staff or through a City-managed contractor.

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Area Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Ongoing

Total Costs:

\$1,300,000 through FY28

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$1,300,000 total

\$ 600,000 transferred

\$100,000 appropriated not transferred

\$600,000 programmed FY26 through FY28

STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENT FUND (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 34)

The Streetscape Enhancement Fund sets aside impact fee revenue for a series of capital projects to make Octavia Boulevard and surrounding streets safer, more pedestrian-friendly, and better at balancing competing demands.

After years of community engagement to update and confirm priorities, the scopes of work covered by this fund will include the Hayes Street “Follow the Paving” project (sidewalk bulbouts on Hayes at Laguna and Buchanan intersections); Oak/Octavia Safety Improvements project (sidewalk bulbouts, extended center medians and landscaping); Market Street/Octavia Boulevard project (intersection improvements and potential circulation changes); Octavia Boulevard Enhancement Project (sustainable streetscape upgrades on northbound lane of Octavia from Page to Patricia’s Green); and area-wide crosswalk upgrades and spot improvements that were completed in 2016.

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan; Vision Zero.

Project Status and Delivery:

Ongoing

Total Costs:

\$6,700,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$6,700,000 total

\$4,700,000 transferred

\$2,000,000 appropriated not transferred

OCTAVIA BOULEVARD IRRIGATION SYSTEM (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 38)

Project Description:

Install a new sub-surface drip irrigation system, building off of existing water pipes and backflow preventers, to replace the existing deficient pop-up overspray system in the side medians of Octavia Boulevard. The new irrigation system will service the street trees and landscaping in the side medians of Octavia Boulevard, which was the central infrastructure enhancement of the Market and Octavia Plan, while reducing water loss and maintenance obligation for the system.

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia CAC

Project Status and Delivery:

TBD

Total Costs:

\$100,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$100,000 (transferred)

KOSHLAND PARK ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 35)

Project Description:

Project proposed to enhance safe access to Koshland Park at Rose and Buchanan Streets. The park is heavily used by neighborhood teenagers and children as it includes playground space and a basketball court. There is currently no marked crossing at this location, though it is frequently used by children and others to access the park. Access improvements at this location would improve pedestrian safety and access to open space, and will be delivered in combination with the Page Street Neighborway project (see No. 24 above) .

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia CAC.

Project Status and Delivery:

Planning phase.

Total Costs:

\$450,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$450,000.

MARGARET HAYWARD PARK RENOVATION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 44)

Margaret Hayward Park had been identified as having major capital improvement needs by the Recreation & Parks Department. Impact fee funds have been used to support planned improvements, including a new playground, removal of certain existing structures and replacement with a new community building, an operations facility, large central plaza for events, and the replacement of existing fields with synthetic fields supplemented by organic infill turf.

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Area Plan.

Project Status and Delivery:

Project completed, open to the public in Fall 2020.

Total Costs:

\$28,500,000 million

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$8,000,000

BUCHANAN STREET MALL – FULTON TO GROVE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 47)

Buchanan Street Mall is comprised of five consecutive blocks of green space, asphalt paths, and underperforming playgrounds from Eddy Street to Grove Street. Presently within the five blocks are several temporary gardens, tree planters, seating areas, decorative lighting, and interactive sculptural multimedia installations that explain the neighborhood's history. Developed through a robust community process, the project is intended to reinvigorate a long-underfunded community by creating a place that serves as a primary gathering place for the neighborhood, starting with the blocks between Eddy Street and Golden Gate Avenue and McAllister and Fulton Streets. Core design elements on all five blocks include new pedestrian lighting, new planting areas, pathways and seating areas, the memory walk, and stormwater retention features. New children's play areas (CPAs) will be constructed on the two northernmost blocks; communal gardens on the two southernmost blocks and Turk-Golden Gate; and microenterprise kiosks on the three central blocks. Other program highlights include a

new lawn, stage, picnic and BBQ areas, a multiuse sports court, and full basketball court. The project is still seeking additional funding for utility contingency and two elements that are key to the community-driven design: 1) a memory walk with embedded art and interpretive elements and 2) microenterprise kiosks to support park activation and local entrepreneurship.

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia CAC

Project Status and Delivery:

The Buchanan Vision Plan was completed early 2017 and the conceptual design for all five blocks the Mall was approved by Rec and Park Commission in April 2020. Adequate funding has now been secured to renovate all 5 blocks under one singular construction project. Previously, construction had been divided up into two distinct phases as sufficient funds were lacking to cover all project costs. Funding has been secured from Let’sPlaySF!, 2020 Health & Recovery Bond, SFPUC Joint Capital Infrastructure Project, IPIC funds, General Funds, CA State budget allocation and State grants (Prop 68 and ORLP).

The project is currently in the design phase, Bid/Award is expected in fall 2023, and construction is expected to begin in spring 2024.

MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$4,120,000 total

\$515,000 transferred

\$3,100,000 appropriated but not yet transferred

\$505,000 programmed FY 24

CIVIC CENTER / IMPROVED CIVIC CENTER PUBLIC SPACES (MAP/EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 48.5)

The Civic Center Public Realm Plan provides a comprehensive vision for Civic Center’s public spaces, including improvements to Civic Center Plaza, Fulton Street Mall, United Nations Plaza, and War Memorial Gateway. Improvements include:

- » Civic Center Plaza improvements that enhance the space for neighborhood and civic use. Except for the existing playgrounds and, potentially, the existing cafe kiosk, the Plan proposes a complete reconstruction of Civic Center Plaza with a new site plan;
- » Fulton Street Mall improvements to convert existing right-of-way into a new plaza;
- » United Nations Plaza Improvements that provide greater flexibility of existing programming, strengthening of the Leavenworth gateway, and improvement of the BART entry; and
- » War Memorial Gateway improvements that better define the western gateway into Civic Center via a flexible-use plaza and improvements to pedestrian circulation.

Project Origin:

Civic Center Public Realm Plan

Project Status and Delivery: TBD

Total Costs: TBD

IPIC Funds:

\$2,524,000 through FY28

11TH STREET PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 48.25)

See 11TH STREET PARK in the Eastern Neighborhoods Project Descriptions section.

Total Costs: \$25,575,000 for acquisition and park development

IPIC Funds:

\$8,810,000 from SoMa portion of the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact fees, of which \$800,000 is on hand

\$3,100,000 appropriated from MO but not yet transferred

\$505,250 from MO programmed FY27 and FY28

KOSHLAND PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 48.75)

This line item was created to set aside funds for open space improvements at Koshland Park

Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Area Plan

Project Status and Delivery: TBD

Total Costs: TBD

IPIC Funds: \$2,000,000 in FY26

OTHER OPEN SPACE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 48.9)

This line item was created to set aside sufficient funds for Market Octavia open space rehabilitation projects or new projects. Projects for which these funds could be used include, but are not limited to Hayes Valley Playground, Patricia’s Green, Duboce Park, Civic Center, Margaret Hayward Playground and Koshland Park and additional under freeway activation.

Project Origin: HUB Public Realm Plan

Total Costs: TBD

IPIC Funds: \$2,000,000 in FY26

CHILD CARE (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 59)

A portion of Market and Octavia impact fee funds are dedicated to supporting the provision of new or expanded licensed child care facilities within the plan area. These funds are administered by the Department of Early Childhood (DEC), which was previously appropriated \$1,273,000 in FY16 to solicited applications for new or expanded facilities. These funds supported the construction of a new child care center at 49 South Van Ness, due to open in November 2022.


Project Status and Delivery:

This line item was kept flexible to enable further scoping and prioritization with the community.

Total Costs:

TBD

IPIC Funds: \$1.9 million in FY 26



Market-Octavia Projects

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| 2. Haight Two-way Transportation and Streetscape | 23. Hayes Two-Way | 36. Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission Ped. Improvements |
| 3. Muni Forward | 24. Living Alleys Community Challenge Grants | 37. Neighborhood Heritage Program |
| 4. Light Rail Service Enhancements | 25. Better Market Street - Market from 10th to Octavia | 38. Octavia Boulevard Irrigation System |
| 5. Polk Street Northbound Bicycle Improvements | 26. Page Street Neighborway | 39. HUB Public Realm Improvements |
| 6. Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission Ped. Improvements | 27. Patricia's Green Rotating Art Project | 39.2 13th Street Bike Improvements |
| 8. Valencia Bikeway | 28. Market / Octavia Plazas Rotating Art Project | 44. Hayward Park Rehabilitation |
| 9. Western Addition CBTP Improvements | 29. Pedestrian Improvements Franklin and Gough Intersections | 45. Brady Block Park - design |
| 10. Hub Transportation Improvements | 30. Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements | 47. Re-Connect Buchanan Street Mall ROW Study |
| 19. Dolores and Market Intersection Improvements (In-Kind) | 31. Predevelopment - Upper Market Street Pedestrian Improvements | 48. HUB Open Space Improvement Fund |
| 20. Oak Plaza (In-Kind) | 32. Re-Establish Octavia Boulevard ROW with Hayward Park | 48.25 11th and Notama |
| 21. 12th / Otis Plaza (Potential In-Kind) | 33. Sidewalk Green Program | 48.5 Civic Center/Improved Civic Center Public Spaces |
| 22. Gough Plaza (Potential In-Kind) | 35. Koshland Park Access Improvements | |



MARKET AND OCTAVIA

- 1. Margaret Hayward Playground
- 2. Upper Market Design
- 3. Turk Entry to Buchanan Mall
- 4. Buchanan Street Mall Concept Plan

Photo credits: (1,3-4) SF Rec Park, (2) DPW

Market Octavia - IPIC Expenditure Plan - FY 24 - FY28

Revenue And Expenditure

	THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY 33	
Revenue: Actuals FY21 and Prior -- Projected FY22 and Forward												
1	TRANSPORTATION / TRANSIT	\$ 9,318,000	\$ 3,025,000	\$ 2,792,000	\$ 2,832,000	\$ 4,606,000	\$ 821,000	\$ 1,866,000	\$ 13,017,000	\$ 25,360,000	\$ 17,614,000	\$ 42,974,000
2	COMPLETE STREETS	\$ 11,312,000	\$ 6,051,000	\$ 5,945,000	\$ 5,866,000	\$ 9,210,000	\$ 1,641,000	\$ 3,778,000	\$ 26,446,000	\$ 43,403,000	\$ 37,870,000	\$ 81,673,000
3	RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	\$ 7,944,000	\$ 2,886,000	\$ 2,579,000	\$ 4,396,000	\$ 783,000	\$ 1,769,000	\$ 783,000	\$ 12,326,000	\$ 23,156,000	\$ 16,172,000	\$ 39,328,000
4	GREENING	\$ 4,298,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,298,000	\$ -	\$ 4,298,000
5	COMMUNITY FACILITIES	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6	CHILDCARE	\$ 3,002,000	\$ 1,099,000	\$ 891,000	\$ 1,066,000	\$ 1,674,000	\$ 298,000	\$ 662,000	\$ 4,558,000	\$ 8,492,000	\$ 5,489,000	\$ 14,181,000
7	LIBRARY	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8	ADMIN	\$ 1,493,000	\$ 687,000	\$ 642,000	\$ 667,000	\$ 1,047,000	\$ 187,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 2,948,000	\$ 5,548,000	\$ 4,060,000	\$ 9,608,000
9	Total	\$ 37,767,000	\$ 13,748,000	\$ 12,849,000	\$ 13,330,000	\$ 20,933,000	\$ 3,720,000	\$ 8,500,000	\$ 59,342,000	\$ 110,857,000	\$ 81,205,000	\$ 192,062,000

Transit

1	Revenue	\$ 9,318,000	\$ 3,025,000	\$ 2,792,000	\$ 2,832,000	\$ 4,606,000	\$ 821,000	\$ 1,866,000	\$ 13,017,000	\$ 25,360,000	\$ 17,614,000	\$ 42,974,000
---	---------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Expenditure

2	Haight Two-way Transportation and Streetscape	MTA Transferred	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Total	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000
3	Muni Forward	MTA Transferred	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Total	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000
4	Light Rail Service Enhancement	MTA Transferred	\$ 1,713,915	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,713,915	\$ -	\$ 1,713,915
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 3,536,085	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,536,085	\$ -	\$ 3,536,085
		Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Total	\$ 5,250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,250,000	\$ -	\$ 5,250,000
5	Polk Street northbound bicycle improvements	MTA Transferred	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Total	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000
6	Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission Ped. Improvements	MTA Transferred	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		Total	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000

Market Octavia - IPIC Expenditure Plan - FY 24 - FY28

Revenue And Expenditure		THROUGH	FY 23 (CURRENT	FY 24 (BUDGET	FY 25 (BUDGET	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH	THROUGH
		FY 22	YEAR)	YEAR 1)	YEAR 2)	YEAR 2)	YEAR 2)	YEAR 2)	FY 28	FY 28	FY 33
7	Hub Transportation Improvements Study										
	DCP										
	Transferred	\$ 250,000								\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
	Appropriated not Transferred										
	Programmed										
	Total	\$ 250,000								\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
8	Valencia Protected Bike Lanes										
	MTA										
	Transferred	\$ 1,000,000								\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
	Appropriated not Transferred										
	Programmed	\$ 3,650,000								\$ 3,650,000	\$ 3,650,000
	Total	\$ 4,650,000								\$ 4,650,000	\$ 4,650,000
9	Western Addition CBTP Improvements										
	MTA										
	Transferred	\$ 330,000								\$ 330,000	\$ 330,000
	Appropriated not Transferred										
	Programmed	\$ 395,000								\$ 395,000	\$ 395,000
	Total	\$ 725,000								\$ 725,000	\$ 725,000
10	HUB Transportation Improvements Fund										
	MTA										
	Transferred	\$ 304,000								\$ 304,000	\$ 304,000
	Appropriated not Transferred										
	Programmed	\$ 5,515,860								\$ 5,515,860	\$ 5,515,860
	Total	\$ 5,819,860								\$ 5,819,860	\$ 5,819,860
10.1	Local Bus TSP										
	MTA										
	Transferred	\$ 196,000								\$ 196,000	\$ 196,000
	Appropriated not Transferred										
	Programmed										
	Total	\$ 196,000								\$ 196,000	\$ 196,000
15	Expenditure Sub Total	\$ 19,070,860								\$ 19,070,860	\$ 19,070,860
16	Category Annual Balance	\$ (9,752,860)	\$ 3,025,000	\$ 2,792,000	\$ 2,892,000	\$ 1,538,860	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,262,860	\$ 535,000	\$ 599,000
17	Category Cumulative Balance	\$ (9,752,860)	\$ (6,727,860)	\$ (3,935,860)	\$ (1,003,860)	\$ 535,000	\$ 535,000	\$ 535,000	\$ 535,000	\$ 535,000	\$ 1,064,000

		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28 THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33 THROUGH FY 33
26.1	Page Street Neighborhood	MTA	1,000,000						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Total	\$ 1,000,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 1,000,000	\$
26.2	Page Street Neighborhood	DCP	250,000						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Total	\$ 250,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 250,000	\$
27	Patrick's Green Rotating Art Project	ARTS	249,000						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$ 111,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 111,000	\$
		Total	\$ 249,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 249,000	\$
28	Market/Octavia Plaza Rotating Art Project	ARTS	300,000						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$ 50,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 50,000	\$
		Total	\$ 300,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 300,000	\$
29	Pedestrian Improvements Franklin and Gough Intersections	MTA	250,000						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Total	\$ 250,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 250,000	\$
30	Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements	DPW	2,088,157						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Total	\$ 2,088,157	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 2,088,157	\$
30.1	Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements	MTA	2,217,100						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Total	\$ 2,217,100	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 2,217,100	\$
31	Predevelopment - Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements	MTA	50,000						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Total	\$ 50,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 50,000	\$
32	Re-establish Octavia Boulevard ROW with Hayward Park	DCP	150,000						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Total	\$ 150,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 150,000	\$
33	Sidewalk Greening Program	DPW	300,000						
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$ 600,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 600,000	\$
		Total	\$ 300,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 300,000	\$
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$ 100,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 100,000	\$
		Total	\$ 700,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 600,000	\$
		Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Appropriated not Transferred	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		Programmed	\$ 100,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 100,000	\$
		Total	\$ 1,300,000	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 1,300,000	\$

Market Octavia - IPIC Expenditure Plan - FY 24 - FY28

Revenue And Expenditure		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28 THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33 THROUGH FY 33
34	Streetscape Enhancement Fund									
	DPW									
	Transferred	\$ 2,350,000							\$ -	\$ 2,350,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 2,000,000							\$ -	\$ 2,000,000
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Total	\$ 4,350,000							\$ -	\$ 4,350,000
34.1	Streetscape Enhancement Fund									
	Transferred	\$ 4,350,000							\$ -	\$ 4,350,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 2,350,000							\$ -	\$ 2,350,000
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Total	\$ 2,350,000							\$ -	\$ 2,350,000
35	Koshland Park Access Improvements									
	DPW									
	Transferred	\$ 450,000							\$ -	\$ 450,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Total	\$ 450,000							\$ -	\$ 450,000
36	Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission ped.									
	DPW									
	Transferred	\$ 500,000							\$ -	\$ 500,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Total	\$ 500,000							\$ -	\$ 500,000
37	Neighborhood Heritage Program									
	DPW									
	Transferred	\$ 50,000							\$ -	\$ 50,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Total	\$ 50,000							\$ -	\$ 50,000
38	Octavia Boulevard Irrigation System									
	DPW									
	Transferred	\$ 100,000							\$ -	\$ 100,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Total	\$ 100,000							\$ -	\$ 100,000
39	HUB Public Realm Improvements Plan									
	DPW									
	Transferred	\$ 11,468,372							\$ -	\$ 11,468,372
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Total	\$ 11,468,372							\$ -	\$ 11,468,372
39.2	13th Street									
	DPW									
	Transferred	\$ 11,468,372							\$ 1,177,478	\$ 11,468,372
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -	\$ -
	Total	\$ 11,468,372							\$ 1,177,478	\$ 11,468,372
40	Expenditure Sub Total	\$ 36,270,629							\$ 10,758,971	\$ 47,029,600
41	Category Annual Balance	\$ (20,600,629)	\$ 6,951,000	\$ 5,945,000	\$ 6,051,622	\$ (2,180,893)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,661,629	\$ 3,072,000
42	Category Cumulative Balance	\$ (20,600,629)	\$ (14,609,629)	\$ (8,664,629)	\$ (2,613,007)	\$ 3,652,893	\$ 1,072,000	\$ 1,072,000	\$ 4,072,000	\$ 54,000

		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY 33
Revenue And Expenditure												
Recreation and Open Space												
43	Revenue	\$ 7,944,000	\$ 2,886,000	\$ 2,579,000	\$ 2,799,000	\$ 4,396,000	\$ 783,000	\$ 1,769,000	\$ 12,326,000	\$ 23,156,000	\$ 16,172,000	\$ 39,328,000
Expenditure												
44	Hayward Park											
	RPD	\$ 7,984,000								\$ 7,984,000		\$ 7,984,000
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Total	\$ 7,984,000								\$ 7,984,000		\$ 7,984,000
45	Brady Block Park - design											
	DCP	\$ 200,000								\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Total	\$ 200,000								\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000
46	Community Challenge Grant											
	ADM	\$ 100,000								\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Total	\$ 100,000								\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
47	Buchanan Street Mall											
	RPD	\$ 515,000								\$ 515,000		\$ 515,000
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 515,000								\$ 515,000		\$ 515,000
	Total	\$ 515,000								\$ 515,000		\$ 515,000
	DCP	\$ 3,100,000								\$ 3,100,000		\$ 3,100,000
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 3,100,000								\$ 3,100,000		\$ 3,100,000
	Total	\$ 3,100,000								\$ 3,100,000		\$ 3,100,000
	ADM	\$ 505,250								\$ 505,250		\$ 505,250
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 505,250								\$ 505,250		\$ 505,250
	Total	\$ 505,250								\$ 505,250		\$ 505,250
	ADM	\$ 3,615,000								\$ 3,615,000		\$ 3,615,000
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 3,615,000								\$ 3,615,000		\$ 3,615,000
	Total	\$ 3,615,000								\$ 3,615,000		\$ 3,615,000
	DCP	\$ 3,100,000								\$ 3,100,000		\$ 3,100,000
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 3,100,000								\$ 3,100,000		\$ 3,100,000
	Total	\$ 3,100,000								\$ 3,100,000		\$ 3,100,000
	ADM	\$ 505,250								\$ 505,250		\$ 505,250
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 505,250								\$ 505,250		\$ 505,250
	Total	\$ 505,250								\$ 505,250		\$ 505,250
	ADM	\$ 4,120,250								\$ 4,120,250		\$ 4,120,250
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 4,120,250								\$ 4,120,250		\$ 4,120,250
	Total	\$ 4,120,250								\$ 4,120,250		\$ 4,120,250
	DCP	\$ 3,177,250								\$ 3,177,250		\$ 3,177,250
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 3,177,250								\$ 3,177,250		\$ 3,177,250
	Total	\$ 3,177,250								\$ 3,177,250		\$ 3,177,250
	ADM	\$ 7,897,500								\$ 7,897,500		\$ 7,897,500
	Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -								\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ 7,897,500								\$ 7,897,500		\$ 7,897,500
	Total	\$ 7,897,500								\$ 7,897,500		\$ 7,897,500

Market Octavia		Revenue And Expenditure										
		THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY 33
Child Care												
52	Revenue		\$ 1,099,000	\$ 891,000	\$ 1,066,000	\$ 1,674,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 662,000	\$ 4,593,000	\$ 9,492,000	\$ 5,480,000	\$ 14,151,000
Expenditure												
OECE												
53	OECE Child Care NOFA Program											
	Transferred	\$ 1,273,000										
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 4,808,000										
	Programmed											
55	Expenditure Sub Total	\$ 6,081,000										
56	Category Annual Balance	\$ (3,079,000)	\$ 1,099,000	\$ 891,000	\$ 1,443,000	\$ 262,000	\$ 530,000	\$ 2,175,000	\$ 2,175,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 275,000
57	Category Cumulative Balance	\$ (3,079,000)	\$ (1,980,000)	\$ (1,089,000)	\$ (67,000)	\$ (335,000)	\$ (159,000)	\$ (195,000)	\$ 395,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 275,000
Program Administration												
58	Revenue	\$ 1,893,000	\$ 687,000	\$ 642,000	\$ 667,000	\$ 1,047,000	\$ 187,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 2,988,000	\$ 5,548,000	\$ 4,080,000	\$ 9,628,000
Expenditure												
Admin Fees												
59	Admin Fees											
	Transferred	\$ 1,095,098										
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 3,106,150										
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 4,201,248										
60	Admin Fees Transferred back to Programs	\$ 962,902										
	Transferred											
	Appropriated not Transferred											
	Programmed											
	Total	\$ 962,902										
61	Expenditure Sub Total	\$ 5,164,150										
62	Category Balance Per Year	\$ (3,271,150)	\$ 687,000	\$ 642,000	\$ 1,047,000	\$ 59,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 2,833,850	\$ 251,000	\$ 4,090,000	\$ 4,293,000	\$ 4,293,000
63	Category Cumulative Balance Per Year	\$ (3,271,150)	\$ (2,584,150)	\$ (1,942,150)	\$ (895,150)	\$ (836,150)	\$ (777,150)	\$ (718,150)	\$ (659,150)	\$ (600,150)	\$ (541,150)	\$ (482,150)
Revenue : Actuals FY22 and Prior -- Projected FY23 and Forward												
64	Area Total Revenue	\$ 3,778,000	\$ 13,748,000	\$ 12,849,000	\$ 13,330,000	\$ 20,933,000	\$ 3,730,000	\$ 8,900,000	\$ 59,942,000	\$ 110,457,000	\$ 81,205,000	\$ 190,662,000
65	Area Total Expenditures	\$ 8,208,498										
66	Area Annual Balance	\$ (4,430,498)	\$ 13,748,000	\$ 12,849,000	\$ 13,332,750	\$ 12,462,287	\$ (3,039,788)	\$ 103,000	\$ 33,201,999	\$ 2,632,550	\$ 4,715,002	\$ 7,328,852
67	Area Cumulative Balance	\$ (4,430,498)	\$ (692,500)	\$ (182,443,998)	\$ (6,911,649)	\$ 5,550,638	\$ 2,310,850	\$ 2,613,850	\$ 2,613,850	\$ 2,613,850	\$ 7,328,852	\$ 7,328,852

RINCON HILL

Background and Highlights

The Rincon Hill Plan, adopted in 2005, enabled over 2,500 additional residential units in the Rincon Hill neighborhood, situated between Downtown and the Bay Bridge. Since plan adoption over 1,900 units have been built. Most fee revenue expected to be generated from the Rincon Hill Area Plan has been received totaling roughly \$36,000,000 when including in-kind improvements.

The Planning Department projects about \$4,500,000 in impact fee revenue available for infrastructure impact fees between FY23 and FY28.

There is an identified need of \$46,600,000 million for Rincon Hill infrastructure based on the original Rincon Hill Area Plan and Streetscape Master Plan of which approximately \$37,000,000 can be funded through impact fees leaving an unmet funding need of \$9,000,000.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

After adoption of the Rincon Hill Plan, the Planning Department drafted the Rincon Hill Streetscape Plan to guide design and implementation of the streetscape improvements in the neighborhood. The Streetscape Plan includes detailed designs for all streets segments within the Rincon Hill Plan Area. The Streetscape Plan was adopted in 2015.

Because the City has known that impact fees will not pay for the entire costs of proposed streetscape improvements, the Planning Department and San Francisco Public Works, along with the local community has prioritized the streetscape projects as either "Priority 1" or "Priority 2". Priority 1 projects, which include completing Harrison Street and Fremont Street, are fully funded and are expected to soon complete design. Priority 2 project are not fully funded. Priority 2 projects are identified in the following Expenditure Plan, Map, and Project Descriptions, as potentially using the additional impact fee revenue.

Project Descriptions

HARRISON STREET – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 1 (MAP NO. 6A / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 6)

Streetscape improvements for Harrison Street would run along both side of Harrison Street from Essex Street to Embarcadero Street. Improvements include lane reduction and narrowing, sidewalk widening, corner bulb-outs, pedestrian lighting and new trees.

Project Status and Delivery:

Construction underway. Substantial Completion anticipated Spring 2023.

Total Costs: \$12,565,000

IPIC Funds: Priority 1 Projects have been fully funded.

FREMONT STREET – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 1 (MAP NO. 6B / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 6)

The improvements between Folsom and Harrison include widening sidewalks to 15', trees and understory planting and bulb-outs.

Project Status and Delivery: Much of Fremont Street improvements are anticipated to be completed as part of individual development projects' conditions of approval as required by the Planning Code.

The remaining Fremont Street would be constructed by Public Works as a "Priority 1" project.

Total Costs: These costs are included in the Harrison Street costs above.

IPIC Funds: See Harrison Street above.

LIVING STREETS (SPEAR, MAIN, AND BEALE) – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 2 (MAP 7A / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 7)

The primary goal of Living Streets is to prioritize pedestrian activity and usable open space over traffic to calm traffic. The major design strategy to achieve this goal is to significantly widen pedestrian space on one side. Such space would accommodate amenities including pocket parks, seating areas, community gardens, dog runs, public art, and the like.

Project Status and Delivery:

Living Streets have been identified as a lower priority and therefore would not be implemented until after Harrison Street and Fremont Street are completed.

Total Costs: \$18,228,000 (in FY16 dollars)

IPIC Funds: \$ 8,998,000 have been programmed as "Priority 2" projects, which could be used for these projects.

MID-BLOCK CROSSINGS – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 2 (MAP 7B / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 7)

In working with the community, San Francisco Public Works has identified mid-block pedestrian crossings on Spear, Main, and Beale and Fremont as important projects.

Project Status and Delivery: The Mid-Block Crossings have been identified by the community as a lower priority and therefore, given the shortage of impact fee funds, would not be implemented until after Harrison and Fremont Streets. Further prioritization with the community may occur before deciding which “Priority 2” project to move forward on after Harrison Street.

Total Costs: \$3,695,000 (in FY16 dollars)

IPIC Funds: \$8,998,000 has been programmed as “Priority 2” projects, which could be used for this project.

GUY PLACE STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS – STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 2 (MAP 7C / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 7)

Guy Place Streetscape project would complete the Lansing/ Guy streetscape improvements for the rest of the loop created by the two streets.

Project Status and Delivery:

Guy Place Streetscape improvements have been identified by the community as a lower priority and therefore, given the shortage of impact fee funds, would not be implemented until after Harrison and Fremont Streets. Further prioritization with the community may occur before deciding with “Priority 2” project to move forward on after Harrison Street.

Total Costs: \$2,600,000 (in FY16 dollars)

IPIC Funds: \$8,998,000 has been programmed as “Priority 2” projects, which could be used for this project.

FIRST STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP NO. 7D / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM 7)

Streetscape improvements for First Street would run along both sides of First Street from Folsom Street to Harrison Street. Improvements include sidewalk widening, corner bulb-outs, a mid-block pedestrian crossing, pedestrian lighting and new trees and understory planting.

Project Status and Delivery:

First Street improvements have been identified by the community as a lower priority and therefore, given the shortage of impact fee funds, would not be implemented until after Harrison and Fremont Streets. Further prioritization with the community may occur before deciding with “Priority 2” project to move forward on after Harrison Street.

Total Costs: \$4,500,000 (in FY16 dollars)

IPIC Funds: \$8,998,000 has been programmed as “Priority 2” projects, and could be used for this project.

MID-BLOCK PEDESTRIAN PATH BETWEEN FREMONT AND BEALE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 13)

A mid-block pedestrian path was constructed between Fremont and Beale in conjunction with the construction of 333 Fremont Street.

Project Status and Delivery: Complete

Total Costs: \$573,000

IPIC Funds: \$573,000 (In-Kind)

FIRST STREET AND HARRISON STREET - ONE RINCON IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 14)

The southernmost block of First Street and the southern side of Harrison Street between First Street and Fremont Street were improved in conjunction with the construction of One Rincon Hill. Improvements included new widened side-walks, street tree and understory plantings, and special paving within the roadway.

Project Status and Delivery: Completed.

Total Costs: \$1,100,000

IPIC Funds: \$1,100,000 (In-Kind)

**GUY PLACE PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN
LINE ITEM NO. 8)**

This small intimate pocket park will feature living green columns, water features, seating areas and other landscaping.

Project Origin: Rincon Hill Area Plan

Project Status and Delivery: Project completed and open to the public in July 2020.

Total Costs: \$6,511,000

IPIC Funds: \$3,000,000

\$1,525,000 from Transit Center


\$1,860,000 million from ABAG (not impact fees) (funding for acquisition and design)

\$126, 000 General fund



Rincon Hill Projects

- 6. Streetscape Priority 1 - Harrison Street and Fremont Street
- 7a. Living Streets (Potential Priority 2 Project)
- 7b. Guy Place Streetscape (Potential Priority 2 Project)
- 7d. First Street (Potential Priority 2 Project)
- 8. Guy Place Park
- 12. Harrison Street (Between Essex and First - North Side) (In-Kind)
- 13. Ped Mid-block ped path between Folsom and Harrison near Fremont (In-Kind)
- 14. First Street and Harrison Street (In-Kind)
- 15. Rincon Hill Park



1 FIRST ST to BEALE ST



2 FREMONT STREET



3 MAIN ST to THE EMBARCADERO



4

RINCON HILL

1. Sidewalk extension on Harrison
2. New paint on Beal Street Bridge
3. Harrison streetscape improvements
4. Harrison Street Plans

Photo credits: (1 - 4) DPW

Revenue - Actuals FY18 and Prior -- Projected FY19 and Forward

	THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY28	THROUGH FY28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY 33
1. GENERAL	\$ 19,413,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,413,000	\$ -	\$ 19,413,000
2. COMPLETE STREETS	\$ 8,998,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,630,100	\$ 3,630,100	\$ 12,628,300	\$ 1,188,800	\$ 13,817,100
3. RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	\$ 182,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 735,200	\$ 735,200	\$ 2,538,700	\$ 240,800	\$ 2,799,500
4. ADMIN	\$ 1,312,100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 229,800	\$ 229,800	\$ 1,541,900	\$ 75,200	\$ 1,617,100
5. Total	\$ 31,546,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,595,100	\$ 4,595,100	\$ 36,141,900	\$ 1,504,800	\$ 37,646,700
ABAG Total	\$ 1,836,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,836,000	\$ -	\$ 1,836,000
In-kind Total	\$ 1,685,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,683,000	\$ -	\$ 1,683,000
Cash Total	\$ 28,027,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,595,100	\$ 4,595,100	\$ 32,623,900	\$ 1,504,800	\$ 34,127,700

Expenditures: Appropriations FY19 and Prior - Planned FY20 and Forward

	THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY28	THROUGH FY28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY 33
6. Streetscape Priority 1- Harrison Street and Fremont Street	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Streetscape / Public Realm Priority 2	\$ 12,565,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,565,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,565,000
8. Guy Place Park- Design and Construct	\$ 8,998,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,998,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,998,000
9. Program Administration	\$ 4,836,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,836,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,836,000
10. Program Admin Transfer to Programs	\$ 366,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 366,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 366,000
11. 25% Transfer to SOMA Stabilization Fund	\$ 296,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 296,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 296,000
12. Harrison Street (Partially between Essex and First North Side) (In-Kind)	\$ 6,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000,000
13. Ped Mid-block ped path between Folsom and Harrison near Fremont (In-Kind)	\$ 626,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 626,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 626,000
14. First Street and Harrison Street (In-Kind)	\$ 573,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 573,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 573,000
In-Kind Total	\$ 11,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,100,000

RUNNING TOTALS

	THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY28	THROUGH FY28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY 33
15. Revenue Totals	\$ 31,546,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,595,100	\$ 4,595,100	\$ 36,141,900	\$ 1,504,800	\$ 37,646,700
16. Total Expenditures	\$ 35,870,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,870,000
17. Annual Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (4,123,200)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,595,100	\$ 4,595,100	\$ 36,141,900	\$ 1,504,800	\$ 1,976,700
18. Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (4,123,200)	\$ (4,123,200)	\$ (4,123,200)	\$ (4,123,200)	\$ (4,123,200)	\$ (4,123,200)	\$ 471,900	\$ 471,900	\$ 471,900	\$ 1,976,700	\$ 1,976,700

SOUTH OF MARKET

Background and Highlights

This was the third year that South of Market (SoMa) was separated from Eastern Neighborhoods for the sake of implementing the Western SoMa, Central SoMa and East SoMa Plans. This separation happened in conjunction with the adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, which went effect in 2019.

The Central Soma Plan, adopted in 2018, enabled greater development potential within the portions of South of Market that are in proximity to the Central Subway alignment. The Plan included new zoning, public realm improvements and a community benefits package that would be implemented through new development requirements and fees. The Plan is projected to result in a net gain of 32,500 jobs and 8,800 housing units above what would have been created under previous zoning. New requirements and fees associated with the Plan are expected to result in \$2 billion in public benefits to serve the neighborhood.

The Central SoMa Plan also included an implementation strategy which described the actions, agencies and stakeholders that aim to implement the objectives and policies of the plan. It includes a detailed public benefits package, guide to urban design, key development site guidelines and key streets guidance. The Plan included the establishment of the Central SoMa Community Infrastructure Impact Fee and a Mello-Roos Community Facilities Fee as a key funding mechanisms.

For more information, visit the project website: <https://sfplanning.org/central-soma-plan>

In the next five years (FY24 through FY28), the City expects to collect about \$143,000,000 in impact fees; between actual fees collected and fees projected, the City expects to have collected \$228,000,000 through FY28, which is slightly higher than last year's projection. Note that these projections assume that all projects active within Planning Departments pipeline, including large-scale office projects, will move forward albeit at a slower pace.

SOMA COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SOMA CAC)

The SoMa Community Planning Advisory Committee (SoMa CAC) is currently seated with 5 members and active recruitment is ongoing to fill the entire committee of 11 standing members and 11 alternants. The SoMa CAC advises the Planning Department and other agencies on the implementation of the Central SoMa Plan along with the

existing East SoMa Plan and Western SoMa Plan. The SoMa CAC is to be comprised of eleven members appointed by both the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. The CAC aims to have a varied composition of residents, small business owners, open space advocates, complete streets and transit advocates, and operators of affordable housing and other community-serving organizations. The CAC not only provides input on the programming of impact fees, but they can provide input of development proposals, open space, and other policy matters relevant to implementing the three area plans.

So far, the CAC and IPIC have identified projects in three main categories: Transit, Complete Streets, and Recreation and Open Space. For the first two categories, funds have been left in general purpose categories to enable flexibility of funding as transit and complete streets projects become further scoped. For the Recreation and Open Space categories, funds have been programmed for three major park projects either through in-kind agreements: Gene Friend Renovation, the new park at 598 Brannan and the Gene Friend Pool Annex at the previously proposed development at 88 Bluxome. Planning anticipates approximately \$394 million in revenue over the next five years (EN Infrastructure Fee, Central SoMa Infrastructure Fee, and the Central SoMa CFD.) This November 2022, the CAC and was in support of the proposed IPIC expenditure plan for SoMa CAC infrastructure funds.

As with all other Plan Areas, revenue for SoMa is now projected to slow down over the next two years, to the current decrease in demand for office space due to a shift in remote and hybrid work. Therefore, IPIC is recommending that expenditures be pushed out by at least two years to enable revenue to catch up with previous expenditure commitments. IPIC is not proposing to fund any new projects this year while maintaining the commitment to fund previously identified projects.

Ongoing Planning

SF RAILYARDS PROJECT

Adjacent to the Central SoMa Plan area, the SF Railyards Project is currently underway and re-imagining transit operations and potential development at the 4th and King Caltrain Railyards. Along with Caltrain and the landowner, SF Planning is coordinating the outreach and design to envision the site as a regional transit center with a new rail station, added Caltrain service, and neighborhood with housing, office and public spaces. The project is expected to identify potential track layouts and development concepts for the SF Railyards site in 2023

The SF Railyards Project is one of the recommendations in the 2018 Rail Alignment and Benefits Study (RAB). The RAB

explored how reconfiguring or relocating infrastructure at the SF Railyards could yield significant public benefits, such as connecting 5th Street, safer bike and pedestrian connections, and opportunities for housing, commercial development and open space. Also, in anticipation of more Caltrain service and High Speed Rail, the RAB recommended the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX) tunnel as a way to avoid increasing minutes of “gate-down” time at the 16th Street and Mission Bay Drive crossings, as 16th Street is a critical transit, shuttle, and street connection to-and-from Mission Bay, UCSF, and Chase Center. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors adopted the PAX as the preliminary preferred alternative in 2018.

The Railyards Project has established a Railyards Working Group which will build on the work and lessons learned from the former Community Working Group established for the RAB (2016-2018). The Railyards Working Group (RWG) consists of approximately 15 community representatives who meet quarterly to hear project updates, convey community priorities, discuss tradeoffs, and bring diverse perspectives to the Railyards Projects. The RWG can inform the public engagement strategy, identify project opportunities, and discover synergies for expanding public benefits.

For more information, please go visit <https://sfplanning.org/railyards>

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

2ND STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP/ EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10, 23 AND 24)

The Second Street Improvement project has transformed the Second Street corridor in the east South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood into a pedestrian and bicycle friendly complete street, consistent with the vision identified by the community in the East and Central SoMa Area Plans.

The Plan identified Second Street as a primary pedestrian, bicycle, and transit thoroughfare and a green connector for the neighborhood. The Project consists of the following features between Market and King Streets:

- One-way cycle track bicycle facilities in the northbound and southbound directions
- Transit boarding islands at most transit stops along with planted medians;
- ADA-compliant curb ramps

- Street trees
- Site furnishings (trash receptacles, bike racks, benches, and pedestrian lighting)
- Curb-to-curb roadway grinding and repaving

In order to achieve the complete street along the corridor, the travel lanes along Second Street have been reduced to two in each direction, restricted left-hand turn lanes at most intersections, and widened sidewalks from 10-foot to 15-foot between Harrison and Townsend Streets. It should be noted that because 2nd Street travels through both the Eastern Neighborhoods and the Transit District Area Plans, funds from both impact fees have been used to fund this project.

Project Origin:

East SoMa Area Plan, San Francisco Bicycle Plan; EN Area Plan Implementation Maps

Project Status and Delivery:

Construction completed. Undergoing long-term plant establishment

Total Costs:

Approximately \$42,000,000

IPIC Funds:

\$4,900,000

FOLSOM STREET / HOWARD STREET STREETScape PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 11 AND 21)

The project includes Howard between 11th and 5th and Folsom between 11th and 2nd. The project will include two-way protected bikeways, a transit only lane on Folsom, bulbouts, traffic signal upgrades, new mid-block traffic signals, and public realm improvements.

Project Origin:

Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document, EN Plan Area Infrastructure Maps, EN Trips. Folsom Street has long been envisioned to serve as the main civic corridor of South of Market and is a major infrastructure component of the East Soma Plan, Western Soma Plan and Central Soma Plan. This is an EN Priority Project

Project Status and Delivery:

The first near-term improvements to Folsom were installed in early 2018 from 11th to Falmouth (between 6th and 5th. Safety enhancements included parking-protected bikeways; increased yellow zones to provide additional space for commercial loading and reduce the frequency of double parking; boarding islands to reduce conflicts between the 12-Folsom and bicycle riders while decreasing travel time and improving reliability; "daylighting" by using red zones near crosswalks to improve the visibility of everyone using the street.

In Winter of 2019 the SFMTA built on those changes taking new measures on Howard Street similar to those already made on Folsom Street. These changes included installing a parking-protected bike lane, more loading zones and daylighting intersections. A huge success of the project was the level of outreach conducted with the public.

One hundred ten businesses were canvassed and gave input on loading conditions on these two streets. The public has had 6 open house sessions to provide input on public realm improvements, transportation improvements, and how the project can reflect the identity of the community (specifically the Filipino community, Youth and Family Special Use District, and Leather and LGBTQ Cultural District).

The project entered detailed design in October 2019. Construction is planned to commence in 2023.

Total Costs:

\$88,200,000

IPIC Funds:

\$20,232,000 total [note: \$550k from Transit / Transportation category]

\$17,842,000 transferred

\$2,390,000 appropriated not transferred

(Additional funds are appropriated for "SoMa Street Improvement Projects (No. g.2) , which could be used for Folsom / Howard and may cover any aspect of design, engineering or construction.

LOCAL TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. A)

The Central SoMa Plan calls for \$125,000,000 of local transit improvements over the next 25 years to be funded by the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Fee and the Central SoMa Infrastructure Fee. Funds are to pay for a variety of near and long-term transit service and capacity enhancements that could include transit enhancement and expansion including purchase of revenue fleet vehicles

that enhance and expand Central SoMa transit service, preventive maintenance (e.g. state of good repair efforts), streetscape improvements (such as transit priority lanes and boarding islands), and service adjustments. Funds for SoMa transit improvements projects are being kept in this single line item to enable funding flexibility for the time being.

Project Origin:

Central SoMa Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Varies. MTA to provide IPIC and SoMa CAC periodic updates.

IPIC Funds:

\$64,010,000 total

\$9,069,000 appropriated not yet transferred

\$49,501,000 programmed FY25 through FY28

5TH AND BRANNAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEMS E.1, E.2, AND E.3)

This line item has been created to account for potential in-kind agreements with three development projects adjacent to the 5th and Brannan intersection (598 Brannan, 88 Bluxome and Flower Mart) for street improvements to widen sidewalks, construct protected bike lanes, signalized midblock pedestrian crossings and a protected intersection, and raise street elevations to reduce flooding. The street improvements would encompass 3,000 linear feet of development project frontage.

Project Origin:

Central SoMa Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Development projects would construct improvements between 2023-2026.

IPIC Funds:

In-kind agreement would be approximately \$8,500,000

PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND STREETScape ENHANCEMENT FUND (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 27.1)

This fund was created to enable flexible, nimble, and strategic spending of Eastern Neighborhood transportation dollars in the short term. The funds are to provide Public Works access to funds that can fill the last gaps of projects and/or to prioritize Eastern Neighborhood projects above others for implementation.

Project Origin:
IPIC

Project Status and Delivery:

Funds are available to streetscape, bike and pedestrian projects upon request and after consultation with IPIC and the SoMa CAC. Eligible projects generally include, but are not limited to, community requested street tree and understory landscaping.

Total Costs:

\$200,000 in FY21

IPIC Funds:

\$200,000 total (appropriated not transferred)

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS DESIGN PLAN AND PRIORITIZATION OF SOMA PROJECTS (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO.G.1)

This line item has been created to enable San Francisco Public Works staff to begin work on design, planning and prioritization of complete streets projects in SoMa in FY21 ahead of more significant funds being available for actual construction and implementation.

Project Origin:

IPIC

IPIC Funds:

\$100,000 (appropriated not transferred)

SOMA STREET IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO G.21)

The Central SoMa Plan call for the improvement of all major streets within Central SoMa to address lack of sufficient sidewalk widths, crosswalks, bicycle infrastructure and other street infrastructure. Funds can go to additional design, community outreach and environmental work as well as construction costs. Although improving main streets is the

highest priority, improvements may also be implemented on alleyways as funding allows. Funds for SoMa Street Improvement projects are being kept in this single line item to enable funding flexibility for the time being. [Note: this line item has been divided into two separate line items indicating which agency will take the lead]

Project Origin:

Central SoMa Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Ongoing

IPIC Funds:

Approximately \$41,450,000

\$160,000 transferred

\$8,889,000 appropriated not transferred

\$37,730,000 programmed FY26 through FY28

GENE FRIEND / SOMA RECREATION CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 39)

Located in an area where open space and recreation opportunities are limited, this facility is heavily used by children, seniors, and people who live and work in the SoMa neighborhood – which is also one of the city’s fastest growing neighborhoods. REC collaborated with the Trust for Public Land on a feasibility study and concept plan, which replaces the existing facility with one almost twice the size. The new facility would include a double basketball court gym, two multi-purpose rooms, a large exercise room and a new kitchen. The project includes improved lighting, security, and new outdoor amenities: a basketball court, plaza space, playground, and landscaping.

Project Origin:

Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document (the document promised one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods)

Project Status and Delivery:

Recreation and Park Commission approved the concept design in September 2019. Construction is anticipated to begin summer 2023. This project is a named park in the 2020 Health and Recovery G.O. Bond and will receive \$30 million in Bond funding and \$500,000 from TPL in-kind grant. Previous funding includes \$27.8 million from

Eastern Neighborhood and Central SoMa impact fees. While Development Impact Fees are not yet available due to pandemic-related market impacts, the Department has identified the following sources to fulfill the project funding gap (\$16 million) until development impact fees are received, with the understanding that projects funded by these sources will be reimbursed once impact fees are available: 2020 Health & Recovery Bond Contingency and Phase 2 Programs along with \$560,000 local funding from the Open Space Fund.

Total Costs:
\$59.3 million

IPIC Funds: -

\$27,800,000 Total

\$2,150,300 transferred

\$25,649,700 appropriated not transferred

11TH STREET PARK (MAP/ EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO.45)

Rec and Park acquired 11th & Natoma in 2018 to build a new park. The site needs to be remediated, designed, and developed. Staff have begun community outreach in 2022 to design the new park and plan to complete CEQA and bring the concept plans for approval before the Recreation and Park Commission in FY22-23.

Project Origin:

Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document (the document promised one new neighborhood in each of the EN Neighborhoods);

Project Status and Delivery:

The project is currently in the Planning phase. Design and environmental review have begun in early 2022 and community engagement to review design concepts occurred in early summer 2022. The project will receive \$11.8 million in Impact Fees from SOMA and Market Octavia, of which \$800,000 is on hand and will be used for the planning and environmental review phases. This project has also received \$9.7 million for acquisition and \$275,000 for remediation needs from REC's Open Space Acquisition Fund.

Total Costs:
\$22,295,250 for acquisition and park creation

IPIC Funds:
\$8,810,000 transferred

\$3,100,000 appropriated from MO but not transferred

\$505,250 from MO programmed FY25

PARK AT WELSH / FREELON / 598 BRANNAN (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. J)

The Central SoMa Plan calls for the creation of an approximately one-acre park located in the interior of the block surrounded by Brannan Street, 4th Street, Bryant Street and 5th Street, the location of the previous Public Utilities Commission yard. Expected features in the park include outdoor seating, dog run, children's playground, public art and flexible space to host community events such as a night market. Specific amenities are to be determined through on-going outreach by the development team.

Project Origin:
Central SoMa Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Project Status and Delivery: The park will be developed in connection with the multi-phase development at 598 Brannan Street, which staff estimates will occur in the next five years in two major phases. The Project Sponsor of the mixed-use office project at 598 Brannan Street have the right to develop the park in-lieu of paying impact fees. (see Planning Code Section 406(e))

IPIC Funds:
Current estimate: \$38,500,000.

GENE FRIEND POOL ANNEX AND COMMUNITY CENTER AT 88 BLUXOME (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. K)

The Gene Friend Pool Annex at 88 Bluxome will include a community pool and 10,000 square foot community room that will be developed as part of the mixed-use project at 88 Bluxome.

Project Origin:
Central SoMa Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

The Pool Annex will be developed in connection with the mixed-use development at 88 Bluxome Street.

IPIC Funds:
Up to \$10,000,000. Actual cost is to be determined.

VICTORIA MANALO DRAVES PARK PROGRAMMING

The project included the addition of sports lighting at the ballfield and basketball court and upgrades of pathway lighting, as well as minor security updates to pathways, low walls, and fencing, to create better circulation and site visibility (added security cameras). Additional seating was installed at the playground and the community garden was expanded with added planters.

Project Origin:


POPOS in-lieu fees

Project Status and Delivery:

project is completed and opened in 2021.

Total Costs:

Final project cost was \$2,200,000; with a balance over \$400K remaining. Remaining funds will be required to go to VMD.



South of Market (SoMa)

- 10. 2nd Street Streetscape Improvements
- 16. Ringold Alley Improvements
- 35. South Park Rehabilitation
- 39. Gene Friend Recreation Center Rehabilitation
- 45. 11th Street and Natoma Street New Park
- 53. Eagle Plaza
- a. SOMA Local Transit Improvements
- b. SOMA Regional Capacity Transit Improvements
- c. MTA Design, Plan and Prioritization of SoMa Projects
- g.1. Public Works Design, Plan and Prioritization of SoMa Projects
- j. SOMA Street Improvement Projects
- j. New Park at Welsh/Freelon/598 Brannan
- k. Gene Friend Aquatic Center Annex at 88 Bluxome
- n. Bluxome Linear Park



SOUTH OF MARKET

1. Central Soma Park
2. 88 Bluxome park
3. Central Soma Park
4. Gene Friend Renovation
5. SF Railyards Project Map

Photo credits: (1,3) Atlas Lab; (2) TMG Partners; (4) SF Rec Park; (5) SF Planning

Revenue And Expenditure

Revenue Summary: Actuals Through FY22; Projected FY23 and forward

AGENCY	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY24 (BUDGET YEAR.1)	FY25 (BUDGET YEAR.2)	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY24 - FY28	THROUGH FY28	FY29 - FY33	THROUGH FY33
HOUSING	\$ 7,753,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,753,000	\$ -	\$ 7,753,000
TRANSPORTATION / TRANSIT	\$ 9,241,000	\$ 9,944,000	\$ 10,827,000	\$ 2,684,000	\$ 11,432,000	\$ 12,584,000	\$ 9,225,000	\$ 46,752,000	\$ 65,937,000	\$ 2,925,000	\$ 68,862,000
COMPLETE STREETS	\$ 16,694,000	\$ 10,795,000	\$ 9,882,000	\$ 3,559,000	\$ 14,834,000	\$ 9,012,000	\$ 9,507,000	\$ 46,774,000	\$ 74,263,000	\$ 9,072,000	\$ 83,335,000
RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	\$ 13,323,000	\$ 9,454,000	\$ 6,727,000	\$ 3,769,000	\$ 15,441,000	\$ 3,196,000	\$ 7,814,000	\$ 36,947,000	\$ 59,774,000	\$ 13,803,000	\$ 73,577,000
CHILD CARE	\$ 1,840,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,135,000	\$ 559,000	\$ 2,259,000	\$ 709,000	\$ 1,242,000	\$ 5,944,000	\$ 9,259,000	\$ 1,901,000	\$ 11,160,000
ADMIN	\$ 2,377,000	\$ 1,686,000	\$ 1,302,000	\$ 556,000	\$ 2,316,000	\$ 1,492,000	\$ 1,463,000	\$ 7,179,000	\$ 11,222,000	\$ 1,464,000	\$ 12,686,000
TOTAL	\$ 51,208,000	\$ 31,334,000	\$ 30,033,000	\$ 11,127,000	\$ 46,322,000	\$ 28,843,000	\$ 29,251,000	\$ 143,398,000	\$ 228,138,000	\$ 29,933,000	\$ 257,491,000

Central SoMa Fees

AGENCY	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY24 (BUDGET YEAR.1)	FY25 (BUDGET YEAR.2)	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY24 - FY28	THROUGH FY28	FY29 - FY33	THROUGH FY33
Central SoMa Community Facilities Fee	\$ -	\$ 1,720,000	\$ 1,938,000	\$ 2,067,000	\$ 2,834,000	\$ 1,821,000	\$ 1,770,000	\$ 10,430,000	\$ 12,150,000	\$ 519,000	\$ 12,669,000
Central SoMa Infrastructure Fee	\$ -	\$ 1,535,000	\$ 160,000	\$ -	\$ 1,174,000	\$ 4,507,000	\$ 1,034,000	\$ 6,875,000	\$ 8,410,000	\$ -	\$ 8,410,000
Info to Transit	\$ -	\$ 1,343,125	\$ 140,000	\$ -	\$ 1,027,250	\$ 3,943,625	\$ 904,750	\$ 6,045,625	\$ 7,258,750	\$ -	\$ 7,258,750
Info to Rec and Open Space	\$ -	\$ 191,875	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 146,750	\$ 563,375	\$ 129,250	\$ 859,375	\$ 1,051,250	\$ -	\$ 1,051,250
PUC Site Park In-Kind Credit from TSF (Fee Swap)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

MELLO ROOS

AGENCY	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY24 (BUDGET YEAR.1)	FY25 (BUDGET YEAR.2)	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY24 - FY28	THROUGH FY28	FY29 - FY33	THROUGH FY33
HOUSING	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TRANSPORTATION / TRANSIT	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,880	\$ 17,420,150	\$ 23,050,610	\$ 13,794,000	\$ 54,331,640	\$ 54,331,640	\$ 68,970,000	\$ 123,301,640
COMPLETE STREETS	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,560	\$ 1,187,738	\$ 1,571,633	\$ 940,500	\$ 3,704,430	\$ 3,704,430	\$ 4,702,500	\$ 8,406,930
RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,760	\$ 5,146,863	\$ 6,810,408	\$ 4,075,500	\$ 16,052,530	\$ 16,052,530	\$ 20,377,500	\$ 36,430,030
ENVIRONMENTAL AND SUSTAINABILITY	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,840	\$ 6,730,513	\$ 8,905,918	\$ 5,329,500	\$ 20,991,770	\$ 20,991,770	\$ 26,647,500	\$ 47,639,270
CULTURAL PRESERVATION AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,820	\$ 8,314,183	\$ 11,001,408	\$ 6,583,500	\$ 25,931,010	\$ 25,931,010	\$ 31,917,800	\$ 58,848,810
CHILD CARE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,040	\$ 791,825	\$ 1,047,155	\$ 627,000	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 3,135,000	\$ 5,604,620
ADMINISTRATION	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,000	\$ 2,083,750	\$ 2,757,250	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 6,493,000	\$ 6,493,000	\$ 8,250,000	\$ 14,743,000
Total Pay Go	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 160,000	\$ 403,000	\$ 410,000	\$ 5,560,000	\$ 6,235,000	\$ 6,235,000	\$ 38,890,000	\$ 45,125,000
Total Bond	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 41,370,000	\$ 54,735,000	\$ -	\$ 96,305,000	\$ 96,305,000	\$ -	\$ 96,305,000
TOTAL	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 160,000	\$ 41,673,000	\$ 55,145,000	\$ 38,000,000	\$ 129,880,000	\$ 129,880,000	\$ 165,000,000	\$ 264,980,000

Revenue And Expenditure

AGENCY THROUGH FY22 FY23 (CURRENT YEAR) FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1) FY25 (BUDGET YEAR 2) FY26 FY27 FY28 THROUGH FY28 FY29 - FY33 THROUGH FY33

Transportation / Transit

Expenditure	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY29 - FY33	THROUGH FY33		
Revenue EN Impact Fee (Soma Only)	\$ 9,241,000	\$ 9,944,000	\$ 10,827,000	\$ 2,684,000	\$ 11,482,000	\$ 12,584,000	\$ 9,225,000	\$ 46,752,000	\$ 65,937,000	\$ 1,431,000	\$ 67,368,000
Revenue Soma Infrastructure Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 140,000	\$ -	\$ 1,027,200	\$ 3,943,625	\$ 904,750	\$ 6,015,625	\$ 7,358,750	\$ -	\$ 7,358,750
Revenue Hello Ross	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,880	\$ 17,404,150	\$ 23,050,610	\$ 2,324,080	\$ 43,861,270	\$ 42,868,720	\$ 68,880,000	\$ 109,741,720
TRANSIT SOMA REVENUE TOTAL	\$ 9,241,000	\$ 11,287,125	\$ 10,967,000	\$ 2,750,880	\$ 29,879,400	\$ 39,578,235	\$ 12,453,830	\$ 95,629,345	\$ 116,157,470	\$ 68,311,000	\$ 184,468,470
Expenditure											
10 2nd Street (OCT Removal)											
DPW											
Transferred	\$ 750,000										
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
Programmed	\$ -										
Total	\$ 750,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 750,000	\$ -	\$ 750,000
11 Folsom Street/Howard Street Improvements											
DPW/MTA											
Transferred	\$ -										
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
Programmed	\$ -										
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 550,000	\$ -	\$ 550,000
15.1 Transit Enhancement Fund - Soma											
MTA											
Transferred	\$ -										
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
Programmed	\$ -										
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 156,000	\$ -	\$ 156,000
16 Ringold Alley Improvements (In/Out)											
In/Out											
Transferred	\$ 1,800,000										
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
Programmed	\$ -										
Total	\$ 1,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,800,000	\$ -	\$ 1,800,000
a Local Transit Improvements											
MTA											
Transferred	\$ -										
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 9,069,000										
Programmed	\$ -										
Total	\$ 9,069,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,069,000	\$ -	\$ 9,069,000
b Regional Transit Capacity Improvements											
Transferred	\$ -										
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
Programmed	\$ -										
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
c.1 MTA Design, Plan and Prioritization of Soma Projects*											
MTA											
Transferred	\$ -										
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -										
Programmed	\$ -										
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Exp enditure Soma	\$ 12,325,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,475,615	\$ 43,325,790	\$ 38,238,065	\$ 13,794,000	\$ 103,833,470	\$ 116,158,470	\$ 61,116,000	\$ 177,274,470
Category Balance Per Year - Soma	\$ (9,084,000)	\$ 11,287,125	\$ 10,967,000	\$ (5,724,735)	\$ (13,446,390)	\$ 1,940,170	\$ (1,940,170)	\$ (6,204,225)	\$ (1,000)	\$ 7,195,000	\$ 7,194,000
Category Cumulative Balance Per Year - Soma	\$ (9,084,000)	\$ 8,203,125	\$ 19,170,125	\$ 13,445,390	\$ (1,000)	\$ 1,338,170	\$ (1,000)	\$ (1,000)	\$ (1,000)	\$ 1,342,000	\$ 1,342,000

* Line item C.1 amount from FY20 (\$300k) has been consolidated with line item "a"

AGENCY		THROUGH FY22					FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)		FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)		FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)		FY 26		FY 27		FY 28		FY 29 - FY 33		THROUGH FY 33	
Complete Streets																						
21. Folsom Street /Howard Street Improvements		MTA	Transferred	\$	17,292,000																	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$	2,390,000																	
			Programmed	\$	-																	
			Total	\$	19,682,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$
23. 2nd Street Improvements		DPW	Transferred	\$	4,812,000																	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$	-																	
			Programmed	\$	-																	
			Total	\$	4,812,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$
27.1. Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Streetscape Enhancement Fund *		DPW	Transferred	\$	-																	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$	200,000																	
			Programmed	\$	-																	
			Total	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$
e.1. 5th and Brannan Intersection Improvements (588 Brannan)		IN-KIND	Transferred	\$	-																	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$	-	2,000,000																
			Programmed	\$	-	-																
			Total	\$	-	2,000,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
e.2. 5th and Brannan Intersection Improvements (58 Bluxome)		IN-KIND	Transferred	\$	-																	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$	-																	
			Programmed	\$	-	2,500,000																
			Total	\$	-	2,500,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-

AGENCY		THROUGH FY22		FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)		FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)		FY25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)		FY26		FY27		FY28		FY29 - FY33		THROUGH FY33	
e.3	Sit and Brannan Intersection Improvements (Flower Mart)	IN-KIND	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	
			Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	
g.1	Public Works Design, Plan, and Prioritization of SOMA Projects	DPW	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Total	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
g.2	SOMA Street Improvement Projects	MTA	Transferred	\$ 160,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 8,889,750	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 475,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,725,000	\$ -	\$ 1,725,000	\$ -	\$ 1,725,000	\$ -	\$ 1,750,000	\$ -	\$ 3,475,000	
			Total	\$ 9,049,750	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 475,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,725,000	\$ -	\$ 1,725,000	\$ -	\$ 1,725,000	\$ -	\$ 1,750,000	\$ -	\$ 12,224,750	
g.2.2	SOMA Street Improvement Projects	DPW / MTA*	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,700,896	\$ 4,924,414	\$ 7,976,370	\$ 7,976,370	\$ 33,601,680	\$ -	\$ 33,601,680	\$ -	\$ 33,601,680	\$ -	\$ 33,601,680	\$ -	\$ 33,601,680	
			Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,700,896	\$ 4,924,414	\$ 7,976,370	\$ 7,976,370	\$ 33,601,680	\$ -	\$ 33,601,680	\$ -	\$ 33,601,680	\$ -	\$ 33,601,680	\$ -	\$ 33,601,680	
g.3	Filipino District Gateway Marker	IN-KIND	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
			Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	
			Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	
			Expenditure SOMA	\$ 39,849,750	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,399,414	\$ 10,476,370	\$ 40,126,880	\$ 77,970,450	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ -	\$ 1,750,000	\$ -	\$ 1,750,000	\$ -	\$ 79,220,430	
			Category Balance Per Year - SOMA	\$ (17,449,750)	\$ 8,795,000	\$ 9,462,000	\$ (3,563,560)	\$ (10,229,169)	\$ 5,184,219	\$ (28,870)	\$ 8,331,750	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	
			Category Commulative Balance Per Year - SOMA	\$ (17,449,750)	\$ (8,654,750)	\$ 1,507,250	\$ (5,153,500)	\$ 5,073,810	\$ (25,870)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	\$ (9,000)	

AGENCY		THROUGH FY22		FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)		FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)		FY25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)		FY26		FY27		FY24 - FY28		THROUGH FY28		FY29 - FY33		THROUGH FY33				
Revenue And Expenditure																								
Recreation and Open Space																								
Revenue EN Impact Fee (Soma Only)		\$	13,323,000	\$	9,454,000	\$	6,727,000	\$	3,769,000	\$	15,741,000	\$	3,196,000	\$	7,814,000	\$	36,947,000	\$	59,724,000	\$	6,804,000	\$	66,228,000	
Revenue Soma Infra Fee		\$	-	\$	19,1875	\$	20,061	\$	-	\$	146,790	\$	563,375	\$	123,250	\$	899,375	\$	1,051,250	\$	-	\$	1,051,250	
Revenue Mello Roos		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	15,760	\$	5,146,883	\$	6,810,408	\$	4,075,500	\$	16,052,530	\$	16,052,530	\$	16,302,000	
Revenue Flower Mart POPOS In-Lieu or In-Kind		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	490,141	\$	-	\$	-	\$	490,141	\$	490,141	\$	10,659,000	\$	11,149,141	
TSF Fee Credit Swap for In-Kind		\$	13,323,000	\$	24,645,875	\$	6,747,000	\$	3,785,760	\$	20,734,613	\$	11,059,524	\$	12,015,790	\$	54,349,046	\$	92,317,921	\$	38,765,000	\$	15,000,000	
REC AND OPEN SPACE REVENUE TOTAL		\$	13,323,000	\$	24,645,875	\$	6,747,000	\$	3,785,760	\$	20,734,613	\$	11,059,524	\$	12,015,790	\$	54,349,046	\$	92,317,921	\$	38,765,000	\$	15,000,000	
Expenditure																								
35	South Park		1,500,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		1,500,000	
			Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Appropriated not Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Programmed		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Total		1,500,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		1,500,000	
h	Gene Friend / Soma Recreation Center		2,150,300		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		2,150,300	
			Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Appropriated not Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Programmed		25,649,700		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		25,649,700	
			Total		27,800,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		27,800,000	
45	11th Street Park (previously "New Parks in Soma")		8,510,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		8,510,000	
			Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Appropriated not Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Programmed		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Total		8,510,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		8,510,000	
45	New Park in Soma		300,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		300,000	
			Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Appropriated not Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Programmed		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Total		300,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		300,000	
53	Eagle Plaza (In-Kind)		300,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		300,000	
			Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Appropriated not Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Programmed		33,500,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		33,500,000	
			Total		34,800,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		34,800,000	
j	Park at Welsh/Freelon/598 Brannan		1,500,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		1,500,000	
			Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Appropriated not Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Programmed		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Total		1,500,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		1,500,000	
k	88 Bluemore (Recreation Center above Aquatic Center)		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Appropriated not Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Programmed		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Total		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
d	TSF Projects (Swap for In-Kind Credit)		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Appropriated not Transferred		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Programmed		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Total		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
			Total		39,734,000		39,500,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	39,734,000
			Expenditure Soma		39,734,000		39,500,000		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	39,734,000
			Category Balance Per Year - Soma		(26,415,000)		(6,854,125)		6,747,000		3,785,760		20,734,613		(6,061,715)		2,016,750		2,121,639		(8,044,718)		30,886,640	22,844,922
			Category Cumulative Balance Per Year - Soma		(26,415,000)		(8,522,125)		(48,522,125)		(44,733,365)		(3,989,753)		(10,669,468)		(6,043,718)		(6,043,718)		(6,043,718)		21,844,922	22,844,922

Revenue And Expenditure

*Prp plans to use existing funds for 11th/ Natoma for Gene Friend on a short term basis

AGENCY		THROUGH FY22		FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)		FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)		FY25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)		FY26		FY27		FY28		THROUGH FY28		FY29 - FY33		THROUGH FY33		
58.2	Child Care																					
	Revenue EN Impact Fee (Soma Only)	\$ 1,840,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,135,000	\$ 559,000	\$ 2,299,000	\$ 2,299,000	\$ 709,000	\$ 1,242,000	\$ 5,944,000	\$ 9,239,000	\$ 9,239,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 10,189,000	
	Revenue Hello Roos	-	-	-	-	3,040	791,825	1,047,755	1,047,755	627,000	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	2,469,620	4,977,620
	CHILD CARE REVENUE TOTAL	\$ 1,840,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,135,000	\$ 562,040	\$ 3,098,825	\$ 3,347,755	\$ 1,756,755	\$ 1,874,000	\$ 8,413,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 11,708,620	\$ 15,166,620	
	OCEC																					
	Transferred	\$ 1,213,178																				
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 965,000																				
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,750,822	\$ 1,059,000	\$ 2,299,000	\$ 709,000	\$ 1,242,000	\$ 7,059,822	\$ 7,059,822	\$ 7,059,822	\$ 7,059,822	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 930,000	\$ 9,989,822	
	Total	\$ 2,178,178	\$ -	\$ 1,750,822	\$ 1,059,000	\$ 2,299,000	\$ 709,000	\$ 1,242,000	\$ 7,059,822	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 9,989,822	
	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,040	\$ 791,825	\$ 1,047,755	\$ 627,000	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 4,977,620	
	Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,040	\$ 791,825	\$ 1,047,755	\$ 627,000	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 2,469,620	\$ 4,977,620	
	Expenditure Soma	\$ 2,178,178	\$ -	\$ 1,750,822	\$ 1,059,000	\$ 2,299,000	\$ 709,000	\$ 1,242,000	\$ 7,059,822	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 2,503,000	\$ 2,503,000	\$ 2,503,000	\$ 2,503,000	\$ 2,503,000	\$ 2,503,000	\$ 2,503,000	\$ 14,208,620	
	Category Balance Per Year - Soma	\$ (338,178)	\$ 1,475,000	\$ (615,822)	\$ (800,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,115,822)	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 937,000	\$ 937,000	\$ 937,000	\$ 937,000	\$ 937,000	\$ 937,000	\$ 937,000	\$ 938,000	
	Category Commulative Balance Per Year - Soma	\$ (338,178)	\$ 1,136,822	\$ 521,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 958,000	\$ 958,000	\$ 958,000	\$ 958,000	\$ 958,000	\$ 958,000	\$ 958,000	\$ 958,000	

Program Administration																					
	Revenue EN Impact Fee (Soma Only)	\$ 2,377,000	\$ 1,666,000	\$ 1,666,000	\$ 566,000	\$ 2,316,000	\$ 1,342,000	\$ 1,463,000	\$ 1,122,000	\$ 1,122,000	\$ 1,122,000	\$ 1,122,000	\$ 1,122,000	\$ 717,000	\$ 717,000	\$ 717,000	\$ 717,000	\$ 717,000	\$ 717,000	\$ 717,000	\$ 11,939,000
	Revenue Hello Roos	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,000	\$ 2,083,790	\$ 2,737,250	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 6,499,000	\$ 13,989,000
	ADMIN REVENUE TOTAL	\$ 2,377,000	\$ 1,666,000	\$ 1,666,000	\$ 574,000	\$ 4,399,790	\$ 4,079,250	\$ 3,113,000	\$ 13,678,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 17,721,000	\$ 25,938,000
	Admin - Soma	\$ 4,156,618	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 235,535	\$ 675,000	\$ 203,000	\$ 155,589	\$ 1,567,804	\$ 6,229,522	\$ 6,229,522	\$ 6,229,522	\$ 6,229,522	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 6,713,153
	Admin Transfer to Programs - Soma	\$ 542,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Expenditure Soma	\$ 4,698,618	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 235,535	\$ 675,000	\$ 203,000	\$ 155,589	\$ 1,567,804	\$ 6,762,522	\$ 6,762,522	\$ 6,762,522	\$ 6,762,522	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 480,631	\$ 7,213,153
	Category Balance Per Year - Soma	\$ (2,317,618)	\$ 1,166,000	\$ 1,202,000	\$ 328,465	\$ 3,724,790	\$ 3,876,250	\$ 2,957,411	\$ 12,110,196	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 6,866,369	\$ 6,866,369	\$ 6,866,369	\$ 6,866,369	\$ 6,866,369	\$ 6,866,369	\$ 6,866,369	\$ 17,824,877
	Category Commulative Balance Per Year - Soma	\$ (2,317,618)	\$ (1,151,618)	\$ 50,382	\$ 376,847	\$ 4,103,597	\$ 8,000,847	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 10,958,478	\$ 17,824,877	\$ 17,824,877	\$ 17,824,877	\$ 17,824,877	\$ 17,824,877	\$ 17,824,877	\$ 17,824,877	\$ 17,824,877

TOTAL BALANCES - Soma																					
68	Revenue Totals	\$ 51,208,000	\$ 51,589,000	\$ 51,589,000	\$ 32,151,000	\$ 13,354,000	\$ 92,054,000	\$ 88,806,141	\$ 53,585,080	\$ 278,901,221	\$ 382,696,221	\$ 382,696,221	\$ 382,696,221	\$ 168,685,000	\$ 168,685,000	\$ 168,685,000	\$ 168,685,000	\$ 168,685,000	\$ 168,685,000	\$ 168,685,000	\$ 551,383,221
69	Total Expenditures	\$ 100,455,546	\$ 37,730,000	\$ 3,988,822	\$ 11,897,990	\$ 91,221,186	\$ 84,446,218	\$ 49,877,739	\$ 241,531,215	\$ 379,707,461	\$ 379,707,461	\$ 379,707,461	\$ 379,707,461	\$ 116,347,991	\$ 116,347,991	\$ 116,347,991	\$ 116,347,991	\$ 116,347,991	\$ 116,347,991	\$ 116,347,991	\$ 496,035,452
70	Annual Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (49,247,546)	\$ 13,859,000	\$ 28,602,178	\$ 1,456,000	\$ 78,834	\$ 4,399,923	\$ 3,667,241	\$ 36,999,807	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 52,337,009	\$ 52,337,009	\$ 52,337,009	\$ 52,337,009	\$ 52,337,009	\$ 52,337,009	\$ 52,337,009	\$ 55,237,769
72	Commulative Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (49,247,546)	\$ (36,378,546)	\$ (7,116,368)	\$ (5,760,318)	\$ (4,976,504)	\$ (616,581)	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 2,990,760	\$ 56,327,769	\$ 56,327,769	\$ 56,327,769	\$ 56,327,769	\$ 56,327,769	\$ 56,327,769	\$ 56,327,769	\$ 55,327,769

TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT

Background and Highlights

The Transit Center District Plan (TCDP), adopted in 2012, originally enabled about 4,800 additional residential units and about 6.5 million square foot of new commercial space (office and retail) near the Transbay Terminal Center (now known as the Salesforce Transit Center). Since plan adoption, about 4,905 units and 5.5 million square footage of commercial space have been entitled by the Planning Department.

The new Transit Center serves as the new heart of downtown San Francisco and a new terminus for Caltrain and eventually High Speed Rail. The Transit Center consists of Phase I: the terminal building, and Phase II: The Downtown Rail Extension (DTX), which would extend the Caltrain and eventually High Speed Rail terminus to the new Transbay Transit Center.

The Transit Center District Plan and the related Transbay Redevelopment Plan are being carried out by several agencies: Planning, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) and the Transbay Joint Authorities Board (TJPA). The TCDP Implementation Document established a list of infrastructure improvement projects to enhance pedestrian and transit infrastructure to accommodate the forthcoming growth in the Transit Center District as a major regional transit hub.

The TCDP established two impact fees for new development in the Transit Center District: one for open space and a second for transportation. In addition to the impact fees, a Community Facilities District (CFD or Mello Roos District) has been established to help fund the DTX as well as the streetscape and open space improvements.

The Transbay CFD includes an additive tax per square foot on properties within the TCDP area plan that will see significant new development. The CFD could potentially raise as much as \$122 million between FY24 and FY28 future towards construction of the Transbay Terminal projects and other streetscape, transit, and open space improvements. Of the \$122 million, \$100 million are specifically be allocated to TJPA-related projects, with the balance of \$22 million are to be allocated to other Transit Center related Projects.

The Planning Department projects about \$75 million in impact fee revenues available for infrastructure impact fees in the Transit Center District. Nearly \$19 million of these impact fees are set aside for open space while the other \$56 million are set aside for transportation and streetscape projects.

THE TRANSIT CENTER FUNDING PROGRAM AND ONGOING APPROACH TO ALLOCATING FUNDS TO PROJECTS

A component of the Transit Center Implementation Document, one of the master approval documents adopted by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, is the Transit Center Funding Plan, which provides a definitive list of transportation and open space infrastructure project (TC Infrastructure Projects) and their expected costs that are to be delivered over the Plan's 20-year timeframe. While the Implementation Document and Funding Plan provides the list of projects and their expected costs, it does not specify the timing of the delivery of the TC Infrastructure Projects; rather it specifies that the timing of funding and delivery would largely be left to IPIC.

In winter of 2020, IPIC decided to use the original costs of the Infrastructure Projects vis-à-vis each other as a way to gage the ongoing funding for each project and to assure enough revenue would be left for each project over time, even when such projects might not be ready for delivery in the near term.

Like last year, this IPIC Report includes both Expenditure Plans for both impact fee and CFD spending. Through this fiscal year, CFD spending has been allocated to TJPA related projects (including the Train Box and Salesforce Park), several Transit Related streetscape projects, Portsmouth Square renovation, BART capacity improvements at Montgomery and Embarcadero Station, and a Congestion Management Study. Over the next five years (FY24 to FY28) IPIC expects \$122 in CFD funding (both through bond issuances and pay-as-you-go special tax revenue).

Project Descriptions

TRANSIT CENTER STREETScape (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 5)

The Transit Center Plan assumes streetscape and public right-of-way improvements on almost all of District's streets. Streetscape improvements have been divided into five phases. As an initial phase, priority street segments have been identified to coincide with the opening of the Transbay station. These street segments include the west side of 1st Street between Mission and Minna pedestrian crosswalk with signal across Mission Street at Shaw Alley with accompanying sidewalk widening, and the construction of a bus island on eastbound Mission between 1st and Fremont Streets.

Project Origin:

The Transit Center District Plan / Transit Center Implementation Plan

Project Status and Delivery:

Minna Natoma Streetscape Project design underway. Anticipated Advertisement Winter 2023.

Beale Street Phase 1 Project approaching 95% design. Anticipated advertisement in Winter 2023.

Transit U Project approaching 95% design. Anticipated advertisement in Spring 2023.

Main Street Phase 1 Project approaching 35% design. Anticipated advertisement in Fall 2023.

Transbay Howard Project approaching 35% design. Anticipated advertisement in Winter 2024.

Total Costs:

\$252 million for all phases (original estimate of streetscape, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements 2022 dollars)

IPIC Funds:

\$27,742,128 total

\$24,290,000 transferred

\$3,452,128 appropriated not transferred

CFD Funds:

\$51,158,400 transferred

\$21,832,927 programmed FY23

TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER AND DOWNTOWN RAIL EXTENSION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 7 AND 8)

The Transbay Program consists of two phases. Phase 1 – which has been completed and is currently operating – comprises design and construction of the above-grade levels of the Transit Center and its related components, including the Roof Top Park (Salesforce Park), the core and shell of the below-grade train box, a bus ramp connecting the station to the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge, bus storage for off-peak bus layovers, and a temporary terminal, which has since been transferred to the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure in 2020.

Phase 2 of the Program will deliver the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) project, which will extend the Caltrain system from its current terminus at Fourth and King streets and ultimately, the California High-Speed Rail Authority statewide system to downtown San Francisco to the Salesforce Transit Center. It will also include the build-out of the Transit Center's below-grade train station, and a new underground station at Fourth and Townsend Streets along with six ventilation and/or egress structures along the tunnel alignment. Engineering for the Downtown Rail Extension is currently underway.

Project Origin:

In 1999, San Francisco voters voted to make it city policy to extend the Caltrain station from Fourth and King Streets up to a new or rebuilt station on the site of the Transbay Terminal located on Mission and First Streets. (Proposition H).

Project Status and Delivery:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued an Amended Record of Decision for the Transbay Program's Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report on July 22, 2019. This document amends the 2005 Record of Decision for the Transbay Program and covers the required environmental analysis of refinements to the Downtown Rail Extension and other transportation improvements in the vicinity of the transit center. Engineering and design work is underway, and on December 3, 2021, the project was accepted into the Project Development phase of the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grants New Starts program. This is the first step of the three-part process to securing a significant federal funding contribution to deliver the project. The TJPA is targeting an August 2023 entry to the Engineering phase, the second step in FTA's three-part process.

Total Costs:

Based on a 2016 estimate, the total cost of Phase 2 is estimated at approximately \$5 billion; an updated cost estimate is under development and anticipated in early 2023.

IPIC Funds:

\$16,000,000 in FY19, which would enable design, engineering, and other preconstruction work. These funds have been appropriated but not yet transferred to TJPA.

RAIL ALIGNMENT AND BENEFITS STUDY (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 9)

The Rail Alignment and Benefits (RAB) Implementation Program is a continuation of the work San Francisco Planning completed in 2018 that focused on the efficient and effective movement of Caltrain and High Speed Rail trains through the City and into the Transbay Transit Center (TTC).

The Mayor’s office and the Board of Supervisors, in their capacity as the County Transportation Authority, both endorsed the Pennsylvania alignment to extend the Downtown Extension (DTX) tunnel and the Pennsylvania Avenue alignment. This project will move the trains underground further south (to around Cesar Chavez).

By tunneling the trains further south, six new street connections can be made along the alignment while preserving the current crossings. The Planning Department is currently leading a study of future Caltrain station locations depending on the tunnel alignments, which are under development by the County Transportation Authority. The Planning Department is also leading work to identify development opportunities for the Railyards that can accommodate critical transit service needed for the City and Region.

In support of the RAB Implementation Program at the Railyards, \$250 thousand may go to support a community engagement process and financial and technical analysis in parallel to the preliminary business case that is being jointly developed by Caltrain and Prologis from 2021-2023.

This work would take place over 2022 and 2023, informing and supporting the technical conclusions of the business case, which is anticipated to conclude in 2023 with a preferred concept to advance into a development agreement discussion.

IPIC Funds:

\$3,800,000 in FY18

BETTER MARKET STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 11)

The Better Market Street Project provides various streetscape and transportation improvements to a 2.2 mile-long corridor along Market Street between Steuart Street and Octavia Boulevard, including a sidewalk-level bicycle facility, pedestrian facilities, and streetscapes along Market Street. The project also introduces changes to the roadway configuration, private vehicle access restrictions, traffic signals, surface transit, commercial and passenger loading, vehicular parking, and utilities. Funds from Transit Center Transportation Impact fee would go toward design and engineering for the project segment in the Transit Center District.

Total Costs:

Approx. \$73,500,000 for portion immediately adjacent to Transit Center

IPIC FUNDS:

\$2,000,000 in FY 19

SODA STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 12)

As described above, the SODA planning effort looks to prioritize public realm improvements in Transit Center and Rincon Hill holistically. Because Transit Center and Rincon Hill are immediately adjacent to each other, public realm projects in each neighborhood serve both areas along with the City as a whole.

SODA Streetscape Improvements is being described separately from the Transit Center Streetscape Improvements to indicate that funds appropriated to this IPIC Project could potentially pay for Rincon Hill streetscape projects if the SODA Plan prioritizes them above other Transit Center streetscape plans for near-term implementation.

Project Origin:

Rincon Hill Master Streetscape Plan, Transit Center Implementation Plan, SODA Planning Process

Project Status and Delivery:

SODA Alleys (Minna, Jesse, Anthony, Stevenson, Tehama, Clementina) TBD.

Total Costs: TBD

IPIC Funds:

\$8.5 million (appropriated not transferred)

CENTRAL SUBWAY CHINATOWN STATION OPEN SPACE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 24)

The Transit Center District Plan explicitly anticipated sharing impact fees for park improvements in nearby Chinatown. A part of these funds have been appropriated for the Chinatown Station Open Space.

Project Origin:

The Transit Center District Plan; Central Subway

Project Status and Delivery:

Project is currently in the testing phase with revenue service expected to begin in Spring of 2022.

IPIC Funds:

\$7,000,000

PORTSMOUTH SQUARE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 25, AND 26)

The much-needed improvements to Portsmouth Square will create a central community space that is safe and welcoming to all, including the many residents of nearby affordable housing. The proposed project design was informed by community feedback with majority support from Chinatown community. The proposed project will renovate the existing park with a new children’s play area, exercise equipment, plazas, shade structures, seating areas, wayfinding, signage, sidewalks, landscaping, terraces, ramps, and a new 8,300-square-foot clubhouse. The proposed project will also re-waterproof the roof of the Portsmouth Square Garage located underneath the park and portions of the adjacent streets and sidewalks, seismically upgrade portions of the parking garage, and demolish and remove the pedestrian bridge spanning Kearny Street that connects Portsmouth Square with 750 Kearny Street (currently managed as a Hilton Hotel and the Chinese Culture Center).

Project Origin: The Transit Center District Plan

Project Status and Delivery: An Environmental Impact Report for the project was completed and certified in January of 2022. The EIR received final approval at the completion of the required 30-day appeal period and the

Notice of Determination was filed on February 16, 2022. The project will receive \$54 million from the 2020 Health & Recovery G.O. Bond.

Total Costs: \$72,000,000

\$10.8 million from Transit Center Community Facilities District funding

TRANSIT DELAY MITIGATION (NEW BUSES)

The Transit Center Implementation Document and the Funding Program calls for the purchase of three buses to serve the Area, up to two for MTA with a third going to a regional transit agency.

Project Origin: The Transit Center District Plan

Project Status and Delivery: MTA is awaiting the transfer of funds to purchase new buses.

CBD Funds: \$3,050,284 in FY23 for MTA.

IPIC Funds: \$1,600,000 in FY27 for regional transit.

DECONGESTION PRICING AND INCENTIVES STUDY (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 12.2)

Traffic congestion has historically been a significant problem in downtown San Francisco and SoMa, and as the city recovers from the pandemic, we are already seeing congestion rise again. The Downtown Congestion Pricing Study is exploring how a fee to drive into downtown/ SoMa during the most congested times could keep traffic moving while making our transportation system safer and more equitable, after we recover from the COVID 19 pandemic. The study begins with an analysis of existing congestion and how it impacts residents, businesses, and other users of the transportation system with a focus on social equity. The study also includes working with stakeholders to identify goals and objectives for potential congestion pricing policies.

The study team will then develop, evaluate, and refine potential congestion pricing program scenarios to identify which best meet the goals and objectives before developing a final recommendation and potential implementation plan. Program elements to be considered include different pricing parameters, discounts and incentives for using non-auto travel modes, credits or discounts to improve equity outcomes, and provision of improved transit service and multimodal infrastructure using revenue raised through pricing.

The study will evaluate potential approaches from three main perspectives: efficacy, equity, and economy. First, the study will evaluate strategies with a focus on efficacy at reducing congestion and its negative effects.

Second, the study will include an equity analysis to assess who would benefit and be impacted by a potential system and what it would take to ensure the resulting program provides net benefits to low-income travelers in San Francisco.

And third, the study will seek to understand business impacts to ensure the approach would foster continued economic growth. The study will also include a robust and inclusive outreach effort to inform the alternatives, analysis, and conclusions. Ultimately, the study will identify the most promising pricing and incentives alternative(s) and next steps for environmental analysis, design, funding, and implementation.

Project Origin:

The Transportation Authority first studied congestion pricing in the 2010 Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study. It has since been included in a wide range of local and regional plans, including the 2017 San Francisco Transportation Plan, 2017 San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Plan, 2017 San Francisco Transportation Sector Climate Action Strategy, 2018 Transportation Task Force 2045 Report, and 2019 San Francisco Vision Zero Action Strategy.

Project Status:

The Transportation Authority Board requested the study in Fall 2018 and appropriated local Prop K sales tax funding in early 2019. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved funding to support the study in Summer 2019. The study launched in July 2019 and was anticipated for completion by the end of calendar 2020. Currently, the study is on hold until 2022, as we observe travel patterns and economic recovery following the COVID 19 pandemic. We anticipate resuming the study in 2022. Ultimately, implementation would require consensus by city leaders and state authorization.

Total Cost: Total estimated study cost is \$3.2 million.

IPIC/ CFD Funds:

\$470,000 in IPIC funds and \$880,000 in CFD funds have been provided for the project. The remainder of the study cost, \$1.85 million, has been funded through a combination of local Prop K sales tax (\$1,250,000); regional MTC funds (\$400,000); and potential private (\$600,000) grant sources.

BART CAPACITY PROJECTS (EXPENDITURE PLAN / LINE ITEM NO. 12.3)

Scope of Work: This project will take place at the BART/Muni Embarcadero station. This station plays a critical role in San Francisco as it is located in an area with multiple tourist attractions, businesses, restaurants, employment offices, education programs, and transit connections; hence, the station serves a wide range of communities, including Communities of Concern. On a typical weekday in 2019, the station provided ~90,000 BART journeys (entries + exists), and in 2022, ~25,000 BART journeys.

This project will increase accessibility, reduce elevator service interruptions, improve station maintainability, and enhance customer experience at the station. The project's scope of work will be delivered in two phases. Phase 1 will renovate and modernize existing hydraulic elevator, relocate existing machine room adjacent to elevator shaft, and demolish and rebuild wider south stairs, increasing width from 36" to 44" to comply with egress requirement. Phase 2 will construct a new elevator in the north side of the station, construct a new machine room for the elevator, and demolish and rebuild wider north stairs. Funding for Phase 1 has been secured and multiple funding sources are either programmed or allocated, including CFD funds.

Project Origin: The Embarcadero station is considered one of the busiest stations of the BART system. BART has conducted several studies to develop project concepts to renovate, modernize, and expand capacity at the Embarcadero station. In addition, with input from various stakeholders, BART has identified needs to improve station functionality, safety, access, appearance, and overall customer experience. These studies informed the scope of work for this project and highlighted the importance of delivering the work to address current and projected needs at the station.

Project Status and Delivery: In the fall of 2019, BART placed a contract out for bid for part of the current scope of work. BART received two bids that were 70% and 99% higher than Engineer's estimate. Upon rejecting all bids, BART determined the project needed to be re-designed and began this process in March of 2020. Due to COVID related impacts, including supply chain shortages, inflation, and staffing shortages, and legacy station complexities identified during the re-design phase, BART determined the project's scope of work needed to be delivered in two phases. For Phase 1, BART expects to complete final design by fall of 2023, begin construction in fall of 2024, and complete construction in fall of 2026. BART will determine the schedule for Phase 2 based on funding availability.



Transit Center District Projects

- 3. Transit Center Streetscape
- 5. Transit Center and DTX
- 9. Better Market Street
- 10. SODA Streetscape
- 11. Mid-Block Crossings (In-Kind)
- 12. Natoma Streetscape (In-Kind)
- 13. Bus Boarding Island on Mission (In-Kind)
- 14. Transit Center In-Kind
- 20. Sales Force Park (aka City Park)
- 21. Downtown / Chinatown Parks
- 22. Central Subway Open Space
- 23. Portsmouth Square Improvements



TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT

1. Portsmouth Square Plan
2. Portsmouth Square Clubhouse
3. Portsmouth Square Upper Plaza
4. Transit Center Park Concept Plan
5. Montgomery BART
6. Embarcadero BART

Photo credits: (1 - 4) SF Rec and Park; (5-6) BART

Transit Center - IJC Expenditure Plan - FY 24 - FY 28

Revenue And Expenditure	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY33
1. TRANSPORTATION / TRANSIT										
In-Kind	\$ 48,890,000	\$ -	\$ 18,024,800	\$ 4,348,800	\$ -	\$ 8,248,800	\$ 25,073,000	\$ 55,695,400	\$ 104,585,400	\$ 54,739,000
Cash	\$ 27,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,500,000	\$ -	\$ 27,500,000
Total	\$ 76,390,000	\$ -	\$ 18,024,800	\$ 4,348,800	\$ -	\$ 8,248,800	\$ 25,073,000	\$ 83,195,400	\$ 104,585,400	\$ 82,239,000
4. RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE										
In-Kind	\$ 17,711,000	\$ -	\$ 5,891,200	\$ 1,599,200	\$ -	\$ 1,874,400	\$ 9,800,000	\$ 19,164,800	\$ 36,875,800	\$ 20,842,000
Cash	\$ 8,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,500,000	\$ -	\$ 8,500,000
Total	\$ 26,211,000	\$ -	\$ 5,891,200	\$ 1,599,200	\$ -	\$ 1,874,400	\$ 9,800,000	\$ 27,664,800	\$ 36,875,800	\$ 29,342,000
3. Total	\$ 102,601,000	\$ -	\$ 23,916,000	\$ 5,948,000	\$ -	\$ 10,123,200	\$ 34,873,000	\$ 110,860,200	\$ 141,461,200	\$ 111,581,000
Revenue: Actuals FY22 and Prior -- Projected FY23 and Forward										
THROUGH FY 22	FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY33
\$ 48,890,000	\$ -	\$ 18,024,800	\$ 4,348,800	\$ -	\$ 8,248,800	\$ 25,073,000	\$ 55,695,400	\$ 104,585,400	\$ 54,739,000	\$ 159,324,400

Transportation

1. Revenue	\$ 48,890,000	\$ -	\$ 18,024,800	\$ 4,348,800	\$ -	\$ 8,248,800	\$ 25,073,000	\$ 55,695,400	\$ 104,585,400	\$ 54,739,000	\$ 159,324,400
5. Streetscape Design and Construction (1)											
DPW	Transferred	\$ 24,250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,496,385	\$ 10,496,385	\$ 34,746,385	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,746,385
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 6,580,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,580,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,580,000
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DCP	Transferred	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Phase I DTX											
TJPA	Transferred	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Phase II DTX											
TJPA	Transferred	\$ 16,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,000,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Rallyed Realignment Study											
DCP	Transferred	\$ 3,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,800,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10. Admin (Planning)											
DCP	Transferred	\$ 135,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Better Market Street											
DPW	Transferred	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Transit Center - IFC Expenditure Plan - FY 24 - FY 28

Revenue : Actuals FY22 and Prior -- Projected FY23 and Forward		FY 23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY 24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY 25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY 28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY 33
12	SODA Streetscape										
	DPW										
	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 8,500,000							\$ 8,500,000		\$ 8,500,000
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
	DPW										
	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
12.2	Congestion Charging Studies and Pilot										
	CTA										
	Transferred	\$ 470,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 470,000	\$ -	\$ 470,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 530,000							\$ 530,000		\$ 530,000
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
12.3	BART Capacity Projects										
	BART										
	Transferred	\$ 170,129	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 170,129	\$ -	\$ 170,129
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 1,829,871	\$ (1,515,985)					\$ (1,515,985)	\$ 313,886	\$ -	\$ 313,886
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
12.5	Transit Delay Mitigation										
	MTA										
	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ 2,000,000	\$ (2,000,000)					\$ (2,000,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
12.75	Transit Delay Mitigation (Regional Transit)										
	[tbd]										
	Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
13	Mid-Block Crossings (In-Kind - Transit Tower)										
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 1,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,600,000	\$ -	\$ 1,600,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
14	Natoma (In-Kind - Transit Tower)										
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 11,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,000,000	\$ -	\$ 11,000,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
15	Bus Boarding Island on Mission Street (In-Kind - Transit Tower)										
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 500,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
16	Transit Tower In-Kind Agreement										
	IN-KIND										
	Transferred	\$ 15,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,000,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000,000
	Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
	Programmed	\$ -							\$ -		\$ -
	Transportation Expenditure Sub Total	\$ 96,005,000	\$ (3,515,985)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 10,496,385	\$ 6,830,400	\$ 104,585,400	\$ -	\$ 104,585,400
17	Category Balance Per Year	\$ (47,115,000)	\$ 21,540,785	\$ 4,348,800	\$ -	\$ 6,648,800	\$ 14,576,615	\$ 47,115,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
18	Category Cumulative Balance	\$ (47,115,000)	\$ (25,574,215)	\$ (21,225,415)	\$ (21,225,415)	\$ (145,766,415)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Transit Center - IPIC Expenditure Plan - FY 24 - FY 28

Revenue - Actuals FY22 and Prior -- Projected FY23 and Forward

	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY33
19 Revenue	\$ 17,771,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,891,200	\$ 1,999,200	\$ -	\$ 1,874,400	\$ 9,364,800	\$ 21,075,800	\$ 20,842,000	\$ 41,917,800

(1) 2nd Street (Line Item 12.05) now included as part of larger Streetscape (line item) (Line Item No. 5)

Recreation and Open Space

	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY33
21 City Park (TJPA)	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
23 Improvements to Downtown/Chinatown Parks	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
24 Central Subway Open Space	\$ 7,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,000,000	\$ -	\$ 7,000,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25 Portsmouth Square Improvements (RPD)	\$ 365,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 365,000	\$ -	\$ 365,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
26 Portsmouth Square Improvements (Planning)	\$ 283,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 283,000	\$ -	\$ 283,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
27 Guy Place Park	\$ 1,525,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,525,000	\$ -	\$ 1,525,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
28 City Park (In-Kind - Transit Tower)	\$ 8,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,500,000	\$ -	\$ 8,500,000
Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriated not Transferred	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Programmed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Rec and Open Space Expenditure Sub total	\$ 21,174,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,174,000	\$ -	\$ 21,174,000
Category Balance Per Year	\$ (9,462,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,891,200	\$ 1,999,200	\$ -	\$ 1,874,400	\$ 9,800,000	\$ 19,164,800	\$ 20,842,000	\$ 36,544,800
Category Cumulative Balance	\$ (9,462,000)	\$ (9,462,000)	\$ 2,429,200	\$ 4,028,400	\$ 4,028,400	\$ 5,902,800	\$ 15,702,800	\$ 15,702,800	\$ 15,702,800	\$ 36,544,800	\$ 36,544,800

Revenue - Actuals FY22 and Prior -- Projected FY23 and Forward

	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)	FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)	FY25 (BUDGET YEAR 2)	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY 24 - FY 28	THROUGH FY28	FY 29 - FY 33	THROUGH FY33
31 Revenue Totals	\$ 66,601,000	\$ -	\$ 23,916,000	\$ 5,940,000	\$ -	\$ 10,122,200	\$ 9,872,000	\$ 74,860,200	\$ 141,441,200	\$ 75,581,000	\$ 217,042,200
32 Total Expenditures	\$ 117,170,000	\$ -	\$ (3,315,985)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 10,496,385	\$ 8,580,400	\$ 125,758,400	\$ -	\$ 125,758,400
33 Annual Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (50,577,000)	\$ -	\$ 27,231,985	\$ 5,940,000	\$ -	\$ 8,522,200	\$ (24,376,615)	\$ 66,279,800	\$ 15,702,800	\$ 75,581,000	\$ 91,283,800
34 Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (50,577,000)	\$ (50,577,000)	\$ (23,345,015)	\$ (17,197,015)	\$ (17,197,015)	\$ (8,673,815)	\$ 15,702,800	\$ 15,702,800	\$ 15,702,800	\$ 91,283,800	\$ 91,283,800

Transit Ceter

IPIC CFD Expenditure Plan FY24 - FY28

Revenue	Future Bond Issuances (5)						THROUGH FY28	THROUGH FY28	THROUGH FY28
	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (Current Year)	FY24 (Budget Year 1)	FY25 (Budget Year 2)	FY26	FY27			
TIPA CFD Bond Proceeds (1)	\$ 397,657,950	\$ 43,457,509	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,973,250	\$ 19,584,000	\$ 88,557,250	\$ 529,672,709
TIPA Pay-Go Special Tax Revenue (2)	\$ 14,467,357	\$ 2,269,431	\$ 2,074,459	\$ 2,095,508	\$ 2,127,652	\$ 2,740,003	\$ 2,938,959	\$ 11,976,581	\$ 28,713,389
TOTAL TIPA SHARE	\$ 412,125,307	\$ 45,726,940	\$ 2,074,459	\$ 2,095,508	\$ 2,127,652	\$ 71,713,253	\$ 22,522,959	\$ 100,533,831	\$ 558,386,078
Total City Bond Proceeds (3)	\$ 61,100,414	\$ 29,918,520	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,518,000	\$ 4,118,250	\$ 18,636,250	\$ 109,655,183
City Pay-Go Special Tax Revenue (4)	\$ 4,888,395	\$ 478,064	\$ 436,993	\$ 441,427	\$ 448,198	\$ 577,192	\$ 619,103	\$ 2,522,912	\$ 7,889,371
TOTAL CITY SHARE	\$ 65,988,809	\$ 30,396,584	\$ 436,993	\$ 441,427	\$ 448,198	\$ 15,095,192	\$ 4,737,353	\$ 21,159,162	\$ 117,544,554
TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 478,114,116	\$ 76,133,524	\$ 2,511,451	\$ 2,536,934	\$ 2,575,850	\$ 86,808,445	\$ 27,260,312	\$ 121,692,993	\$ 675,930,532
<p>1 For FY2021-22, includes bond proceeds from the Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017B, 2019B, 2020B, and 2021B. For FY2022-23, includes bond proceeds from the Special Tax Bonds, Series 2022A (DPW/MTA/BART). Amounts are net of 0.2% CSA audit fee.</p> <p>2 For FY2021-22, includes \$11,620,000 appropriated to TIPA per Ordinance No. 177-21. Estimated for FY2022-23 and thereafter.</p> <p>3 For FY2021-22, includes bond proceeds from the Special Tax Bonds, Series 2017A (DPW) and 2019A (DPW/RECBART). For FY2022-23, includes bond proceeds from the Special Tax Bonds, Series 2022A (DPW/MTA/BART). Amounts are net of 0.2% CSA audit fee.</p> <p>4 Includes \$880,000 allocated to the San Francisco County Transportation Authority for the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study Program. Estimated for FY2022-23 and thereafter.</p> <p>5 Estimated future bond issuances and pay-go are based on current development status of Conditioned Projects and timing estimates provided by OCl and Planning. Subject to change.</p>									
CFD Bond Proceeds represent the maximum bonding capacity for each issuance, and Pay-Go Special Tax Revenues represent 10% debt service coverage required for Bonds less administrative expenses.									
Expenditure	THROUGH FY22	FY23 (Current Year)	FY24 (Budget Year 1)	FY25 (Budget Year 2)	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY23 - FY28	THROUGH FY28
TIPA Projects	\$ 412,125,307	\$ 45,726,940	\$ 2,074,459	\$ 2,095,508	\$ 2,127,652	\$ 71,713,253	\$ 22,522,959	\$ 100,533,831	\$ 558,386,078
Transit Center Related Streetscape									
2nd Street Infrastructure Improvements	\$ 9,655,835								\$ 9,655,835
Folsom Street Infrastructure Improvements	\$ 4,500,000								\$ 4,500,000
Transit Center Streetscape	\$ 36,859,645	\$ 25,120,482							\$ 61,980,127
TC Streetscape Total	\$ 51,015,480								\$ 51,015,480
BART: Embarcadero & Montgomery Stations	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,747,754							\$ 2,747,754
Congestion Pricing Study	\$ 880,000								\$ 880,000
Portsmouth Square	\$ 9,000,000								\$ 9,000,000
Transit Delay Mitigation (New Buses)	\$ -	\$ 3,050,284							\$ 3,050,284
2nd / Howard Park	\$ -								\$ -
Traffic Studies	\$ -								\$ -
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$ 474,020,787	\$ 75,645,460	\$ 2,074,459	\$ 2,095,508	\$ 2,127,652	\$ 71,713,253	\$ 22,522,959	\$ 100,533,831	\$ 650,200,718
Annual Balance	\$ 4,093,329	\$ 478,064	\$ 436,993	\$ 441,427	\$ 448,198	\$ 15,095,192	\$ 4,737,353	\$ 21,159,162	\$ 25,730,555
Cummulative Balance	\$ 4,093,329	\$ 4,571,393	\$ 5,008,385	\$ 5,449,812	\$ 5,898,010	\$ 20,993,202	\$ 25,730,555	\$ 25,730,555	\$ 25,730,555

VISITACION VALLEY

Background and Highlights

The Visitacion Valley Community Facilities and Infrastructure Fee and Fund was established in 2006 in anticipation of moderate to high density development at Executive Park (located immediately east of the Highway 101 at the southern San Francisco border) and in other areas within the Visitacion Valley area. Unlike most other impact fee areas, Visitacion Valley does not have a comprehensive Area Plan. Portions of Visitacion Valley are included in other plans; most notably, the Executive Park Subarea Plan, the Baylands North (Schlage Lock) development project, and the Sunnydale HOPE SF development project.

Between these three developments, a net increase of 4,800 units, 140,000 square feet of commercial/retail space, and 75,000 square feet of community space is expected; build out would occur over at least 15 years. Over the next six years, the Planning Department projects approximately \$11.2 million in fee revenue. The Planning Department, in collaboration with SFMTA, Public Works, and Recreation and Parks, has continued to engage the Visitacion Valley community to identify and prioritize projects for impact fee spending.

Because impact fee revenue in Visitacion Valley is reliant on three large-scale development projects (Executive Park, Schlage Lock and Sunnydale HOPE SF), projected revenue has the potential of changing dramatically from year to year depending on the progress of those projects.

In fact, three years ago staff was assuming that significant portions of Schlage Lock and Executive Park would be under construction within the year based on where they were in the development pipeline. Originally due to construction costs and then later exasperated by COVID-19 the development projects have been delayed and as such revenue is now expected to come in later than anticipated. Because revenue was not realized as anticipated, and projections have been pushed out in the next couple of years, IPIC is recommending that no new appropriations be provided in FY 24 and FY 25.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Because the Visitacion Valley fee area is not a comprehensive plan area like the other fee areas, there is not a master list of expected community benefits. Therefore, the Planning Department, SFMTA, Public Works, and the Recreation and Parks Department are engaged with the Visitacion Valley community on an ongoing basis to prioritize for the use of

impact fees. Since the Schlage Lock approvals were certified by the Board of Supervisors on May 19, 2015, City staff have held numerous community meetings. Planning Department staff provided an update to the community in November of 2022, which included information on the IPIC process, capital projects being led by Public Works, SFMTA, and the Recreation and Parks Department, as well as information from the developer. and the developer has also planned several outreach events. The purpose of these updates is to enable community input into the IPIC process, to understand community priorities for the programming of projected impact fees, and to provide current information regarding the status of projects and developments in the area. The City is committed to providing at least one update per year until all impact fees are programmed and any associated projects are implemented. The proposed projects are in the following categories: park and playground improvements, bike and transit improvements, McLaren Park access improvements, and intersection and pedestrian safety improvements. The implementing agency (i.e. Public Works, SFMTA, or Rec and Park) will facilitate a community design process to take each proposed project from conceptual design through detailed design, during which additional community feedback will be solicited.

The City is working with the developer and a group of neighborhood stakeholders to bring programming to the community space at the Historic Office Building at 2201 Bayshore Boulevard. As part of the development agreement, Baylands Development Incorporated has agreed to make a floor of the office building available for community use rent-free for at least fifteen years. Currently, the City and a group of residents are working to identify a community organization that could serve as a master tenant, and provide community services while also allowing other stakeholders and residents to use the space for events, classes, and programming.

As noted above, construction of the Executive Park and Baylands North (Schlage Lock) development projects have proceeded more slowly than anticipated, resulting in a delay in the availability of impact fees. While this delay is unfortunate given the severe housing shortage in the city and region, it has allowed City staff to work with the community on developing a strong list of priority projects for implementation and to advance planning, design, and implementation for a few priority projects. In addition, the City has been successful in securing alternative funding sources for the priority projects.

VISITACION AVENUE MCLAREN PARK CONNECTOR

New sidewalks, bicycle safety improvements, and traffic calming measures are proposed for Visitation Avenue. The Recreation and Parks Department is conducting community engagement and seeking additional funding and expects to have a preferred design in Spring/Summer of 2023.

HERZ PLAYGROUND RENOVATION

This project is a partnership with Mercy Housing and Related California. The scope includes constructing a new recreation center featuring indoor basketball court, bleachers, multi-purpose room, restrooms and staff spaces. Exterior improvements include removing hazardous trees, installing new adult exercise equipment and constructing bicycle and pedestrian paths and picnic areas. The concept design was approved by the Recreation and Parks Commission in March 2021. Construction is estimated to take place in 2023.

BLANKEN UNDERPASS ART MURAL

The installation of art murals on Blanken Avenue in the Route 101 underpass was originally proposed for implementation utilizing impact fees, however, the District 10 Supervisor provided \$20,000 in add back funding for the project. While no impact fees were used for this project, it is described in this report since it was conceived by Visitation Valley residents during the impact fee prioritization process starting in 2015. Project funding was distributed in early 2019 through an San Francisco Arts Commission artist grant to 1brush, a San Francisco non-profit that connects communities and artists for the development of public art projects. The final design was approved by the San Francisco Arts Commission in August 2020. Because the mural will be installed on Caltrans property, Planning Department and Public Works staff have been working with Caltrans to secure the permit for installation. However, the Caltrans application is currently on hold until future maintenance costs can be identified.

VISITACION AVENUE STREETScape PROJECT


This project is being developed in partnership with San Francisco Recreation and Parks and San Francisco MTA. The purpose is to design a walkable and slower Visitation Avenue in McLaren Park along Visitation Avenue between Leland and Mansell. Project scope to include new sidewalks, protected bike lanes, bulbouts, landscaping and improved roadway.

Project Origin: McLaren Park Vision Plan (2018), SFMTA Visitation Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan

MCLAREN TRAILS PRIORITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

This project delivers improvements in four priority areas of McLaren Park to ensure safe recreation and access, maintain and build on natural character, protect natural resources, and clarify circulation routes. Improvements are aligned with the Natural Resources Management Plan and follow the organizing framework and best practices previously approved in the 2017 McLaren Park Vision Plan. Design work will continue winter 2022-23, followed by construction. Construction will be phased to minimize disturbance of natural resources and impact on park users, and project completion is anticipated by spring 2024.

A new trail on the east side of Visitation Avenue, between Hah Street and Visitation Valley Middle School is intended to improve safe access and connect local residents with open space. A Native Plane Garden and nature exploration area was installed south of the community garden in Winter-Spring 2022. Additional hazardous tree removals and installation of a pedestrian-only trail is scheduled for late 2022-early 2023.



VISITACION VALLEY PROJECTS

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visitation Avenue McLaren Park Connector (sidewalk and bike facility improvements) 2. Visitation Valley Greenway Mid-block crossings 3. Aleta Avenue Intersection Improvements 4. Blanken Underpass Illumination 5. Herz Playground Renovation | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Blanken Underpass Art Mural 7. Visitation Valley Ballfield Renovation 8. Elliot Street Stair 9. Visitation Valley Playground Revovation 10. Bike Routes to Bay Trail and Candlestick Point 11. Leland and Cora Bulbout and Sidewalk Widening |
|---|--|



VISITACION VALLEY

1. Visitacion Avenue Design Concept
2. Visitacion Valley Branch Library
3. New park at Schlage Lock rendering
4. Herz Playground
5. Blanken Underpass Art Mural

Photo credits: (1-6) SF Planning

Visitation Valley - IPIC Expenditure Plan - FY24 - FY28

Expenditures: Appropriations FY19 and Prior - Planned FY20 and Forward		FY23 (CURRENT YEAR)		FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1)		FY25		FY26		FY27		FY28		THROUGH FY28		THROUGH FY29 - FY33		THROUGH FY33	
--	--	---------------------	--	----------------------	--	------	--	------	--	------	--	------	--	--------------	--	---------------------	--	--------------	--

Recreation and Open Space																							
10	Revenue	\$	608,000	\$	38,000	\$	6,000	\$	1,175,000	\$	-	\$	1,152,000	\$	2,333,000	\$	2,979,000	\$	4,616,000	\$	7,595,000		
	Expenditure	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
12	Rec and Open Space Planning and Near Term Improvements Enhancement Ft RPD	Transferred	\$	310,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	310,000	
	Appropriated not Transfers	\$	2,423,000	\$	1,336,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	3,759,000
	Programmed	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
14	Expenditure Sub Total	\$	2,733,000	\$	1,336,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	4,069,000

15	Category Balance Per Year	\$	(7,733,000)	\$	(1,298,000)	\$	6,000	\$	1,175,000	\$	-	\$	1,152,000	\$	2,333,000	\$	(1,090,000)	\$	4,616,000	\$	3,516,000
16	Category Cumulative Balance	\$	(2,125,000)	\$	(3,423,000)	\$	(3,417,000)	\$	(2,242,000)	\$	(2,242,000)	\$	(1,090,000)	\$	(1,090,000)	\$	(1,090,000)	\$	3,526,000	\$	3,526,000

Child Care																							
17	Revenue	\$	406,000	\$	26,000	\$	796,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	768,000	\$	1,564,000	\$	1,996,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	1,996,000
	Expenditure	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
18	Child Care to H.S.A.	Transferred	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$
	Appropriated not Transfers	\$	2,269,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
	Programmed	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
19	Expenditure Sub Total	\$	2,269,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-

20	Category Balance Per Year	\$	(2,269,000)	\$	26,000	\$	796,000	\$	764,000	\$	-	\$	768,000	\$	2,348,000	\$	511,000	\$	4,830,000	\$	5,241,000
21	Category Cumulative Balance	\$	(1,863,000)	\$	(1,837,000)	\$	(1,041,000)	\$	(257,000)	\$	(257,000)	\$	(257,000)	\$	511,000	\$	511,000	\$	5,341,000	\$	5,341,000

Visitation Valley - IPIC Expenditure Plan - FY24 - FY28

Expenditures: Appropriations FY19 and Prior - Planned FY20 and Forward

AGENCY THROUGH FY22 CURRENT YEAR FY23 (CURRENT YEAR) FY24 (BUDGET YEAR 1) FY25 FY26 FY27 FY28 THROUGH FY28 THROUGH FY29 THROUGH FY30 THROUGH FY33 THROUGH FY33

Admin																
	27	Revenue	\$	78,000	\$	6,000	\$	190,000	\$	184,000	\$	458,000	\$	1,156,000	\$	1,614,000
Expenditure			\$													
Admin			\$													
DCP			\$													
Transferred			\$	114,000												
Appropriated not Transferred			\$	497,000												
Programmed			\$													
Admin Transfer to Programs			\$													
Expenditure Sub Total			\$	611,000												
Category Balance Per Year			\$	1,812,000		6,000		190,000		187,000		651,000		94,000		1,150,000
Category Cumulative Balance Per Year			\$	(933,000)		(927,000)		(317,000)		(150,000)		34,000		34,000		1,190,000
RUNNING TOTALS																
			\$	1,922,000		122,000		1,558,000		3,749,000		8,882,000		11,026,000		18,134,000
Revenue Totals			\$	9,379,000		1,386,000										23,059,000
Total Expenditures			\$	(7,453,000)		(1,234,000)		(1,558,000)		(3,749,000)		(8,882,000)		(1,013,000)		17,121,000
Annual Surplus (Deficit)			\$	(8,731,000)		(9,595,000)		(8,437,000)		(4,689,000)		(1,013,000)		(1,013,000)		17,121,000
Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)			\$													

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 8:38:00 AM
Attachments: [Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights 3.16.23.pdf](#)

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

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

From: Boskovich, Alex (WOM) <alex.boskovich@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2023 8:14 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Ellis, Kimberly (WOM) <kimberly.n.ellis@sfgov.org>; Battung, Lauren Alexandra (WOM) <lauren.battung@sfgov.org>
Subject: Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights

Good morning,

On behalf of the Department on the Status of Women, please see the attached Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights Memorandum. I look forward to supporting the Board of Supervisors and their staff around any questions or requests for additional information.

Thank you,

Alex Boskovich, MSW | Project Manager for Strategic Initiatives
San Francisco Dept. on the Status of Women
c: (408) 373-4099 | *Engage. Educate. Empower.*



City and County of San Francisco
Department on the Status of Women



London N. Breed
Mayor

Date: March 16, 2023

To: Mayor London Breed; Members of the Board of Supervisors; City Attorney David Chiu; Dr. Grant Colfax, Director of the Department of Public Health; Dr. Sheryl Davis, Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission and other interested stakeholders.

Cc: Sean Elsbernd, Chief of Staff to Mayor London Breed; Andrea Bruss, Deputy Chief of Staff to Mayor London Breed; Eileen Mariano, Policy Advisor to Mayor London Breed; Chiamaka Ogwuegbu, Racial Equity Policy Advisor to Mayor London Breed; Julie Wilensky, Deputy City Attorney to City Attorney David Chiu; Rebekah Krell, Director of Policy and Legislative Affairs to City Attorney David Chiu; Kimberly Ellis, Director of the Department on the Status of Women; Dr. Claire Horton, San Francisco Health Network Chief Medical Officer of the Department of Public Health; Angela Yip, Communications and Legislative Analyst to City Administrator Carmen Chu

From: Alex Boskovich, Strategic Initiatives Project Manager, Department on the Status of Women

Subject: Monthly Update on the Status of Abortion Rights

The following update memo provides an overview of abortion laws in individual states, as well as local and statewide efforts to protect patients' access to reproductive healthcare. Our goal is to provide monthly updates to keep the Mayor and other key internal stakeholders apprised of developments in this new, ever-changing post-Roe landscape.

I. Current Snapshot of Abortion Access across the Nation

- Abortion remains banned in at least [13 states](#) (Alabama, Arkansas, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia and Wisconsin). [Florida](#) state lawmakers introduced legislation on March 7, 2023 to ban abortion after six weeks of pregnancy; the state's current gestational limit is 15 weeks. Georgia also bans abortion after six weeks of pregnancy, which is frequently before women and patients are aware that they are pregnant.
- The [Idaho State House passed an "abortion trafficking" bill on March 7, 2023](#), which would criminalize transporting a minor out-of-state for an abortion with the [intent to conceal the abortion from the parents or guardian](#). According to the Guttmacher Institute, parental involvement laws increase barriers to abortion access, particularly for [immigrant youth and youth living in unstable and abusive homes](#).

- On March 15, 2023, U.S. District Judge Matthew Kacsmaryk held a hearing regarding a [Texas lawsuit against the FDA](#) challenging its authority to approve the abortion medication mifepristone in 2000. The lawsuit was filed last November by the legal group [Alliance Defending Freedom](#), which helped to write the Mississippi law that the Supreme Court used to overturn Roe v. Wade. According to the Washington Post, ["If Kacsmaryk sides with the plaintiffs, it would be the first time a court has ordered the government to withdraw or suspend approval of a medication despite opposition from the FDA and the drug's manufacturer."](#)
- In a February 2023 interview with the San Francisco Chronicle, [UCSF Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology Dr. Daniel Grossman indicated that in California, "We will still be able to offer medication abortion" even if mifepristone is taken off the market.](#) [Misoprostol] works in a majority of cases, and the side effects are bearable. But it's not as good as we have today." [Planned Parenthood Northern California, which serves San Francisco, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, Solano and Sonoma counties, has also indicated that its providers will "immediately pivot to a misoprostol-only regimen](#) for [medication abortion]" should patients lose access to mifepristone as a result of the recent legal threat. Medication abortions account for more than [half of all abortions in the U.S.](#)

II. Federal Policy Update

- On March 8, 2023, U.S. Senators Tammy Baldwin (WI) and Richard Blumenthal (CT) introduced the ["Women's Health Protection Act of 2023"](#) to restore reproductive rights to women and pregnant people living in states where abortion is banned. [The proposed legislation would:](#)
 - i. "Prohibit states from imposing restrictions that jeopardize access to abortion earlier in pregnancy, including many of the state-level restrictions in place prior to Dobbs, such as arbitrary waiting periods, medically unnecessary mandatory ultrasounds, or requirements to provide medically inaccurate information.
 - ii. Ensure that later in pregnancy, states cannot limit access to abortion if it would jeopardize the life or health of the mother.
 - iii. Protect the ability to travel out of state for an abortion, which has become increasingly common in recent years."

III. State Policy Update

- The [California Women's Legislative Caucus introduced a package of 17 bills](#) on March 13, 2023 to further protect and strengthen access to abortion and reproductive healthcare, including increasing privacy protections, insurance company requirements and public information. The proposed legislative package has been [endorsed by the California Future of Abortion Council](#), which successfully advocated for over a dozen abortion and reproductive rights bills and \$200 million in the state budget last year. Several Bay Area lawmakers contributed to the package:

- i. Alameda/Contra Costa County Senator and Women's Legislative Caucus Chair Nancy Skinner
 1. SB 36: Strengthens safe haven protections for abortion and gender-affirming care by prohibiting bail agents or bounty hunters from apprehending people in California and protecting access to public benefits.
 2. SB 345 (Skinner) Improves protections for providers who provide abortion and gender-affirming care and services.

- ii. Alameda/Contra Costa County Assemblymember Rebecca Bauer-Kahan
 1. AB 254: Provides privacy protections for digital data related to patients accessing abortion services in California.
 2. AB 352: Enhances privacy protections for medical records related to abortion, pregnancy loss, and other sensitive services through electronic health record sharing and health information exchanges.

- iii. Alameda/Contra Costa County Assemblymember Buffy Wicks
 1. AB 598 (Wicks) Requires school districts to participate in the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) and include a module on sexual and reproductive health care as one of the core survey modules.

- iv. Alameda County Assemblymember Mia Bonta
 1. AB 793: Supports safe access to reproductive and gender-affirming care in the digital age by protecting people from unconstitutional searches of their data.

- On March 8, 2023, [Governor Newsom ordered state officials to not renew a \\$54 million correctional system pharmacy contract with Walgreens in response to the company's decision to not dispense the abortion medication mifepristone in 21 states](#). The renewal agreement was scheduled to take effect on May 1, 2023. Governor Newsom is one of 21 Governor members of the [recently launched Reproductive Freedom Alliance](#), a non-partisan, multi-state coalition with major funding from the California Wellness Foundation. A group of [U.S. Democratic Senators, including California Senator Alex Padilla, have also sent a letter to Walgreens](#) to express strong opposition to the company's "premature decision" concerning its mifepristone dispensing policies.

[Last month, 21 Republican State Attorney Generals signed onto a letter discouraging the nation's two largest retail pharmacies, Walgreens and CVS, from moving forward with their publicly stated intention to provide the abortion pill in states where the law still currently allows. According to a spokesman for Governor Newsom, "Walgreens preemptively shared its plan that it would not dispense the abortion medication](#)

mifepristone in 21 states, including where abortion remains legal, because of a letter from 21 anti-abortion attorneys general. Walgreens continues to refuse to clarify why it will not dispense mifepristone in several states — from that group of 21 — where abortion is legal." The New York Times reported that pharmacy retailer, [Rite Aid, has indicated that it will continue to monitor and evaluate the situation; CVS, Walmart, Costco, Kroger and Albertsons did not respond to additional requests for comment.](#)

IV. San Francisco Bay Area Abortion Rights Coalition Regional Landscape Analysis

- With strong support from Mayor Breed and the Board of Supervisors, the Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) received funds from the FY23-24 Budget Cycle to establish a San Francisco Bay Area Abortion Rights Coalition (BAARC), including the coordination of a regional landscape analysis with coalition stakeholders to assess abortion care access and services across surrounding cities and counties. This also involves measuring and projecting future impacts from the influx of patients who are forced to travel to the Bay Area to receive reproductive healthcare services.

To date, DOSW has consulted several BAARC direct service provider members and stakeholders, including ACCESS REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE, Planned Parenthood Northern California, San Francisco Department of Public Health and UCSF, to help inform the future assessment's questions, methodology and specific data needs. Preliminary regional data sets and analyses requested include:

- i. Local implementation evaluation of new abortion access policies and funding
- ii. Transportation resources and impacts to accessing abortion services
- iii. Health insurance data
- iv. Telehealth access
- v. Access to basic needs (i.e., food, healthcare, housing) and other poverty impacts on abortion access and quality of care
- vi. Local buffer zone ordinances and other public safety protections
- vii. Regional communications and messaging
- viii. Abortion service desert neighborhoods within the nine Bay Area counties
- ix. Impact of (lack of) access to abortion from counties surrounding the nine Bay Area county region
- x. Data privacy and other legal protections for local providers treating out-of-state patients

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Ethics Commission IP List: Meeting Summary – Summary of Matters Discussed and Actions Taken at Ethics Commission's March 10, 2023 Regular Meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 9:44:36 PM

From: San Francisco Ethics Commission <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 3:35 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Ethics Commission IP List: Meeting Summary – Summary of Matters Discussed and Actions Taken at Ethics Commission's March 10, 2023 Regular Meeting



Meeting Summary – Summary of Matters Discussed and Actions Taken at Ethics Commission's March 10, 2023 Regular Meeting

March 13, 2023
Contact: Michael Canning (415) 252-3100

Chair Yvonne Lee called the Meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. With Vice-Chair Larry Bush and Commissioner Michael Romano participating, a quorum was present. Commissioners Theis Finlev and Argemira Flórez Feng were not present due to excused absences.

Under Item 2, provided the opportunity for general public comment on matters not appearing on the Agenda but within the Ethics Commission's subject matter jurisdiction.

Under its Consent Calendar, provided the opportunity for public comment on all consent calendar items and voted 3-0 to adopt a motion by Commissioner Romano and seconded by Commissioner Bush to approve the following Consent items that required action by the Commission:

- [Item 3, Draft Minutes for February 10, 2023, Regular Meeting,](#)
- [Item 4, Director of Enforcement's report dated March 6, 2023](#) and
- [Item 6, Cover memo and Proposed Stipulation in SFEC Case No. 2122-028/2122-359.](#)

[Item 5, Acting Executive Director's report dated March 6, 2023](#) was informational and required no

action by the Commission.

Under Item 7, discussed the [cover memo and Proposed Stipulation in SFEC Case No. 2122-021/040](#). Commissioner Bush moved to approve the proposed SARP stipulation, the motion was seconded by Chair Lee and approved unanimously (3-0).

The Commission then took up Agenda Item 8a, and provided the opportunity for public comment on all matters pertaining to proposed closed session. Under Item 8b, the Commission unanimously (3-0) approved a motion by Commissioner Romano and seconded by Chair Lee to proceed into closed session for an update with the City's Department of Human Resources Labor Negotiator regarding Labor Negotiations on the status of ongoing meet and confer concerning the Ethics Commission's gift and ethics recommendations for City law.

The Commission moved into closed session at 10:24 am.

After reconvening in open session at 11:23 am, the Commission did not approve a motion by Commissioner Romano and seconded by Chair Lee by a vote of 2-1 to not disclose matters discussed in closed session, with Commissioner Bush in the dissent. Without an affirmative vote to disclose being approved, the matters discussed in closed session remain confidential.

Under Item 9, provided the opportunity to discuss items for future meetings.

Under Item 10, provided the additional opportunity for general public comment on matters not appearing on the agenda.

Under Item 11, adjourned the meeting at 11:27 am.

Draft Minutes for the March 10, 2023, Regular Meeting will be available upon their completion and will be included on the Agenda for the Commission's next Regular Meeting, which will be made available on the Commission's website at sfethics.org.

Meeting agendas and materials are available at <https://sfethics.org/ethics/category/agendas>.

For further information, please contact the Ethics Commission at ethics.commission@sfgov.org or (415) 252-3100.

SFGovTV provides a continuous archive of selected Commission, council and board meetings that allows viewers to watch those meetings online in full at the viewer's convenience. Video, audio, and closed-captioning archives of Ethics Commission meetings may be accessed [here](#).

[Web archive of Interested Persons List posts](#).

Visit us online at sfethics.org.

Share this email:



[Manage](#) your preferences | [Opt out](#) using TrueRemove®
Got this as a forward? [Sign up](#) to receive our future emails.
View this email [online](#).

[25 Van Ness Ave Suite 220](#)
[San Francisco, CA | 94102 US](#)

This email was sent to angela.calvillo@sfgov.org.
[To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.](#)



City and County of San Francisco
Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

The Ethics Commission's Online Payment Portal will be down for maintenance from March 13th to 15th. Learn more about maintenance window and alternative payment methods.

Draft Minutes – February 10, 2023

Posted on March 6, 2023 (Updated March 10, 2023)

**Draft Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
The San Francisco Ethics Commission
Friday, February 10, 2023**

Hybrid meeting conducted in-person in City Hall Room 400, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, and also held online as a Remote Meeting via **WebEx** and aired live on **SFGovTV**

(Approved March 10, 2023)

Note: SFGovTV provides a continuous archive of audio, video, and Caption Notes recordings of Ethics Commission meetings that allows viewers to watch those meetings online in full at the viewer's convenience. These archives of Ethics Commission meetings may be accessed at SFGovTV at http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=142.

(Note: A [complete video recording of this meeting](#) is available at SFGovTv.)

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: With Chair Yvonne Lee, Vice-Chair Larry Bush, and Commissioners Theis Finlev, Michael Romano, and Argemira Flórez Feng attending, a quorum was present.

STAFF PRESENTING: Gayathri Thaikkendiyil, Acting Director; Geraldo Moya, Onsite Clerk; Ronald Contreras, Online Meeting Moderator; Michael Canning, Acting Policy and Legislative Affairs Manager.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY PRESENT: Brad Russi, Deputy City Attorney.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES PRESENT: Ardis Graham, Employee Relations Director.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED:

- [Proposed Resolution on Continuation of Remote/Hybrid Commission Meetings.](#)
- [Draft Minutes for January 13, 2023, Regular Meeting.](#)
- [Draft Minutes for January 20, 2023, Special Meeting.](#)
- [Acting Executive Director's report dated February 6, 2023.](#)
- [Staff memo dated February 6, 2023 on the Election of Commission Officers.](#)
- [Public Comment Received After Meeting on the Election of Commission Officers](#) 
- [Staff memo dated February 6, 2023 on the impact of the upcoming termination of the Governor's COVID-19 emergency proclamation and the Mayor's emergency order on current Ethics Commission hybrid meeting operations.](#)
- [Staff memo dated February 6, 2023 the BOS Resolution \(File No. 221211\) urging the Ethics Commission to timely complete backlog of outstanding audits.](#)
- [Staff memo dated February 6, 2023 regarding Ethics Commission budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2024 that begins July 1, 2023.](#)

Item 1. Call to order and roll call.

Chair Yvonne Lee convened the meeting at 10:03 a.m. and stated that the hybrid meeting is being held pursuant to the Forty-fifth Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency Dated February 25, 2020, which the Mayor issued February 10, 2022. Meeting Moderator Ronald Contreras summarized procedures for participation by members of the public for the hybrid meeting.

Item 2. Public comment on matters not appearing on the agenda.

Under Item 2, the Commission provided the opportunity for general public comment on matters not appearing on the Agenda but within the Ethics Commission's subject matter jurisdiction.

Public Comment:

Winship Hillier spoke complaints from the public regarding the Sunshine Ordinance, asked about a compliant he submitted, and noted speaking with Investigator Eric Willett about it in the past. Chair Lee asked Mr. Willett to follow up with Mr. Hillier.

David Pilpel asked if Item 12(e) on the agenda would be heard today. Chair Lee confirmed the item would be being continued to the March meeting.

No further public comment was received and public comment on the item was closed.

Consent Calendar, Items 3, 4, 5, and 6.

The Commission took up its consent calendar on Item 3, Resolution on Continuation of Remote/Hybrid Commission Meetings, Item 4, Draft Minutes of the Ethics Commission January 13, 2023, Regular Meeting, Item 5, Draft Minutes of the Ethics Commission January 20, 2023, Special Meeting, and Item 6 Acting Executive Director's Report highlighting various departmental programs, operations, and staff news.

Public Comment:

David Pilpel noted a spelling error on the January 13 minutes and that it is unusual in minutes for subsequent references to a person to be limited to their last name. Pilpel also noted that Gary Winuk's name was misspelled in the January 13 minutes.

No further public comment was received and public comment on the item was closed.

Chair Lee closed public comment and called the question on Consent Calendar Items 3, 4, and 5. Item 6 was informational and required no action by the Commission.

Commissioner Finlev moved adoption of the Consent Calendar, with an update to Gary Winuk's name in the January 13 minutes and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Romano. On a roll call vote the Commission unanimously (5-0) approved the motion to approve Consent Calendar items.

Motion 230210-01 (Finlev / Romano): Moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to adopt Items 3, 4, and 5 as presented on the Consent Calendar with amendment to Item 4.

Item 7. Election of Commission Officers for 2023 per Ethics Commission Bylaws, Article IV, Section 1.

Acting Director Thaikkendiyil provided an overview of the nominating process.

Chair Lee self-nominated herself to continue serving as Chair.

No other nominations were made.

Commissioner Finlev asked Commissioner Bush if he would like to remain as Vice Chair. Commissioner Bush confirmed he would.

Chair Lee called for public comment. No public comment was received.

Commissioner Finlev stated he appreciates the lack of drama on the Ethics Commission selection process and asked the Chair if other commissioners can have more input into the agenda.

Chair Lee stated her understanding that the agenda is set by the Chair, but that every meeting ends with an opportunity for other commissioners to suggest future items and that she works with the Director to ensure that each suggested item is included.

Commissioner Bush noted this is a critical period for the Commission and spoke in favor of Chair Lee staying on as Chair.

Motion 230210-02 (Lee): The Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to elect Yvonne Lee Chair of the Commission.

Chair Lee thanked her fellow commissioners for their trust and spoke about the importance of their diverse perspectives.

Chair Lee nominated Commissioner Bush to continue to serve as Vice Chair and spoke in support of Commissioner Bush.

Commissioner Bush accepted the nomination for Vice Chair.

Chair Lee called for public comment. No public comment was received.

Commissioner Bush spoke about being appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the importance of encouraging greater participation in City government.

Motion 230210-03 (Lee): The Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to elect Larry Bush Vice Chair of the Commission.

Item 8. Discussion and possible action on Executive Director recruitment process, which may include participation by a representative from the executive search firm.

Chair Lee provides an update and thanks the Director and the DHR liaison for their hard work and spoke about upcoming stakeholder meetings regarding the search.

Chair Lee and Acting Director Thaikkendiyil spoke about the logistics of the upcoming meetings.

Pam Derby from the executive search firm (CPS), gave a presentation on the status of the process and next steps.

Commissioner Bush asked if candidates will be identified by which Commissioner or former official proposed them. Derby responded that no, CPS would not provide that info, but could if requested by the Commission. Commissioner Bush stated that it could be helpful to know.

Chair Lee added that the selection process must be fair and transparent and that she would prefer CPS not provide the information Commissioner Bush is asking about due to privacy concerns.

Commissioner Romano clarified with Derby that CPS will be bringing just two or three candidates to the full Commission for review.

Commissioner Flórez Feng asked about how Commissioners can contribute to there being diverse candidates and Chair Lee suggested there is a list of organizations for targeting that they can contribute to.

Commissioner Bush asked that candidates disclose if they have ever attended an Ethics Commission meeting before or been involved in any campaigning or lobbying.

Commissioner Finlev stated he agreed with Commissioner Romano that only the finalists need to be brought to the entire Commission but would like a repository created of all applications that the commissioners can review. Regarding Commissioner Bush's comment about knowing who referred a candidate, Commissioner Finlev stated the candidate is being picked on merit so it should not matter who referred them, but does hope applicants will provide a list of references.

Public Comment:

David Pilpel asked that Ms. Derby's presentation be posted online and encourage the Commission to hold the listening session as remote or hybrid. Pilpel also asked that a link to the brochure be posted.

No further public comment was received and public comment on the item was closed.

Chair Lee asked the director to add a separate page regarding the executive search to the Commission's website and noted that the search subcommittee has a standing weekly meeting with CPS and the DHR liaison. Chair Lee noted the subcommittee will review every applicant that comes through.

Commissioner Finlev restated that he would like a repository of resumes available to all commissioners.

Commissioner Romano asked that there not be updates at each Commission meeting until there are finalists to be brought to the Commission and that other updates can be posted on the Commission's website. Commissioner Finlev agreed that updates only need to be made if there are issues the Commission needs to weigh in on.

Derby noted that most Commissions have a dedicated website for their executive search.

Item 9. Discussion and possible action regarding the impact of the upcoming termination of the Governor's COVID-19 emergency proclamation and the Mayor's emergency order on current Ethics Commission hybrid meeting operations and whether to continue to resource and provide online and telephone conferencing services to facilitate remote public comment.

Commissioner Finlev stated that he suspects everyone would prefer the Commission continue taking remote public coming.

Canning noted that there are recommendations from the City Administrator forthcoming.

Public Comment:

David Pilpel spoke regarding Item 8, stating that the Commission should look at outreach to internal City candidates as well. And that the Commission should absolutely continue remote public comment.

Debbi Lerman stated support for Staff recommendation to continue remote public comment and that doing so would send a signal that the Commission values public participation.

No further public comment was received and public comment on the item was closed.

Commissioner Flórez Feng moved to continue remote public comment, the motion was seconded by Commission Finlev and approved unanimously (5-0).

Motion 230210-04 (Flórez Feng / Finlev): Moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to continue offering remote public comment at Commission meetings.

Item 10. Discussion of the BOS Resolution (File No. 221211) urging the Ethics Commission to timely complete backlog of outstanding audits, and updates from the Audit program.

Acting-Director Thaikkendiyil noted this item was added to the agenda based on a request for an update by the Commission at last meeting, regarding a motion passed by the Board of Supervisors in December 2022.

Linda Fong gave a presentation and noted that Board's resolution urged the Commission's Audit Division to timely work through the audit backlog, create the core components of a long-term sustainable audit function, and to seek assistance if possible. The presentation provided updates and an overview of the Commission's audit function.

Commissioner Finlev asked Fong about the plan to use existing resources to cover audits and Fong stated that even if a contract is not acquired, Staff can address the backlog and complete audits in a more timely manner.

Thaikkendiyil explained the reason why contracting has taken so long in the past and why the situation is different now.

Commissioner Romano asked questions about the audit function generally and discussed with Fong how goals are established for the quantity of audits to be completed.

Commissioners Romano and Finlev discussed the likely number of political committees operating within the City and Finlev estimated it is closer to 100 than to 10.

Commissioner Flórez Feng asked about the process for working with contractors and the sort of training they would receive. Fong responded that that is something that is currently being evaluated to decide if the firm would follow its own process or use a process established by the Commission.

Commissioner Flórez Feng and Fong discussed more of the logistics regarding the hiring of a contractor.

Thaikkendiyil added that in the past when the Commission has worked with an external auditor, the Commission had provided them with Commission procedures to follow and that following the Commission's processes would be built into the contract.

Commissioner Bush stated that he believes the law requires an audit of at least one lobbyist was passed in 2015, and that the Commission pushed it to the side for several years. Commissioner Bush noted that the FPPC began to undertake audits on behalf of local governments, so the FPPC helping with audits is an option.

Public Comment:

David Pilpel stated that this is not a new issue and requested short audit updates in the monthly director reports and in the semiannual report. Also stated that campaign audits should be prioritized over lobbyist audits and Form 700 reviews.

Francisco Da Costa stated that SOTF is not working and that the Commission knows how it is performing. Da Costa stated that the Commission needs standard operating procedures, timelines, and goals, and that the Commission needs resources, as outsourcing audits doesn't work.

No further public comment was received and public comment on the item was closed.

Item 11. Public comment, discussion, and possible action regarding Ethics Commission budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2024 that begins July 1, 2023.

Acting-Director Thaikkendiyil gave a presentation on the budget, which was a follow-up to January 20 meeting and noted the next steps are to finalize the budget submission by next week.

Commissioner Bush stated that a better picture is needed of the top 10 lobbyists and their economic impact on the City.

Public Comment:

Francisco Da Costa stated that the presentation was very general, with no timelines or goals. Stated that the Commission clearly has insufficient resources to address its backlog and have quality control. Da Costa stated there is a need for accountability and transparency.

David Pilpel noted that the budget covers FY 2024 and FY 2025. Pilpel stated that he hopes the Mayor and Board will engage with the Commission on the budget and that there are significant shortfalls, which will be a constraint on the Commission's ability to fulfill its mandate.

No further public comment was received and public comment on the item was closed.

Commissioner Romano moved to submit the budget proposal to the Mayor, the motion was seconded by Chair Lee and approved unanimously (5-0).

Motion 230210-05 (Romano / Lee): Moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to submit the proposed budget to the Mayor.

Item 12. POTENTIAL CLOSED SESSION ITEMS – Confidential closed session discussion and possible action the status of the ongoing meet and confer concerning the Ethics Commission's gift and ethics recommendations for City law with labor negotiators and a probable cause determination for a complaint alleging violations of the Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance, Article III, Chapter 2 of the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code.

Chair Lee declared that Item 12(e) regarding the determination of a probable cause was being continued to the Commission's next meeting, making Items 12(b) and 12(g) no longer relevant.

Chair Lee introduced the item and explained the basis for the closed session discussion with labor negotiators. She stated the topic of discussion is the status of the meet and confer process with the San Francisco Municipal Executives Association (MEA) regarding the Commission's proposed ballot measure and regulation amendments. Representatives from DHR were present to participate in closed session.

Chair Lee explained the process that public comment on the item will first be received and then a vote will be taken on whether to meet in closed session under California Government Code Section 54957.6 and Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.10(e) to discuss labor negotiations. Then, if a closed session is held, the

Commission will initiate a closed session meeting with Labor Negotiators and will then reconvene in an open session. Finally, pursuant to Brown Act section 54957.1 and Sunshine Ordinance section 67.12, the Commission will then discuss and vote on a motion whether or not to disclose any action taken or discussion held in the closed session regarding labor negotiations.

Chair Lee called for public comment. No public comment was received.

Commissioner Bush moved to meet in closed session under California Government Code Section 54957.6 and Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.10(e) to discuss labor negotiations. The Motion was seconded by Commissioner Finlev and approved unanimously (5-0).

Motion 230210-06 (Bush / Finlev): Moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to meet in closed session.

Chair Lee explained that the Commission will be entering closed session but that the audio and visual airing of the Commission will resume once the Commission resumes its meeting back in open session.

The Commission went into closed session at 12:07 p.m. After reconvening in open session at 1:08 p.m., Commissioner Finlev made a motion pursuant to Brown Act section 54957.1 and Sunshine Ordinance section 67.12 to maintain confidentiality of discussions held in closed session regarding anticipated litigation as plaintiff and not disclose matters discussed in closed session, which was seconded by Commissioner Romano and approved by a vote of 4-0, with Commissioner Bush unable to vote due to technical difficulties.

Motion 230210-07 (Finlev / Romano): Moved, seconded, and passed (4-0) to not disclose matters discussed in closed session, with Commissioner Bush unable to vote.

Item 13. Discussion and possible action on items for future meetings.

Commissioner Finlev requested an overview of the political committees operating within the City and who they represent, to better understand the universe of committees in the City.

Commissioner Romano expressed a desire to shorten meeting days and trim fat from meetings wherever possible, stating that meetings could be more efficient. Commissioner Finlev agreed with this sentiment.

Chair Lee called for public comment. No public comment was received.

Item 14. Additional opportunity for public comment on matters not appearing on the agenda pursuant to Ethics Commission Bylaws Article VII Section 2.

Chair Lee called for public comment. No public comment was received.

Item 15. Adjournment.

The Commission adjourned at 1:13 p.m.

Posted in [Commission Meeting Documents](#)




City and County of San Francisco
Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

The Ethics Commission's Online Payment Portal will be down for maintenance from March 13th to 15th. Learn more about maintenance window and alternative payment methods.

March 10, 2023 Meeting Agenda Item 4 — Quarterly Enforcement Report

Posted on March 6, 2023

Print Copy of Report 

March 6, 2023

To: Members of the Ethics Commission

From: Patrick Ford, Director of Enforcement

Subject: **Agenda Item 4: Quarterly Enforcement Report**

Summary and Action Requested

This report provides general programmatic updates and data about the cases handled by the Commission's Enforcement Division.

No action is required by the Commission, as this item is for informational purposes only.

Background

The Commission's Enforcement Division is responsible for investigating violations of state and local laws relating to campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest, governmental ethics, and whistleblower protection. Enforcement matters are initiated both in response to complaints the Division receives from

members of the public and by the Director of Enforcement based on information contained in public records, media reports, and other sources.

All enforcement matters are first examined through the preliminary review process, which assesses whether there is reason to believe that a violation of law within the Commission's jurisdiction has been committed. Matters will be dismissed in preliminary review if they are outside of the Commission's jurisdiction, lack sufficient evidence to support further investigation, do not allege violations of the law, pertain to conduct that has already been investigated or resolved, or other similar bases that indicate an investigation would not serve the interest of justice.

Matters that are not dismissed in preliminary review are opened as investigations. The Enforcement Division seeks evidence through the investigation that would indicate whether a violation of the law has been committed. This may include interviewing witnesses and respondents, reviewing documents, and issuing subpoenas when necessary. Details about any matter that is opened as an investigation are shared with the City Attorney's and District Attorney's offices so that those offices may determine whether they wish to pursue civil or criminal penalties, respectively.

If the Enforcement Division finds evidence indicating that a violation of the law has been committed, it will seek to resolve the matter by securing penalties from the respondent in one of two ways. First, the respondent may enter into a stipulated settlement agreement with the Commission in which the respondent admits to violating the law, agrees to pay a penalty, and may need to take remedial action such as filing a missing disclosure form. Alternatively, the Enforcement Division may initiate an administrative hearing process before the Ethics Commission.

Cases Resolved

Fiscal Year 2023

So far in Fiscal Year 2023 (July 1, 2022 – March 1, 2023), the Enforcement Division has concluded a total of 98 enforcement matters. Two of these matters resulted in stipulated settlements approved by the Commission. In total, these settlements represented penalties of \$23,600.

Cases In Progress

So far in FY23, 68 enforcement matters have been initiated. The majority of these (57) began from complaints that the Commission receives from the public, but this also includes 11 matters that the Division initiated based on media reports, observations in public disclosures, independent research, findings from audit reports, and interactions with regulated persons. Some of these matters initiated in FY23 remain in progress while others have already been resolved.

In total, 56 matters are currently in progress, including matters that were initiated during FY23 and matters that were initiated in prior fiscal years. Of these matters, 12 are in preliminary review, and 44 are open investigations.

The current cases in progress are broken down by program area in Charts 1 and 2 below.




Chart 1 – Matters in Preliminary Review by Program Area. Matters Currently in Preliminary Review: 12




Chart 2 – Open Investigations by Program Area. Investigations Currently Open: 44

Six of the 44 investigations (14%) are currently more than two years old. This is down from the time of the last Enforcement Report in November, when 7 of 49 investigations (14%) were more than two years old, and from May 2022, when 12 of 48 investigations (25%) were more than two years old. This reduction reflects the Division’s ongoing focus to resolve older cases and to timely address newer cases before two years has elapsed. The Division continues to work toward the goal of resolving all cases within two years, in accordance with the Case Closure Plan. However, there are a variety of reasons a matter might not be resolved within two years, including respondents pursuing all available due process rights, respondents or other sources not readily releasing evidence, complex factual investigative work, coordination with another law enforcement agency, and investigative holds requested by the District Attorney or City Attorney. At this time, all of the 6 cases that are more than two years old are either in the administrative hearing stage or are in settlement negotiations.

Current Initiatives

The Division is currently pursuing a number of initiatives that will continue to build the Commission’s enforcement capacity. This work is done in order to better conduct thorough, high-quality investigative

work, develop more high-impact cases, and achieve more efficient case resolutions. This section summarizes some of the primary initiatives currently underway.

Launch of New Case Management System

The Division has been collaborating with the Commission's Electronic Disclosure and Data Analysis (EDDA) Division to develop a new case management system that the Division will use to administer enforcement matters. The new system was fully launched on February 24th. The system integrates case data tracking with case document management, so that only one system need be used (previously two systems were needed to accomplish tracking and document management). The system also provides for significantly expanded case data tracking, which will allow faster and more thorough communication between investigators who are collaborating on a case and provide a more detailed picture of the current status of each case. Senior Investigator Eamonn Wilson led much of the Enforcement Division's work on this project and leveraged his background as a performance auditor with the California State Auditor, where he evaluated the performance of systems and processes used by state and local government agencies.

As part of the transition to the new system, all cases were assigned a new case number. For cases that are already before the Commission, documents will use both case numbers to refer to the case. Otherwise, the new case numbers will be used.

Streamlining Preliminary Review

In addition to streamlining the investigation phase in accordance with the Enforcement Division's Case Closure Plan, the Division has also made progress in streamlining the preliminary review stage. Preliminary review is the first stage of each case, and in this stage initial analysis and fact finding seeks to determine whether there is reason to believe a violation has occurred and, if so, whether an investigation should be opened to fully investigate the case.

The Enforcement Division has sought to make preliminary reviews more efficient and timely by establishing benchmarks for preliminary review completion, using case tracking data to better monitor the status of preliminary reviews and balance investigator workloads, and by prioritizing more complex and important cases that will require more time to conduct the review. Another significant factor in reducing preliminary review time has been the greater number of investigators on staff during the last two fiscal years. Through

these methods and increased staff, the Division has been able to significantly reduce the amount of time taken on average to complete preliminary reviews. Table 1 below provides the average preliminary review times for the current fiscal year and each of the prior fiscal years. Preliminary reviews in the current year take 103 days on average, which is one-third the time taken in FY21. The Enforcement Division has the goal of completing preliminary reviews within 90 days on average.

Fiscal Year	Average Time Spent on Preliminary Reviews completed in Fiscal Year (Days)
FY20	248
FY21	313
FY22	117
FY23 (7/1/22 – 3/1/23)	103

Table 1 – Average Preliminary Review Time by Fiscal Year

Hiring

There are currently two vacancies in the Division: one Senior Investigator (1823) and one Investigator (1822). Although filling these positions was a top priority at the time of the last Enforcement Report and recruitment for the 1823 position was initiated, hiring has been paused because of the budget instructions from the Mayor’s office which require City departments to plan for potential target cuts in the upcoming fiscal years. Hiring may resume depending on the outcome of the FY24 budget process.

Administrative Hearings

Summary of Laws Governing Probable Cause Process and Hearings on the Merits

The Enforcement Division, in collaboration with the City Attorney’s office, is developing a written resource that summarizes the laws governing the Commission’s probable cause process and hearings on the merits. The purpose of the resource is to assist the Commission and the public in understanding the legal processes

in place for the Commission to consider the evidence in a case and determine whether a violation has occurred. These processes are core features of the Commission's role as an administrative enforcement body, a role that was established in the City Charter when the Commission was first formed. In instances where the law is silent on particular aspects of the enforcement process, the resource will describe options for potential use by the Commission to achieve a full, timely, and effective resolution of the substantive issues presented in a proceeding.

The Enforcement Division anticipates providing this document, which will be a public document, to the Commission at its April meeting.

Hearing Updates

In the second quarter of FY23, the Division served probable cause reports in multiple cases in which violations were discovered through the investigation but settlement negotiations were unable to conclude the case. In three of these cases, a public finding of probable cause has been ratified by the Commission. The cases are *In the Matter of Paul Allen Taylor* (SFEC Case No. 1920-031), *In the Matter of Progress San Francisco, Vince Courtney, Jr., and Shawnda Deane* (SFEC Case No. 2021-025), and *In the Matter of Victor Makras* (SFEC Case No. 2021-001). The [determinations of probable cause](#) in these cases are available on the Commission's website. The Enforcement Division continues to seek settlement of these cases while also moving forward with the administrative hearing process. Absent settlement, the Division anticipates requesting that the Chair agendaize a hearing in one or more cases during the last quarter of FY23.

Posted in [Commission Meeting Documents, Reports](#)



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

March 10, 2023

To: Members of the Ethics Commission
From: Patrick Ford, Director of Enforcement
Subject: **AGENDA ITEM 6: Proposed Stipulation, Decision and Order *In the Matter of Deborah Raphael* (SFEC Complaint No. 2122-028/2122-359).**

Summary

This memorandum provides information regarding the Proposed Stipulation appearing in this agenda item and what the Commission may do next regarding this Proposed Stipulation.

Action Requested

The Commission may approve the Proposed Stipulation by majority vote, or it may provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed Stipulation.

Regulatory Background

Pursuant to the Commission's Enforcement Regulations, the Executive Director may enter negotiations with a respondent at any time to resolve the factual and legal allegations in a complaint by way of a stipulated order (*i.e.* a negotiated settlement). Enf. Reg. § 12(A). The Regulations require that the stipulated order set forth the pertinent facts and may include an agreement as to anything that could be ordered by the Commission under its authority pursuant to Charter section C3.699-13. *Id.*

Immediately after the Executive Director enters a stipulated order with a respondent, the Executive Director must inform the Commission of the proposed stipulation. Enf. Reg. § 12(E). Thereafter, any member of the Commission may request that the stipulated order be reviewed in public session by the full panel of the Commission during its next meeting. *Id.*

As of today, no Commissioner had requested review of the attached stipulated order in public session by the full panel of the Commission. It therefore appears on the Consent Calendar. The Commission may approve the stipulation by majority vote, or it may provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed Stipulation. Enf. Reg. 12(F).

Members of the public may comment on the Proposed Stipulation, noting that the Commission receives public comment once for all consent items collectively.




City and County of San Francisco
Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

The Ethics Commission's Online Payment Portal will be down for maintenance from March 13th to 15th. Learn more about maintenance window and alternative payment methods.

March 10, 2023 Meeting Agenda Item 6 — Proposed Stipulation, Decision and Order In the Matter of Deborah Raphael

Posted on March 6, 2023

Print Copy of Memo 

March 10, 2023

To: Members of the Ethics Commission

From: Patrick Ford, Director of Enforcement

Subject: **AGENDA ITEM 6: Proposed Stipulation, Decision and Order *In the Matter of Deborah Raphael***
(SFEC Complaint No. 2122-028/2122-359).

Summary

This memorandum provides information regarding the Proposed Stipulation appearing in this agenda item and what the Commission may do next regarding this Proposed Stipulation.


Action Requested

The Commission may approve the Proposed Stipulation by majority vote, or it may provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed Stipulation.

Regulatory Background

Pursuant to the Commission's Enforcement Regulations, the Executive Director may enter negotiations with a respondent at any time to resolve the factual and legal allegations in a complaint by way of a stipulated order (*i.e.* a negotiated settlement). Enf. Reg. § 12(A). The Regulations require that the stipulated order set forth the pertinent facts and may include an agreement as to anything that could be ordered by the Commission under its authority pursuant to Charter section C3.699-13. *Id.*

Immediately after the Executive Director enters a stipulated order with a respondent, the Executive Director must inform the Commission of the proposed stipulation. Enf. Reg. § 12(E). Thereafter, any member of the Commission may request that the stipulated order be reviewed in public session by the full panel of the Commission during its next meeting. *Id.*

As of today, no Commissioner had requested review of the [attached stipulated order](#)  in public session by the full panel of the Commission. It therefore appears on the Consent Calendar. The Commission may approve the stipulation by majority vote, or it may provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed Stipulation. Enf. Reg. 12(F).

Members of the public may comment on the Proposed Stipulation, noting that the Commission receives public comment once for all consent items collectively.

Attachment

[2023.03.10 – Agenda item 6 – 2122-028 – Raphael – Stipulation and Order](#) 

Posted in [Commission Meeting Documents](#)



City and County of San Francisco
Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

The Ethics Commission's Online Payment Portal will be down for maintenance from March 13th to 15th. Learn more about maintenance window and alternative payment methods.

Acting Executive Director's Report for March 2023

Posted on March 6, 2023

March 6, 2023

To: Members of the Ethics Commission

From: Gayathri Thaikkendiyil, Acting Executive Director

Subject: Agenda Item 5 – Acting Executive Director's Report for March 2023

Summary and Action Requested

This report provides various programmatic and operational highlights since the last report.

No action is required by the Commission, as this item is for informational purposes only.


Staff News

I am sorry to announce that Geraldo Moya's last day with the Ethics Commission was on March 3. Geraldo joined our office as an Administrative Services Clerk in the Engagement & Compliance Division in January 2022. He brought a range of customer service and technology support experiences to his role at the Commission, including prior work in the healthcare field in Alameda County and at SF International Airport (SFO). During his time with the Commission, Geraldo assisted with facilitating monthly public meetings as the onsite Clerk and provided critical administrative support for the Commission's compliance procedures


and front-office functions. We thank Geraldo for his tremendous contributions to the Commission's work and wish him the best for his future endeavors.

On February 16, Peter Lauterborn, Ethics@Work Training & Outreach Manager, assumed the supervisory responsibilities for the Engagement & Compliance Division to provide leadership and support to that Division on an interim basis due to the vacancy in the 1824 Engagement & Compliance manager position. With this change, Peter will lead both divisions until that position is filled. Peter joined the Commission in July 2022. Prior to that, he was with Civic Edge Consulting for five years, where he led project management for stakeholder outreach across multiple public-sector client teams, conducted in-person facilitation, and directed the company's pivot to remote training, workshops and webinars at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. He last served as the company's Vice President for Civic Engagement and Planning, where he managed multiple cross-disciplinary project teams and was the point person for supporting executive-level public sector clients and their programmatic campaigns. His prior experience also includes City service as Legislative Aide to former Supervisor Eric Mar, where his portfolio included the areas of education, environment, public transit and utilities, and as Youth Vote Coordinator for the Department of Children, Youth & Their Families, where he directed the city education programs' educational curriculum. Peter holds a BA in History from San Francisco State.

Budget Update

Following the Commission's last monthly meeting on February 10 our office submitted its [FY24-FY25 Ethics Commission Budget request](#)  to the Mayor's Office, which called for a 7.5 percent increase in the Commission's operating budget in FY24 and 38.8 percent increase in FY25 to secure continued funding for full staffing and operational needs to support its core transparency, compliance, and oversight functions. On the same day, the Commission issued a [public statement](#) on its FY24-FY25 budget proposal. For background regarding the Commission's budget proposals and future updates visit the [budget webpage](#).

Behested Payments

At the Commission's December meeting, the Commission voted to approve [new regulations](#) regarding the City's behested payment rules. On December 12, Staff [referred the approved regulations](#)  to the Board of Supervisors, where the Board had 60 days in which they could have vetoed the regulations with a two-thirds

vote. The Board did not veto the regulations and they became effective on February 7. The [Commission's website](#) has been updated to reflect the new regulations and a public notice was sent out through the Commission's Interested Persons List to notify the public of these changes.


April 3 Deadline Approaching: Annual Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700) Filings

Annual economic interest filings by more than 5,000 City officials and designated employees are due no later than Monday, April 3, 2023. These filings are typically due by April 1, but as this date falls on a Saturday, the deadline has been moved to the following business day. These annual filings will cover the period January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022. City Elected officials, Department Heads, and Board and Commission Members who are required to file their statements online with the Ethics Commission must also certify online by April 3rd that they have completed their required annual Ethics and Sunshine Ordinance training. City employees who file a Form 700 in their department because their position is designated in their department's section of the Conflict of Interest Code are also required to file their Form 700s using the Ethics Commission's online filing system.


Ahead of this filing deadline, the Engagement and Compliance Division has been proactively engaging Form 700 filers and departmental filing officers to inform them regarding their filing obligations. In this calendar year, the team has fielded over 200 individual requests for information regarding how to complete the Form 700. Two informational sessions were held in February 2023 remotely, which included 188 and 36 participants respectively. Videos of these sessions have been posted online, along with other training materials. Additional reminders will be sent to filers in advance of the deadline. As of March 1, 31% of filings were completed, which is over 9 percent higher than the compliance rate around this time last year.

In addition, the Division is preparing to update the Netfile e-filing system to adjust to additions, deletions, and changes in titles of certain filers to reflect City departments' organizational and staffing changes per the biennial update of the City's Conflict of Interest Code which will be effective March 11. The team will be working to notify departmental filing officers regarding these updates to ensure timely compliance. Those newly required to complete a Form 700 per the updated Code will have 30 days to file their Assuming Office Statement but do not need to file their Annual Statement. Those whose positions have been removed from the code, will have 30 days to file a Leaving Office Statement.

Implementation Status of the Recommendations of the August 2020 BLA Audit

At the request of the Board of Supervisors, the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office (BLA) conducted a performance audit of the Ethics Commission through a motion passed on January 28, 2020, to look for opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of Commission operations across all functions. At the conclusion of the audit in August 2020, the BLA issued 16 recommendations which the Department fully agreed with. The Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee discussed the audit at its November 19, 2020 meeting ([BOS File No. 201158](#)) and filed the report without taking further action. As of February 6, 2023, the Commission has completed implementing process enhancements to address all recommendations. The 16 recommendations and the actions taken to implement process enhancements in response to the recommendations are identified in the [attached table](#) .

Ethics@Work Program Update

The Ethics@Work team continues to develop its proactive educational materials while fielding departmental requests and supporting Commission staff with other operational needs. The Division's detailed [program update](#)  is included here. The major change since the last update to the Commission in October 2022 is the new plan to reach out to departments to develop customized work plans in close collaboration with departmental leadership teams to heighten awareness of ethics rules by offering educational materials and trainings for their staff and officers. Starting with the largest departments, the team will work with their staff to identify the most relevant educational materials or opportunities for workshops on key issues. This initiative is targeted to launch in the upcoming months. Ongoing progress updates regarding agency engagement will be shared in future reports. Additionally, the Ethics@Work team – which is now fully staffed – is working to develop ethics training content in multimedia formats to meet a range of learning styles.

Separately, the Ethics@Work program team has also been working on a rebranding effort to enable a consistent look-and-feel of the Commission's outreach and public facing materials so that the public can easily recognize the Commission's work products and follow our work. The Division has developed a new logo and established best practices for the use of more readable fonts and colors in our materials. The team has also developed style guidelines to help ensure a consistent implementation of these standards

department wide. The new logo identified, which can be seen in the program update presentation linked above, shows an open door highlighting both transparency and a welcome to those who seek out guidance. This will help label our work and online presence more clearly.

Revenues Report

The table below reflects revenues received by the Commission for Fiscal Year 2023 as of February 6, 2023.

Account Description	FY22-23 Original Budget	FY22-23 Actuals
Campaign Consultant Registration Fee	\$7,000	\$6,600
Lobbyist Registration Fee	\$85,000	\$102,000
Campaign Consultant Fines	\$2,000	\$50
Campaign Disclosure Fines	\$50,000	\$5,881
Statement of Economic Interests Fines	\$1,250	\$0
Lobbyists Fines	\$2,000	\$2,450
Other Ethics Fines	\$7,500	\$23,638
Other General Government Charges	\$2,450	\$0
Total	\$157,200	\$140,619

I look forward to answering any questions you may have at the upcoming Commission meeting.

Posted in [Commission Meeting Documents](#)



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

March 6, 2023

To: Members of the Ethics Commission

From: Eric Willett, Senior Investigator and Streamlined Program Administrator

Subject: **AGENDA ITEM 7: Proposed SARP Stipulation, Decision and Order *In the Matter of Alison Collins for School Board 2018 and Alison Collins* (SFEC Complaint No. 2122-021/040).**

Summary

This memorandum provides information regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation appearing in this agenda item and what the Commission may do next regarding this Proposed SARP Stipulation.

Action Requested

The Commission may approve the Proposed SARP Stipulation by majority vote, or it may provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation.

Regulatory Background

Pursuant to the Commission's Enforcement Regulations, the Executive Director may enter negotiations with a respondent at any time to resolve the factual and legal allegations in a complaint by way of a stipulated order (*i.e.* a negotiated settlement). Enf. Reg. § 12(A). The Regulations require that the stipulated order set forth the pertinent facts and may include an agreement as to anything that could be ordered by the Commission under its authority pursuant to Charter section C3.699-13. *Id.*

Immediately after the Executive Director enters a stipulated order with a respondent, the Executive Director must inform the Commission of the proposed stipulation. Enf. Reg. § 12(E). Stipulations will be agendized on the consent calendar unless a Commissioner requests, by noon on the fifth calendar day before the Commission's meeting, to have the stipulation placed on the agenda as a regular agenda item. Because the Executive Director entered into this stipulated order with Respondent shortly before this deadline for Commissioner requests, the stipulated order was agendized as a regular agenda item. *Id.*

This proposed stipulation was reached pursuant to the Commission's [Streamlined Administrative Resolution Program](#). The Commission may discuss this item, and it may either approve the Proposed SARP Stipulation by majority vote or provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation. Enf. Reg. § 12(F).

Members of the public may comment on the Proposed SARP Stipulation.




City and County of San Francisco
Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

The Ethics Commission's Online Payment Portal will be down for maintenance from March 13th to 15th. Learn more about maintenance window and alternative payment methods.

March 10, 2023 Meeting Agenda Item 7 — Proposed SARP Stipulation, Decision and Order In the Matter of Alison Collins for School Board 2018 and Alison Collins

Posted on March 6, 2023 (Updated March 8, 2023)

Print Copy of Memo 

March 6, 2023

To: Members of the Ethics Commission

From: Eric Willett, Senior Investigator and Streamlined Program Administrator

Subject: **AGENDA ITEM 7: Proposed SARP Stipulation, Decision and Order *In the Matter of Alison Collins for School Board 2018 and Alison Collins (SFEC Complaint No. 2122-021/040)*.**

Summary

This memorandum provides information regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation appearing in this agenda item and what the Commission may do next regarding this Proposed SARP Stipulation.


Action Requested

The Commission may approve the Proposed SARP Stipulation by majority vote, or it may provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation.

Regulatory Background

Pursuant to the Commission's Enforcement Regulations, the Executive Director may enter negotiations with a respondent at any time to resolve the factual and legal allegations in a complaint by way of a stipulated order (*i.e.* a negotiated settlement). Enf. Reg. § 12(A). The Regulations require that the stipulated order set forth the pertinent facts and may include an agreement as to anything that could be ordered by the Commission under its authority pursuant to Charter section C3.699-13. *Id.*

Immediately after the Executive Director enters a stipulated order with a respondent, the Executive Director must inform the Commission of the proposed stipulation. Enf. Reg. § 12(E). Stipulations will be agendized on the consent calendar unless a Commissioner requests, by noon on the fifth calendar day before the Commission's meeting, to have the stipulation placed on the agenda as a regular agenda item. Because the Executive Director entered into this stipulated order with Respondent shortly before this deadline for Commissioner requests, the stipulated order was agendized as a regular agenda item. *Id.*

This [proposed stipulation](#)  was reached pursuant to the Commission's [Streamlined Administrative Resolution Program](#). The Commission may discuss this item, and it may either approve the Proposed SARP Stipulation by majority vote or provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation. Enf. Reg. § 12(F).

Members of the public may comment on the Proposed SARP Stipulation.

Attachments

[2023.03.10 – Agenda Item 7 – Proposed SARP Stipulation, Decision and Order](#) 

Posted in [Commission Meeting Documents](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for February 2023
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:38:00 AM
Attachments: [CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for February 2023.pdf](#)

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

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

From: Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <ichieh.dion@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:38 AM
Subject: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for February 2023

All-

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

Regards,

Ichieh Chiang Dion (she/her/hers)
Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 140
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-554-5433

**Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco**



José Cisneros, Treasurer

Tajel Shah, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Hubert R White, III CFA, CTP, Chief Investment Officer

Investment Report for the month of February 2023

March 15, 2023

**The Honorable London N. Breed
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638**

**The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638**

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of February 28, 2023. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of February 2023 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics *

<i>(in \$ million)</i>	Current Month		Prior Month	
	Fiscal YTD	February 2023	Fiscal YTD	January 2023
Average Daily Balance	\$ 14,053	\$ 14,215	\$ 14,032	\$ 14,612
Net Earnings	159.13	25.45	133.68	26.56
Earned Income Yield	1.70%	2.33%	1.62%	2.14%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

<i>(in \$ million)</i>	% of Portfolio	Book Value	Market Value	Wtd. Avg. Coupon	Wtd. Avg. YTM	WAM
Investment Type						
U.S. Treasuries	26.90%	\$ 3,978.3	\$ 3,688.1	0.88%	0.85%	746
Federal Agencies	40.80%	5,858.7	5,593.5	1.85%	1.92%	648
Public Time Deposits	0.29%	40.0	40.0	4.46%	4.46%	90
Negotiable CDs	13.97%	1,920.0	1,914.8	4.64%	4.64%	201
Commercial Paper	5.37%	730.1	736.9	0.00%	5.07%	125
Money Market Funds	7.74%	1,061.2	1,061.2	4.49%	4.48%	1
Supranationals	4.93%	711.0	675.5	1.21%	1.59%	580
Totals	100.0%	\$ 14,299.3	\$ 13,710.0	2.09%	2.37%	529

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

Respectfully,

**José Cisneros
Treasurer**

cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Aimee Brown, Kevin Kone, Brenda Kwee McNulty, Meghan Wallace
Ben Rosenfield - Contoller, Office of the Contoller
Mark de la Rosa - Director of Audits, Office of the Contoller
Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Francisco Public Library
San Francisco Health Service System

Portfolio Summary

Pooled Fund

As of February 28, 2023

<i>(in \$ million)</i>							
Security Type	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value	Market/Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	\$ 3,975.0	\$ 3,978.3	\$ 3,688.1	92.70	26.90%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	5,860.2	5,858.7	5,593.5	95.47	40.80%	100%	Yes
State & Local Government							
Agency Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	40.0	40.0	40.0	100.00	0.29%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	1,920.0	1,920.0	1,914.8	99.73	13.97%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	750.0	730.1	736.9	100.92	5.37%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	-	-	-	-	0.00%	30%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	10%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds - Government	1,061.2	1,061.2	1,061.2	100.00	7.74%	20%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$50mm	Yes
Supranationals	704.2	711.0	675.5	95.01	4.93%	30%	Yes
TOTAL	\$ 14,310.5	\$ 14,299.3	\$ 13,710.0	95.88	100.00%	-	Yes

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

Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution. The full Investment Policy can be found at <https://sftreasurer.org/banking-investments/investments>

Totals may not add due to rounding.


City and County of San Francisco

Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics

For the month ended February 28, 2023



Average Daily Balance	\$14,214,500,664
Net Earnings	\$25,450,306
Earned Income Yield	2.33%
Weighted Average Maturity	529 days

Investment Type	(\$ million)	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	\$	3,975.0	\$ 3,978.3	\$ 3,688.1
Federal Agencies		5,860.2	5,858.7	5,593.5
Public Time Deposits		40.0	40.0	40.0
Negotiable CDs		1,920.0	1,920.0	1,914.8
Commercial Paper		750.0	730.1	736.9
Money Market Funds		1,061.2	1,061.2	1,061.2
Supranationals		704.2	711.0	675.5
Total		\$ 14,310.5	\$ 14,299.3	\$ 13,710.0




Portfolio Analysis

Pooled Fund




Yield Curves

Yields (%) on Benchmark Indices



Source: Bloomberg

U.S. Treasury Yield Curves



Source: Bloomberg

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

As of February 28, 2023

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Maturity		Par Value	Book Value	Amortized		Market Value
			Date	Coupon			Book Value	Market Value	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZD5	UNITED STATES TREASURY	3/15/2023	0.50	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,335,938	\$ 50,006,469	\$ 49,914,063	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBU4	UNITED STATES TREASURY	3/31/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,972,656	49,998,821	49,804,688	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	UNITED STATES TREASURY	6/15/2023	0.25	150,000,000	150,136,719	150,017,844	147,960,938	
U.S. Treasuries	912828S35	UNITED STATES TREASURY	6/30/2023	1.38	100,000,000	100,744,141	100,149,552	98,796,875	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCK5	UNITED STATES TREASURY	6/30/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,865,234	49,977,662	49,203,125	
U.S. Treasuries	912828S92	UNITED STATES TREASURY	7/31/2023	1.25	100,000,000	102,439,453	100,435,719	98,453,125	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAK7	UNITED STATES TREASURY	9/15/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,886,719	49,970,718	48,687,500	
U.S. Treasuries	912828WE6	UNITED STATES TREASURY	11/15/2023	2.75	50,000,000	51,960,938	50,355,411	49,171,875	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	UNITED STATES TREASURY	12/15/2023	0.13	150,000,000	148,613,281	149,477,851	144,234,375	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	UNITED STATES TREASURY	1/31/2024	0.88	100,000,000	97,996,094	99,000,453	96,187,500	
U.S. Treasuries	9128285Z9	UNITED STATES TREASURY	1/31/2024	2.50	50,000,000	52,511,719	50,994,037	48,820,313	
U.S. Treasuries	912828B66	UNITED STATES TREASURY	2/15/2024	2.75	50,000,000	50,250,000	50,130,000	48,875,000	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBR1	UNITED STATES TREASURY	3/15/2024	0.25	50,000,000	48,708,984	49,335,249	47,539,063	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CC3	UNITED STATES TREASURY	5/15/2024	0.25	50,000,000	49,718,750	49,881,650	47,156,250	
U.S. Treasuries	912828XT2	UNITED STATES TREASURY	5/31/2024	2.00	50,000,000	52,263,672	50,975,942	48,109,375	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	UNITED STATES TREASURY	7/15/2024	0.38	150,000,000	147,531,250	148,503,538	140,648,438	
U.S. Treasuries	912828Y87	UNITED STATES TREASURY	7/31/2024	1.75	50,000,000	52,210,938	50,939,512	47,718,750	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCT6	UNITED STATES TREASURY	8/15/2024	0.38	50,000,000	49,898,438	49,850,154	46,726,563	
U.S. Treasuries	912828YM6	UNITED STATES TREASURY	10/31/2024	1.50	50,000,000	51,746,094	50,822,484	47,250,000	
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	UNITED STATES TREASURY	11/15/2024	2.25	100,000,000	106,388,672	102,967,650	95,640,625	
U.S. Treasuries	912828YY0	UNITED STATES TREASURY	12/31/2024	1.75	50,000,000	52,226,563	51,077,162	47,281,250	
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	UNITED STATES TREASURY	1/31/2025	1.38	100,000,000	103,023,438	101,521,499	93,734,375	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	UNITED STATES TREASURY	2/28/2025	1.13	100,000,000	102,009,766	101,020,250	93,031,250	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	UNITED STATES TREASURY	3/31/2025	0.50	100,000,000	99,619,141	99,799,328	91,640,625	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZL7	UNITED STATES TREASURY	4/30/2025	0.38	50,000,000	49,615,234	49,789,086	45,546,875	
U.S. Treasuries	912828XB1	UNITED STATES TREASURY	5/15/2025	2.13	50,000,000	52,849,609	51,700,063	47,289,063	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	UNITED STATES TREASURY	6/30/2025	0.25	450,000,000	442,748,047	445,770,436	406,687,500	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	UNITED STATES TREASURY	7/31/2025	0.25	100,000,000	98,822,266	99,285,490	90,078,125	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	UNITED STATES TREASURY	9/15/2025	3.50	50,000,000	49,075,104	49,093,620	48,687,500	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	UNITED STATES TREASURY	9/30/2025	0.25	100,000,000	98,390,625	99,030,852	89,640,625	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	UNITED STATES TREASURY	10/31/2025	0.25	150,000,000	147,425,781	148,527,610	133,921,875	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	UNITED STATES TREASURY	12/31/2025	0.38	100,000,000	98,726,563	99,254,402	89,203,125	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	UNITED STATES TREASURY	4/30/2026	0.75	100,000,000	99,392,578	99,602,215	89,140,625	
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	UNITED STATES TREASURY	5/15/2026	1.63	100,000,000	104,093,750	102,754,001	91,593,750	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	UNITED STATES TREASURY	6/30/2026	0.88	450,000,000	449,880,859	449,842,512	401,062,500	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	UNITED STATES TREASURY	8/31/2026	0.75	50,000,000	49,449,219	49,608,204	44,125,000	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	UNITED STATES TREASURY	9/30/2026	0.88	150,000,000	148,679,688	149,046,358	132,679,688	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	UNITED STATES TREASURY	11/30/2026	1.25	150,000,000	147,267,578	147,797,538	133,968,750	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	UNITED STATES TREASURY	12/31/2026	1.25	50,000,000	47,107,422	47,668,296	44,578,125	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	UNITED STATES TREASURY	3/31/2027	2.50	25,000,000	24,757,813	24,801,593	23,312,500	
Subtotals				0.88	\$ 3,975,000,000	\$ 3,978,340,729	\$ 3,970,881,231	\$ 3,688,101,563	
Federal Agencies	313384CM9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	3/1/2023	0.00	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 49,687,625	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 49,993,750	
Federal Agencies	3133EMUH3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	3/23/2023	0.13	65,000,000	64,955,150	64,998,633	64,812,020	
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	4/13/2023	0.13	95,000,000	94,874,600	94,992,613	94,470,090	
Federal Agencies	3133EMXM9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	4/27/2023	0.13	44,500,000	44,462,233	44,497,018	44,169,721	
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	5/10/2023	0.13	112,500,000	112,356,000	112,486,192	111,468,263	
Federal Agencies	3130AMRY0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	6/2/2023	0.13	15,000,000	14,986,200	14,998,237	14,816,910	
Federal Agencies	3133EMF31	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/2/2023	0.13	100,000,000	99,938,000	99,992,101	98,779,400	

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Maturity		Par Value	Book Value	Amortized	
			Date	Coupon			Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agencies	3133EMH96	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/14/2023	0.13	50,000,000	49,864,850	49,980,181	49,307,600
Federal Agencies	3130AUNE0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	6/26/2023	4.78	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	28,972,943
Federal Agencies	3133EM3S9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/26/2023	0.20	98,067,000	97,806,076	98,013,080	96,570,203
Federal Agencies	3133EMS37	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	7/14/2023	0.13	100,000,000	99,835,044	99,969,494	98,195,100
Federal Agencies	3133ENEY2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	7/24/2023	0.45	50,000,000	49,996,500	49,999,164	49,094,050
Federal Agencies	3133EM2E1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	8/10/2023	0.16	50,000,000	49,970,000	49,993,342	48,930,550
Federal Agencies	3137EAEV7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE	8/24/2023	0.25	40,776,000	40,542,761	40,710,425	39,842,433
Federal Agencies	313384LJ6	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	9/6/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,055,750	48,787,250	48,687,250
Federal Agencies	3130AJXD6	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	9/8/2023	0.13	20,975,000	20,806,361	20,924,115	20,442,382
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	9/8/2023	3.38	90,000,000	90,243,750	90,114,226	89,194,500
Federal Agencies	3135G0U43	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A	9/12/2023	2.88	29,648,000	30,793,302	29,995,872	29,300,377
Federal Agencies	3133EM6N7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	9/27/2023	0.17	50,000,000	49,950,000	49,985,616	48,615,700
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	12/1/2023	0.50	125,000,000	124,818,750	124,931,533	120,722,125
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	12/8/2023	2.25	40,000,000	41,204,000	40,466,385	39,116,520
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	12/20/2023	0.68	112,000,000	111,946,088	111,978,288	108,059,168
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	1/8/2024	4.80	36,000,000	35,986,400	35,989,251	35,869,932
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	1/18/2024	0.90	61,856,000	61,439,815	61,665,940	59,578,895
Federal Agencies	3130AFW94	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	2/13/2024	2.50	39,010,000	40,648,810	39,704,951	38,031,005
Federal Agencies	3133ELNE0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	2/14/2024	1.43	20,495,000	20,950,604	20,606,668	19,778,085
Federal Agencies	3130AUYG3	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	2/16/2024	5.10	25,000,000	24,996,500	24,996,625	24,966,875
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	2/26/2024	0.25	110,000,000	109,960,400	109,986,909	104,789,960
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	2/28/2024	2.13	36,000,000	35,958,960	35,978,811	34,933,824
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	3/8/2024	4.75	115,000,000	115,329,911	114,980,002	114,435,005
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	3/18/2024	0.30	100,000,000	99,878,950	99,957,699	95,018,500
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	4/22/2024	0.35	84,969,000	84,992,791	84,978,174	80,420,864
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	5/16/2024	2.63	95,000,000	94,871,750	94,922,453	92,144,205
Federal Agencies	3133ENYH7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/10/2024	2.63	100,000,000	99,871,000	99,917,588	96,845,500
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	6/14/2024	2.88	109,435,000	109,808,808	109,666,684	106,289,619
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	6/14/2024	3.13	56,210,000	56,019,452	56,080,494	54,766,808
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/17/2024	3.25	100,000,000	99,911,250	99,942,452	97,583,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/28/2024	3.10	100,000,000	99,947,000	99,964,836	97,338,800
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	7/8/2024	3.00	42,500,000	42,417,550	42,444,169	41,302,435
Federal Agencies	3133EMV25	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	7/23/2024	0.45	50,000,000	50,092,000	50,043,364	46,869,600
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	8/21/2024	4.88	55,000,000	54,977,700	54,978,026	54,817,620
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ84	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	8/26/2024	3.38	50,000,000	49,916,500	49,937,860	48,772,850
Federal Agencies	3130ATVD6	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	9/13/2024	4.88	50,000,000	50,082,313	50,051,774	49,857,150
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	9/23/2024	0.43	125,000,000	124,873,750	124,934,110	116,432,875
Federal Agencies	3133ENP79	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	9/26/2024	4.25	50,000,000	49,996,000	49,996,854	49,409,050
Federal Agencies	3130ATT31	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	10/3/2024	4.50	50,000,000	49,879,250	49,884,346	49,605,850
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	11/18/2024	0.88	70,000,000	69,919,500	69,953,874	65,344,230
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ94	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	11/18/2024	4.50	25,000,000	24,973,500	24,977,234	24,782,925
Federal Agencies	3133ELCP7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	12/3/2024	1.63	25,000,000	24,960,000	24,985,922	23,617,750
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	12/9/2024	0.92	100,000,000	99,948,000	99,969,208	93,239,600
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	12/20/2024	4.25	60,000,000	59,891,900	59,902,399	59,310,240
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	1/6/2025	1.13	70,000,000	69,842,500	69,902,266	65,385,180
Federal Agencies	3135G0X24	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A	1/7/2025	1.63	39,060,000	40,632,556	39,845,698	36,822,448
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	1/10/2025	4.88	50,000,000	49,997,780	49,998,091	49,974,550
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	2/10/2025	4.25	39,875,000	39,663,265	39,668,768	39,413,487
Federal Agencies	3137EAEPO	FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE	2/12/2025	1.50	133,532,000	135,388,452	134,491,022	125,265,167
Federal Agencies	3130AUVZ4	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	2/13/2025	4.50	50,000,000	49,921,500	49,923,218	49,648,900

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Maturity		Par Value	Book Value	Amortized		Market Value
			Date	Coupon			Book Value	Market Value	
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	3/3/2025	1.21	40,000,000	39,954,960	39,981,720	37,241,400	
Federal Agencies	3133EMW75	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	4/21/2025	0.60	50,000,000	49,973,500	49,985,816	45,768,700	
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A	4/22/2025	0.63	137,938,000	136,719,742	137,155,688	126,240,996	
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	5/23/2025	2.85	26,000,000	25,963,600	25,972,966	24,955,294	
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	6/13/2025	3.38	24,640,000	24,806,223	24,772,865	23,913,514	
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/13/2025	4.25	45,000,000	44,967,233	44,970,032	44,515,215	
Federal Agencies	3133ENYQ7	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/13/2025	2.95	50,000,000	49,975,500	49,981,334	48,071,350	
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A	6/17/2025	0.50	14,655,000	14,346,240	14,453,718	13,309,832	
Federal Agencies	3130AN4A5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	6/30/2025	0.70	17,680,000	17,734,631	17,712,123	16,124,673	
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A	8/25/2025	0.38	97,500,000	96,546,250	96,971,844	87,701,543	
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	9/12/2025	1.75	10,295,000	10,475,333	10,479,105	9,582,771	
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE	9/23/2025	0.38	22,600,000	22,295,352	22,428,452	20,292,065	
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	11/17/2025	1.05	94,675,000	94,545,232	94,586,889	86,211,055	
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	12/16/2025	1.17	95,000,000	94,903,100	94,932,283	86,612,355	
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	12/29/2025	4.00	60,000,000	59,828,050	59,828,343	59,092,620	
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	1/13/2026	4.00	50,000,000	49,959,600	49,961,332	49,247,650	
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	2/6/2026	4.01	21,100,000	20,990,128	20,987,523	20,793,396	
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	2/23/2026	4.38	103,000,000	102,825,580	102,826,535	102,546,697	
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	2/25/2026	3.32	35,000,000	34,957,650	34,963,870	33,826,275	
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	4/6/2026	0.69	15,500,000	15,458,150	15,472,149	13,808,470	
Federal Agencies	3133ENU00	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	4/8/2026	2.64	50,000,000	49,903,000	49,924,710	47,327,500	
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	7/13/2026	1.05	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	88,685,200	
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	7/27/2026	1.07	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	88,624,900	
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	8/10/2026	1.05	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	88,469,200	
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	9/3/2026	1.08	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	88,357,800	
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	10/19/2026	1.43	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	89,348,800	
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	11/16/2026	1.61	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	89,714,700	
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	12/14/2026	1.65	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	89,650,300	
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	3/8/2027	2.35	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	91,637,300	
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	3/10/2027	1.68	48,573,000	47,432,020	47,651,439	43,824,066	
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	4/5/2027	2.60	72,000,000	71,573,348	71,650,262	67,333,824	
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	5/17/2027	4.13	55,650,000	55,613,093	55,615,430	55,155,884	
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	6/11/2027	3.50	44,100,000	44,710,878	44,634,149	42,692,108	
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	6/28/2027	3.24	27,865,000	28,099,066	28,068,536	26,683,663	
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU	8/23/2027	4.13	10,000,000	9,974,000	9,974,095	9,934,430	
Subtotals				1.75	\$ 5,860,179,000	\$ 5,858,660,914	\$ 5,857,984,716	\$ 5,593,519,385	
Public Time Deposits	PPFQECA11	Bridge Bank	3/20/2023	3.57	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	
Public Time Deposits	PPFTL68P0	Bank of San Francisco	6/5/2023	4.69	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	
Public Time Deposits	PPG03UL74	Bridge Bank	6/19/2023	4.72	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	
Public Time Deposits	PPFTLUBP3	Bank of San Francisco	7/10/2023	4.85	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	
Subtotals				4.46	\$ 40,000,000	\$ 40,000,000	\$ 40,000,000	\$ 40,000,000	
Negotiable CDs	06367CV46	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	3/27/2023	2.60	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 49,921,700	
Negotiable CDs	78012U5Z4	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	3/27/2023	2.58	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,921,050	
Negotiable CDs	65602Y3E8	Norinchukin Bank - New York Branch	5/8/2023	5.20	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,028,850	
Negotiable CDs	89115B3A6	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br	6/15/2023	3.60	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,557,100	
Negotiable CDs	78012U6W0	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	6/15/2023	3.71	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,793,050	
Negotiable CDs	78012U7H2	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	6/15/2023	3.68	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,789,350	
Negotiable CDs	89115BAW0	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br	6/30/2023	3.90	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,787,850	

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Maturity		Par Value	Book Value	Amortized	
			Date	Coupon			Book Value	Market Value
Negotiable CDs	06367CX51	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	6/30/2023	3.92	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,791,250
Negotiable CDs	06367CWT0	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	7/3/2023	3.75	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,755,400
Negotiable CDs	78015J3N5	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	7/3/2023	3.73	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,752,050
Negotiable CDs	06367CXA0	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	7/3/2023	3.84	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,771,600
Negotiable CDs	06417MB87	Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch	7/3/2023	3.73	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,753,850
Negotiable CDs	78015JAJ6	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	7/3/2023	4.02	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,802,550
Negotiable CDs	06367D2M6	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	7/3/2023	5.30	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,029,800
Negotiable CDs	65602Y7E4	Norinchukin Bank - New York Branch	8/16/2023	5.05	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,956,000
Negotiable CDs	06367CXR3	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	8/28/2023	4.23	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,717,350
Negotiable CDs	78015JFJ1	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	9/20/2023	4.75	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,776,800
Negotiable CDs	78015JHJ9	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	9/22/2023	4.81	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,823,750
Negotiable CDs	06367CY27	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	9/22/2023	4.80	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,821,650
Negotiable CDs	06367CXX0	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	9/25/2023	4.82	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,821,400
Negotiable CDs	78015JH67	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	9/25/2023	4.76	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,804,900
Negotiable CDs	06367CYA9	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	10/6/2023	4.97	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,817,050
Negotiable CDs	89115BC73	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br	10/23/2023	5.57	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,022,050
Negotiable CDs	78015JMJ3	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	10/23/2023	5.46	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,991,350
Negotiable CDs	13606KRZ1	Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	11/6/2023	5.32	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,950,050
Negotiable CDs	89115BJX9	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br	11/20/2023	5.51	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,992,950
Negotiable CDs	06417MN84	Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch	11/21/2023	5.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,989,600
Negotiable CDs	78015JPE1	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	12/18/2023	5.37	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,927,450
Negotiable CDs	78015JRE9	Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran	12/29/2023	5.43	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,896,600
Negotiable CDs	89115BPB0	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br	1/3/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,944,150
Negotiable CDs	89115BPF1	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br	1/5/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,906,500
Negotiable CDs	06367D3V5	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	1/12/2024	5.24	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	69,803,790
Negotiable CDs	89115BQB9	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br	1/17/2024	5.24	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,821,000
Negotiable CDs	89115BST8	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br	1/29/2024	5.21	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,666,800
Negotiable CDs	06417MT47	Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch	2/9/2024	5.43	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,924,250
Subtotals				4.64	\$ 1,920,000,000	\$ 1,920,000,000	\$ 1,920,000,000	\$ 1,914,830,890
Commercial Paper	62479MQD8	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	3/13/2023	0.00	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 49,360,278	\$ 49,921,667	\$ 49,913,400
Commercial Paper	89233HQD9	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	3/13/2023	0.00	50,000,000	49,255,944	49,924,333	49,915,750
Commercial Paper	62479MTG8	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	6/16/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,751,972	49,253,972	49,253,650
Commercial Paper	89233HTW4	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	6/30/2023	0.00	150,000,000	144,920,833	147,512,778	147,481,200
Commercial Paper	62479MTW3	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	6/30/2023	0.00	100,000,000	97,331,306	98,309,361	98,304,800
Commercial Paper	62479MU35	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	7/3/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,515,417	49,123,389	49,130,600
Commercial Paper	62479MV26	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	8/2/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,785,111	48,936,972	48,909,700
Commercial Paper	62479MV75	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	8/7/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,750,597	48,902,458	48,872,450
Commercial Paper	89233HVB7	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	8/11/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,756,944	48,868,056	48,845,950
Commercial Paper	62479MVE0	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	8/14/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,660,667	48,865,667	48,820,050
Commercial Paper	62479MVU4	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	8/28/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,457,583	48,755,000	48,714,450
Commercial Paper	89233HVW1	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	8/30/2023	0.00	50,000,000	48,601,375	48,733,583	48,699,450
Subtotals				0.00	\$ 750,000,000	\$ 730,148,028	\$ 737,107,236	\$ 736,861,450

Investment Inventory Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Maturity		Par Value	Amortized		
			Date	Coupon		Book Value	Book Value	Market Value
Money Market Funds	61747C319	MORG STAN I LQ:GV IMP	3/1/2023	4.46	\$ 10,631,130	\$ 10,631,130	\$ 10,631,130	\$ 10,631,130
Money Market Funds	608919718	FEDERATED HRMS GV O PRMR	3/1/2023	4.44	12,848,872	12,848,872	12,848,872	12,848,872
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BLKRK LQ:T-FUND INSTL	3/1/2023	4.43	15,140,850	15,140,850	15,140,850	15,140,850
Money Market Funds	31607A703	FIDELITY IMM:GOVT INSTL	3/1/2023	4.50	707,492,754	707,492,754	707,492,754	707,492,754
Money Market Funds	85749T517	SS INST INV:US GV MM OPP	3/1/2023	4.39	14,464,166	14,464,166	14,464,166	14,464,166
Money Market Funds	262006208	DREYFUS	3/1/2023	4.47	300,618,386	300,618,386	300,618,386	300,618,386
Subtotals				4.49	\$ 1,061,196,158	\$ 1,061,196,158	\$ 1,061,196,158	\$ 1,061,196,158
Supranationals	459058JV6	INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON	4/20/2023	0.13	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 99,793,000	\$ 99,985,822	\$ 99,386,900
Supranationals	4581X0CC0	INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E	10/4/2023	3.00	25,756,000	26,837,752	26,112,748	25,440,618
Supranationals	45906M3B5	INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON	6/14/2024	1.98	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	96,081,000
Supranationals	4581X0EE4	INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E	7/1/2024	3.25	80,000,000	79,992,000	79,994,659	78,014,720
Supranationals	459056HV2	INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON	8/28/2024	1.50	50,000,000	50,984,250	50,521,748	47,412,850
Supranationals	45950VQG4	INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORP	9/23/2024	0.44	10,000,000	9,918,700	9,956,416	9,260,960
Supranationals	4581X0DZ8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E	9/23/2024	0.50	50,000,000	49,595,500	49,780,480	46,588,250
Supranationals	4581X0CM8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E	1/15/2025	2.13	100,000,000	105,676,000	102,863,041	95,078,900
Supranationals	459058JB0	INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON	4/22/2025	0.63	40,000,000	40,086,000	40,049,188	36,612,000
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E	7/15/2025	0.63	28,900,000	28,519,098	28,655,738	26,275,418
Supranationals	45950VRU2	INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORP	1/26/2026	4.02	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	97,958,400
Supranationals	45818WDG8	INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E	2/27/2026	0.82	19,500,000	19,556,907	19,537,800	17,354,337
Subtotals				1.90	\$ 704,156,000	\$ 710,959,207	\$ 707,457,641	\$ 675,464,352
Grand Totals				2.05	\$ 14,310,531,158	\$ 14,299,305,036	\$ 14,294,626,982	\$ 13,709,973,798

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

For month ended February 28, 2023

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity		Earned Interest	Amort.	Realized	Earned Income
							Date	Expense		Gain/(Loss)	/Net Earnings	
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z86	United States Department of The Treasury	0	1.375	1.375	8/17/21	2/15/23	26,155	-23,645	0	2,510	
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z86	United States Department of The Treasury	0	1.375	1.375	3/3/22	2/15/23	26,155	-6,660	0.00	19,495	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZD5	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.5	0.1627	3/18/21	3/15/23	19,337	-12,938	0	6,399	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBU4	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.125	0.1537	5/4/21	3/31/23	4,808	1,100	0	5,908	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.252	6/24/21	6/15/23	9,615	76	0.00	9,691	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.1838	4/8/21	6/15/23	9,615	-2,536	0.00	7,080	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZU7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.1912	3/12/21	6/15/23	9,615	-2,254	0	7,362	
U.S. Treasuries	912828S35	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.375	0.2459	6/24/21	6/30/23	53,177	-43,319	0	9,858	
U.S. Treasuries	912828S35	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.375	1.6051	1/9/20	6/30/23	53,177	8,712	0	61,889	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCK5	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.125	0.2597	6/30/21	6/30/23	4,834	5,169	0	10,003	
U.S. Treasuries	912828S92	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.25	0.2046	4/1/21	7/31/23	48,343	-40,100	0	8,243	
U.S. Treasuries	912828S92	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.25	0.2029	4/1/21	7/31/23	48,343	-40,164	0	8,178	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAK7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.125	0.2334	8/10/21	9/15/23	4,834	4,141	0.00	8,975	
U.S. Treasuries	912828WE6	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	2.75	1.7265	12/17/19	11/15/23	106,354	-38,423	0	67,931	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.125	0.2951	3/19/21	12/15/23	4,808	6,501	0.00	11,309	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.125	0.7231	12/9/21	12/15/23	4,808	22,737	0.00	27,545	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBA8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.125	0.6864	12/15/21	12/15/23	4,808	21,351	0	26,158	
U.S. Treasuries	912828S29	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	2.5	0.3304	10/4/21	1/31/24	96,685	-82,836	0.00	13,849	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	2.4625	4/11/22	1/31/24	33,840	59,162	0.00	93,002	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDV0	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	1.5159	2/23/22	1/31/24	33,840	24,134	0.00	57,973	
U.S. Treasuries	912828B66	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	2.75	2.4706	4/11/22	2/15/24	105,487	-10,370	0	95,116	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBR1	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	1.5538	3/8/22	3/15/24	9,669	48,982	0.00	58,650	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCC3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.4471	7/2/21	5/15/24	9,669	7,514	0.00	17,183	
U.S. Treasuries	91282XT2	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	2	0.4302	7/6/21	5/31/24	76,923	-59,795	0	17,128	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.375	0.3763	8/6/21	7/15/24	14,503	51	0	14,554	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.375	2.6013	4/12/22	7/15/24	14,503	82,396	0.00	96,899	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCL3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.375	0.4018	8/9/21	7/15/24	14,503	1,021	0	15,524	
U.S. Treasuries	912828Y87	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.75	0.4178	3/30/21	7/31/24	67,680	-50,784	0	16,895	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCT6	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.375	0.4437	8/25/21	8/15/24	14,385	2,619	0	17,003	
U.S. Treasuries	912828YM6	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.5	0.5059	4/15/21	10/31/24	58,011	-37,753	0	20,258	
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	2.25	0.5199	3/9/21	11/15/24	87,017	-65,690	0	21,327	
U.S. Treasuries	912828G38	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	2.25	0.4798	3/12/21	11/15/24	87,017	-67,261	0.00	19,756	
U.S. Treasuries	912828YY0	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.75	0.5654	3/15/21	12/31/24	67,680	-44,949	0	22,731	
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.375	0.5773	3/30/21	1/31/25	53,177	-30,248	0	22,929	
U.S. Treasuries	912828Z52	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.375	0.5723	4/15/21	1/31/25	53,177	-30,439	0.00	22,738	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.125	0.6095	3/31/21	2/28/25	43,483	-19,542	0.00	23,941	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZC7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.125	0.6083	3/15/21	2/28/25	43,483	-19,591	0.00	23,892	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.5	0.6127	4/15/21	3/31/25	19,231	4,274	0.00	23,504	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZF0	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.5	0.582	4/19/21	3/31/25	19,231	3,110	0	22,341	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZL7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.375	0.5719	5/18/21	4/30/25	14,503	7,466	0.00	21,969	
U.S. Treasuries	912828XB1	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	2.125	0.5683	9/2/21	5/15/25	82,182	-59,059	0	23,123	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.5087	8/5/21	6/30/25	9,669	9,825	0.00	19,493	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6534	3/8/21	6/30/25	9,669	15,278	0	24,946	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6165	5/18/21	6/30/25	9,669	13,890	0.00	23,559	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	1.035	12/7/21	6/30/25	9,669	29,509	0	39,177	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6499	5/13/21	6/30/25	9,669	15,149	0.00	24,817	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.5577	8/6/21	6/30/25	9,669	11,675	0.00	21,343	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6014	7/12/21	6/30/25	9,669	13,323	0	22,991	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6015	5/12/21	6/30/25	9,669	13,328	0.00	22,996	
U.S. Treasuries	912828ZW3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6999	3/9/21	6/30/25	9,669	17,025	0	26,693	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.5241	8/5/21	7/31/25	9,669	10,404	0	20,073	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAB7	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.5731	8/6/21	7/31/25	9,669	12,253	0	21,922	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CFK2	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	3.5	4.2532	10/7/22	9/15/25	135,359	24,113	0	159,472	

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity		Earned Interest	Amort.	Realized	Earned Income
							Date	Expense		Gain/(Loss)	/Net Earnings	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.5983	7/26/21	9/30/25	9,615	13,179	0.00	22,795	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAM3	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6619	5/12/21	9/30/25	9,615	15,566	0.00	25,182	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6643	3/4/21	10/31/25	9,669	15,648	0.00	25,316	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.5534	2/25/21	10/31/25	9,669	11,488	0.00	21,156	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CAT8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.25	0.6509	3/2/21	10/31/25	9,669	15,148	0	24,817	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.375	0.6805	2/26/21	12/31/25	14,503	11,531	0	26,034	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBC4	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.375	0.603	2/25/21	12/31/25	14,503	8,620	0.00	23,123	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.75	0.8926	6/28/21	4/30/26	29,006	5,354	0	34,360	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CBW0	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.75	0.8639	7/2/21	4/30/26	29,006	4,281	0	33,286	
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.625	0.8077	8/27/21	5/15/26	62,845	-30,742	0	32,103	
U.S. Treasuries	912828R36	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.625	0.6941	7/23/21	5/15/26	62,845	-35,110	0.00	27,736	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	0.903	7/2/21	6/30/26	33,840	1,049	0.00	34,889	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	0.7749	8/10/21	6/30/26	33,840	-3,768	0	30,071	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	0.8461	7/14/21	6/30/26	33,840	-1,087	0.00	32,753	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	0.7063	8/6/21	6/30/26	33,840	-6,358	0	27,481	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	1.0519	10/14/21	6/30/26	33,840	6,613	0.00	40,453	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	0.7326	7/22/21	6/30/26	33,840	-5,366	0	28,474	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	0.7398	7/22/21	6/30/26	33,840	-5,093	0	28,747	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	1.3228	1/4/22	6/30/26	33,840	16,627	0.00	50,466	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCJ8	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	0.9018	9/24/21	6/30/26	33,840	1,006	0.00	34,846	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCW9	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.75	0.9795	9/28/21	8/31/26	28,989	8,577	0.00	37,566	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	1.0103	10/8/21	9/30/26	33,654	5,054	0.00	38,707	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	1.1589	10/19/21	9/30/26	33,654	10,562	0.00	44,216	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CCZ2	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	0.875	1.003	10/8/21	9/30/26	33,654	4,783	0.00	38,437	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.25	1.22	12/3/21	11/30/26	48,077	-1,110	0.00	46,967	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.25	2.5854	3/29/22	11/30/26	48,077	47,928	0.00	96,005	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDK4	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.25	1.2013	12/7/21	11/30/26	48,077	-1,804	0.00	46,273	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CDQ1	United States Department of The Treasury	50000000	1.25	2.5489	3/29/22	12/31/26	48,343	46,601	0.00	94,943	
U.S. Treasuries	91282CEF4	United States Department of The Treasury	25000000	2.5	2.7091	4/6/22	3/31/27	48,077	3,726	0.00	51,803	
Subtotals			\$ 3,975,000.00					\$ 2,736,473	\$ (129,167)	\$ -	\$ 2,607,305	
Federal Agencies	313384BK4	Federal Home Loan Banks	\$ -	0.00	0.00	2/2/23	2/3/23	\$ -	\$ 3,042	\$ -	\$ 3,042	
Federal Agencies	313384BK4	Federal Home Loan Banks	-	0.00	0.00	2/2/23	2/3/23	-	3,042	-	3,042	
Federal Agencies	313384BK4	Federal Home Loan Banks	-	0.00	0.00	2/2/23	2/3/23	-	3,042	-	3,042	
Federal Agencies	313384BK4	Federal Home Loan Banks	-	0.00	0.00	2/2/23	2/3/23	-	3,042	-	3,042	
Federal Agencies	3133EMPH9	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	-	0.13	0.13	3/3/22	2/3/23	316	2,396	-	2,712	
Federal Agencies	3133827H0	Federal Home Loan Banks	-	2.14	2.14	3/7/22	2/6/23	13,197	(6,349)	-	6,847	
Federal Agencies	3133ENDQ0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	-	0.16	0.16	11/12/21	2/10/23	2,000	1,982	-	3,982	
Federal Agencies	313384CM9	Federal Home Loan Banks	50,000,000	0.00	4.47	1/9/23	3/1/23	-	171,500	-	171,500	
Federal Agencies	3133EMUH3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	65,000,000	0.13	0.16	3/31/21	3/23/23	6,771	1,739	-	8,510	
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	0.13	0.19	4/13/21	4/13/23	2,083	1,013	-	3,096	
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	0.13	0.19	4/13/21	4/13/23	2,604	1,266	-	3,870	
Federal Agencies	3133EMVP4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.13	0.19	4/13/21	4/13/23	5,208	2,532	-	7,740	
Federal Agencies	3133EMXM9	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	44,500,000	0.13	0.17	5/5/21	4/27/23	4,635	1,465	-	6,100	
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	12,500,000	0.13	0.19	5/10/21	5/10/23	1,302	614	-	1,916	
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	0.13	0.19	5/10/21	5/10/23	2,604	1,227	-	3,832	
Federal Agencies	3133EMYX4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	75,000,000	0.13	0.19	5/10/21	5/10/23	7,813	3,682	-	11,495	
Federal Agencies	3130AMRY0	Federal Home Loan Banks	15,000,000	0.13	0.17	6/4/21	6/2/23	1,563	531	-	2,093	
Federal Agencies	3133EMF31	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	100,000,000	0.13	0.16	6/2/21	6/2/23	10,417	2,378	-	12,795	
Federal Agencies	3133EMH96	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.13	0.26	6/28/21	6/14/23	5,208	5,285	-	10,494	
Federal Agencies	3130AUNE0	Federal Home Loan Banks	29,000,000	4.78	4.78	1/26/23	6/26/23	115,517	-	-	115,517	
Federal Agencies	3133EM3S9	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	48,067,000	0.20	0.53	12/14/21	6/26/23	8,011	12,062	-	20,073	
Federal Agencies	3133EM3S9	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.20	0.22	8/26/21	6/26/23	8,333	842	-	9,175	
Federal Agencies	3133EMS37	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.13	0.20	7/14/21	7/14/23	5,208	2,770	-	7,978	

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity		Earned Interest	Amort.	Realized	Earned Income
							Date	Expense		Gain/(Loss)	/Net Earnings	
Federal Agencies	3133EMS37	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.13	0.22	7/14/21	7/14/23	5,208	3,557	-	-	8,766
Federal Agencies	3133ENEY2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.45	0.45	11/24/21	7/24/23	18,750	161	-	-	18,911
Federal Agencies	3133EM2E1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.16	0.19	8/10/21	8/10/23	6,667	1,151	-	-	7,817
Federal Agencies	3137EAEV7	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	40,776,000	0.25	0.58	12/6/21	8/24/23	8,495	10,432	-	-	18,927
Federal Agencies	313384LJ6	Federal Home Loan Banks	50,000,000	0.00	4.77	11/7/22	9/6/23	-	179,667	-	-	179,667
Federal Agencies	3130AJXD6	Federal Home Loan Banks	20,975,000	0.13	0.59	12/14/21	9/8/23	2,185	7,460	-	-	9,644
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	3.38	3.11	7/27/22	9/8/23	70,313	(4,924)	-	-	65,388
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	3.38	3.12	7/27/22	9/8/23	70,313	(4,804)	-	-	65,509
Federal Agencies	313383YJ4	Federal Home Loan Banks	40,000,000	3.38	3.14	7/28/22	9/8/23	112,500	(7,017)	-	-	105,483
Federal Agencies	3135G0U43	Federal National Mortgage Association	29,648,000	2.88	0.66	12/9/21	9/12/23	71,032	(49,951)	-	-	21,081
Federal Agencies	3133EM6N7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.17	0.22	9/27/21	9/27/23	7,083	1,918	-	-	9,001
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	0.50	0.57	12/3/21	12/1/23	10,417	1,394	-	-	11,811
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	0.50	0.57	12/3/21	12/1/23	10,417	1,394	-	-	11,811
Federal Agencies	3133ENGF1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	75,000,000	0.50	0.57	12/3/21	12/1/23	31,250	4,183	-	-	35,433
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	Federal Home Loan Banks	10,000,000	2.25	0.73	12/10/21	12/8/23	18,750	(11,577)	-	-	7,173
Federal Agencies	3130A3VC5	Federal Home Loan Banks	30,000,000	2.25	0.73	12/10/21	12/8/23	56,250	(34,731)	-	-	21,519
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	0.68	0.70	12/20/21	12/20/23	14,167	460	-	-	14,627
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	0.68	0.70	12/20/21	12/20/23	14,167	476	-	-	14,642
Federal Agencies	3133ENHR4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	62,000,000	0.68	0.70	12/20/21	12/20/23	35,133	1,132	-	-	36,265
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	Federal Home Loan Banks	11,000,000	4.80	4.81	12/8/22	1/8/24	44,000	78	-	-	44,078
Federal Agencies	3130AU4V3	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	4.80	4.85	12/8/22	1/8/24	100,000	884	-	-	100,884
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	11,856,000	0.90	1.44	3/3/22	1/18/24	8,892	4,783	-	-	13,675
Federal Agencies	3133ENLF5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.90	1.21	2/1/22	1/18/24	37,500	11,693	-	-	49,193
Federal Agencies	3130AFW94	Federal Home Loan Banks	39,010,000	2.50	0.62	11/12/21	2/13/24	81,271	(55,755)	-	-	25,515
Federal Agencies	3133ELNE0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,495,000	1.43	0.85	3/18/20	2/14/24	24,423	(8,933)	-	-	15,490
Federal Agencies	3130AUYG3	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	5.10	5.11	2/16/23	2/16/24	53,125	125	-	-	53,250
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	5,000,000	0.25	0.26	2/26/21	2/26/24	1,042	46	-	-	1,088
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	5,000,000	0.25	0.26	2/26/21	2/26/24	1,042	46	-	-	1,088
Federal Agencies	3133EMRZ7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	100,000,000	0.25	0.26	2/26/21	2/26/24	20,833	921	-	-	21,754
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	Federal Home Loan Banks	11,000,000	2.13	2.18	3/25/22	2/28/24	19,479	498	-	-	19,977
Federal Agencies	3130ARHG9	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	2.13	2.18	3/25/22	2/28/24	44,271	1,132	-	-	45,403
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Banks	10,000,000	4.75	4.65	11/15/22	3/8/24	39,583	(777)	-	-	38,806
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Banks	20,000,000	4.75	4.75	11/18/22	3/8/24	79,167	(47)	-	-	79,120
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	4.75	4.81	12/8/22	3/8/24	98,958	1,105	-	-	100,064
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Banks	30,000,000	4.75	4.81	12/8/22	3/8/24	118,750	1,326	-	-	120,076
Federal Agencies	3130ATUQ8	Federal Home Loan Banks	30,000,000	4.75	4.75	11/18/22	3/8/24	118,750	(106)	-	-	118,644
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.30	0.34	3/18/21	3/18/24	12,500	1,547	-	-	14,047
Federal Agencies	3133EMTW2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.30	0.34	3/18/21	3/18/24	12,500	1,546	-	-	14,046
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	16,545,000	0.35	0.34	5/4/21	4/22/24	4,826	(120)	-	-	4,706
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	29,424,000	0.35	0.34	5/4/21	4/22/24	8,582	(213)	-	-	8,369
Federal Agencies	3133EMWV0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	39,000,000	0.35	0.34	5/4/21	4/22/24	11,375	(282)	-	-	11,093
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	45,000,000	2.63	2.69	5/16/22	5/16/24	98,438	2,327	-	-	100,764
Federal Agencies	3133ENWP1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	2.63	2.69	5/16/22	5/16/24	109,375	2,585	-	-	111,960
Federal Agencies	3133ENYH7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	2.63	2.69	6/10/22	6/10/24	109,375	2,471	-	-	111,846
Federal Agencies	3133ENYH7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	2.63	2.69	6/10/22	6/10/24	109,375	2,471	-	-	111,846
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Banks	15,955,000	2.88	2.71	5/18/22	6/14/24	38,226	(1,974)	-	-	36,251
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Banks	17,980,000	2.88	2.70	5/18/22	6/14/24	43,077	(2,358)	-	-	40,719
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,500,000	2.88	2.77	5/12/22	6/14/24	61,094	(1,925)	-	-	59,169
Federal Agencies	3130A1XJ2	Federal Home Loan Banks	50,000,000	2.88	2.67	5/16/22	6/14/24	119,792	(7,516)	-	-	112,276
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	Federal Home Loan Banks	28,000,000	3.13	3.31	7/22/22	6/14/24	72,917	3,858	-	-	76,774
Federal Agencies	3130ASHK8	Federal Home Loan Banks	28,210,000	3.13	3.31	7/22/22	6/14/24	73,464	3,841	-	-	77,305
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	3.25	3.31	6/17/22	6/17/24	67,708	1,120	-	-	68,829
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	3.25	3.31	6/17/22	6/17/24	67,708	1,130	-	-	68,838
Federal Agencies	3133ENYX2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	3.25	3.28	6/17/22	6/17/24	135,417	1,149	-	-	136,566

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity		Amort.	Realized	Earned Income
							Date	Earned Interest			
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	3.10	3.13	6/28/22	6/28/24	64,583	517	-	65,100
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	3.10	3.13	6/28/22	6/28/24	64,583	479	-	65,062
Federal Agencies	3133ENZS2	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	3.10	3.13	6/28/22	6/28/24	129,167	1,034	-	130,201
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Banks	10,000,000	3.00	3.10	7/8/22	7/8/24	25,000	743	-	25,743
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Banks	15,000,000	3.00	3.10	7/8/22	7/8/24	37,500	1,115	-	38,615
Federal Agencies	3130ASME6	Federal Home Loan Banks	17,500,000	3.00	3.10	7/8/22	7/8/24	43,750	1,300	-	45,050
Federal Agencies	3133EMV25	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.45	0.39	8/6/21	7/23/24	18,750	(2,381)	-	16,369
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	10,000,000	4.88	4.91	2/21/23	8/21/24	13,542	63	-	13,605
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	4.88	4.90	2/21/23	8/21/24	27,083	117	-	27,200
Federal Agencies	3133EPBF1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	4.88	4.90	2/21/23	8/21/24	33,854	146	-	34,000
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ84	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	3.38	3.46	8/26/22	8/26/24	140,625	3,198	-	143,823
Federal Agencies	3130ATVD6	Federal Home Loan Banks	50,000,000	4.88	4.81	11/10/22	9/13/24	203,125	(2,579)	-	200,546
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	0.43	0.46	9/23/21	9/23/24	8,958	645	-	9,603
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.43	0.46	9/23/21	9/23/24	17,917	1,290	-	19,207
Federal Agencies	3133EM5X6	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.43	0.46	9/23/21	9/23/24	17,917	1,290	-	19,207
Federal Agencies	3133ENP79	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	4.25	4.25	9/26/22	9/26/24	177,083	153	-	177,237
Federal Agencies	3130ATT31	Federal Home Loan Banks	50,000,000	4.50	4.65	11/1/22	10/3/24	187,500	5,564	-	193,064
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	10,000,000	0.88	0.91	11/18/21	11/18/24	7,292	294	-	7,585
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	10,000,000	0.88	0.91	11/18/21	11/18/24	7,292	294	-	7,585
Federal Agencies	3133ENEJ5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.88	0.91	11/18/21	11/18/24	36,458	1,469	-	37,927
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ94	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	4.50	4.56	11/18/22	11/18/24	93,750	1,015	-	94,765
Federal Agencies	3133ELCP7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	1.63	1.66	12/3/19	12/3/24	33,854	613	-	34,467
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.92	0.95	12/9/21	12/9/24	38,333	945	-	39,279
Federal Agencies	3133ENGQ7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.92	0.93	12/9/21	12/9/24	38,333	383	-	38,717
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	10,000,000	4.25	4.34	12/20/22	12/20/24	35,417	655	-	36,072
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	4.25	4.35	12/20/22	12/20/24	88,542	1,743	-	90,284
Federal Agencies	3133EN4N7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	4.25	4.35	12/20/22	12/20/24	88,542	1,743	-	90,284
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	1.13	1.20	1/11/22	1/6/25	18,750	1,155	-	19,905
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	1.13	1.20	1/11/22	1/6/25	23,438	1,444	-	24,881
Federal Agencies	3133ENKS8	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	1.13	1.20	1/11/22	1/6/25	23,438	1,444	-	24,881
Federal Agencies	3135G0X24	Federal National Mortgage Association	39,060,000	1.63	0.53	4/21/21	1/7/25	52,894	(32,448)	-	20,446
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	10,000,000	4.88	4.88	11/10/22	1/10/25	40,625	21	-	40,646
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	4.88	4.88	11/10/22	1/10/25	81,250	42	-	81,292
Federal Agencies	3133ENZ37	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	4.88	4.88	11/10/22	1/10/25	81,250	15	-	81,265
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	10,000,000	4.25	4.53	2/10/23	2/10/25	24,792	1,372	-	26,164
Federal Agencies	3133EPAG0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	29,875,000	4.25	4.53	2/10/23	2/10/25	74,065	4,131	-	78,196
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	5,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	6,250	59	-	6,309
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	5,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	6,250	59	-	6,309
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	5,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	6,250	59	-	6,309
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	15,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	18,750	177	-	18,927
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	50,000,000	1.50	1.52	2/14/20	2/12/25	62,500	591	-	63,091
Federal Agencies	3137EAEP0	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	53,532,000	1.50	0.55	4/21/21	2/12/25	66,915	(38,554)	-	28,361
Federal Agencies	3130AUVZ4	Federal Home Loan Banks	50,000,000	4.50	4.58	2/13/23	2/13/25	112,500	1,718	-	114,218
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	16,000,000	1.21	1.22	3/23/20	3/3/25	16,133	144	-	16,277
Federal Agencies	3133ELQY3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	24,000,000	1.21	1.24	3/23/20	3/3/25	24,200	554	-	24,754
Federal Agencies	3133EMWT5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	0.60	0.61	4/21/21	4/21/25	25,000	508	-	25,508
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Association	37,938,000	0.63	1.08	12/8/21	4/22/25	19,759	12,970	-	32,729
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Association	50,000,000	0.63	1.08	12/8/21	4/22/25	26,042	17,197	-	43,239
Federal Agencies	3135G03U5	Federal National Mortgage Association	50,000,000	0.63	0.57	7/12/21	4/22/25	26,042	(2,191)	-	23,850
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	6,000,000	2.85	2.90	5/23/22	5/23/25	14,250	215	-	14,465
Federal Agencies	3133ENXE5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	2.85	2.90	5/23/22	5/23/25	47,500	715	-	48,215
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	Federal Home Loan Banks	11,940,000	3.38	3.19	8/4/22	6/13/25	33,581	(1,614)	-	31,967
Federal Agencies	3130ASG86	Federal Home Loan Banks	12,700,000	3.38	3.07	8/3/22	6/13/25	35,719	(2,841)	-	32,877
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	15,000,000	4.25	4.28	12/13/22	6/13/25	53,125	356	-	53,481

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity		Earned Interest	Amort.	Realized	Earned Income
							Date	Expense		Gain/(Loss)	/Net Earnings	
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	15,000,000	4.25	4.28	12/13/22	6/13/25	53,125	313	-	53,438	
Federal Agencies	3133EN4B3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	15,000,000	4.25	4.28	12/13/22	6/13/25	53,125	336	-	53,461	
Federal Agencies	3133ENYQ7	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	2.95	2.97	6/13/22	6/13/25	122,917	626	-	123,543	
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	Federal National Mortgage Association	4,655,000	0.50	1.11	12/8/21	6/17/25	1,940	2,140	-	4,080	
Federal Agencies	3135G04Z3	Federal National Mortgage Association	10,000,000	0.50	1.11	12/8/21	6/17/25	4,167	4,577	-	8,744	
Federal Agencies	3130AN4A5	Federal Home Loan Banks	17,680,000	0.70	0.62	7/12/21	6/30/25	10,313	(1,056)	-	9,258	
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	Federal National Mortgage Association	25,000,000	0.38	0.66	3/4/21	8/25/25	7,813	5,407	-	13,220	
Federal Agencies	3135G05X7	Federal National Mortgage Association	72,500,000	0.38	0.57	2/25/21	8/25/25	22,656	10,879	-	33,536	
Federal Agencies	3130A8ZQ9	Federal Home Loan Banks	10,295,000	1.75	1.03	11/2/21	9/12/25	15,014	(5,567)	-	9,447	
Federal Agencies	3137EAEX3	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	22,600,000	0.38	0.67	3/4/21	9/23/25	7,063	5,126	-	12,189	
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	39,675,000	1.05	1.08	11/17/21	11/17/25	34,716	1,011	-	35,727	
Federal Agencies	3133ENEG1	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	55,000,000	1.05	1.09	11/17/21	11/17/25	48,125	1,476	-	49,601	
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	45,000,000	1.17	1.20	12/16/21	12/16/25	43,875	880	-	44,755	
Federal Agencies	3133ENHM5	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	1.17	1.20	12/16/21	12/16/25	48,750	977	-	49,727	
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	15,000,000	4.00	4.11	12/29/22	12/29/25	50,000	1,157	-	51,157	
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	4.00	4.11	12/29/22	12/29/25	66,667	1,543	-	68,210	
Federal Agencies	3133EN5E6	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	4.00	4.11	12/29/22	12/29/25	83,333	1,948	-	85,281	
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	4.00	4.03	1/13/23	1/13/26	66,667	450	-	67,116	
Federal Agencies	3133EN6A3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	30,000,000	4.00	4.03	1/13/23	1/13/26	100,000	582	-	100,582	
Federal Agencies	3130AUTC8	Federal Home Loan Banks	21,100,000	4.01	4.21	2/9/23	2/6/26	51,707	2,096	-	53,803	
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	4.38	4.44	2/23/23	2/23/26	24,306	255	-	24,560	
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	28,000,000	4.38	4.43	2/23/23	2/23/26	27,222	251	-	27,474	
Federal Agencies	3133EPBJ3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	50,000,000	4.38	4.43	2/23/23	2/23/26	48,611	449	-	49,060	
Federal Agencies	3133ENJ35	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	35,000,000	3.32	3.36	8/25/22	2/25/26	96,833	926	-	97,760	
Federal Agencies	3133EMZ21	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	15,500,000	0.69	0.75	8/9/21	4/6/26	8,913	689	-	9,601	
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	20,000,000	2.64	2.69	4/8/22	4/8/26	44,000	744	-	44,744	
Federal Agencies	3133ENUD0	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	30,000,000	2.64	2.69	4/8/22	4/8/26	66,000	1,115	-	67,115	
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	8/19/21	7/13/26	21,875	-	-	21,875	
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	8/19/21	7/13/26	21,875	-	-	21,875	
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	8/19/21	7/13/26	21,875	-	-	21,875	
Federal Agencies	3130ANNM8	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	8/19/21	7/13/26	21,875	-	-	21,875	
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.07	1.07	8/20/21	7/27/26	22,292	-	-	22,292	
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.07	1.07	8/20/21	7/27/26	22,292	-	-	22,292	
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.07	1.07	8/20/21	7/27/26	22,292	-	-	22,292	
Federal Agencies	3130ANMP2	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.07	1.07	8/20/21	7/27/26	22,292	-	-	22,292	
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	9/13/21	8/10/26	21,875	-	-	21,875	
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	9/13/21	8/10/26	21,875	-	-	21,875	
Federal Agencies	3130ANTG5	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.05	1.05	9/13/21	8/10/26	21,875	-	-	21,875	
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.08	1.07	10/1/21	9/3/26	22,396	-	-	22,396	
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.08	1.07	10/1/21	9/3/26	22,396	-	-	22,396	
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.08	1.07	10/1/21	9/3/26	22,396	-	-	22,396	
Federal Agencies	3130AP6T7	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.08	1.07	10/1/21	9/3/26	22,396	-	-	22,396	
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	11/18/21	10/19/26	29,792	-	-	29,792	
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	11/18/21	10/19/26	29,792	-	-	29,792	
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	11/18/21	10/19/26	29,792	-	-	29,792	
Federal Agencies	3130APPR0	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.43	1.43	11/18/21	10/19/26	29,792	-	-	29,792	
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	12/16/21	11/16/26	33,438	-	-	33,438	
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	12/16/21	11/16/26	33,438	-	-	33,438	
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	12/16/21	11/16/26	33,438	-	-	33,438	
Federal Agencies	3130AQ7L1	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.61	1.61	12/16/21	11/16/26	33,438	-	-	33,438	
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.65	1.65	1/14/22	12/14/26	34,271	-	-	34,271	
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.65	1.65	1/14/22	12/14/26	34,271	-	-	34,271	
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.65	1.65	1/14/22	12/14/26	34,271	-	-	34,271	

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity		Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
							Date	Earned Interest			
Federal Agencies	3130AQJ95	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	1.65	1.65	1/14/22	12/14/26	34,271	-	-	34,271
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	2.35	2.35	3/22/22	3/8/27	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	2.35	2.35	3/22/22	3/8/27	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	2.35	2.35	3/22/22	3/8/27	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3130ARB59	Federal Home Loan Banks	25,000,000	2.35	2.35	3/22/22	3/8/27	48,958	-	-	48,958
Federal Agencies	3133ENRD4	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	48,573,000	1.68	2.18	3/16/22	3/10/27	68,002	17,554	-	85,556
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	22,500,000	2.60	2.70	4/6/22	4/5/27	48,750	1,652	-	50,402
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	24,500,000	2.60	2.71	4/6/22	4/5/27	53,083	1,887	-	54,970
Federal Agencies	3133ENTS9	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	2.60	2.77	4/6/22	4/5/27	54,167	3,007	-	57,174
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	4,650,000	4.13	4.14	11/17/22	5/17/27	15,984	55	-	16,039
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	5,000,000	4.13	4.14	11/17/22	5/17/27	17,188	59	-	17,246
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	21,000,000	4.13	4.14	11/17/22	5/17/27	72,188	222	-	72,409
Federal Agencies	3133EN2L3	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	25,000,000	4.13	4.14	11/17/22	5/17/27	85,938	294	-	86,232
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Banks	10,000,000	3.50	3.19	7/19/22	6/11/27	29,167	(2,216)	-	26,951
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Banks	12,375,000	3.50	3.18	7/19/22	6/11/27	36,094	(2,785)	-	33,309
Federal Agencies	3130ASGU7	Federal Home Loan Banks	21,725,000	3.50	3.20	7/20/22	6/11/27	63,365	(4,568)	-	58,796
Federal Agencies	3133ENZK9	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	27,865,000	3.24	3.06	7/7/22	6/28/27	75,236	(3,607)	-	71,629
Federal Agencies	3133EPBM6	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor	10,000,000	4.13	4.19	2/23/23	8/23/27	9,167	95	-	9,262
Subtotals			\$ 5,860,179,000					\$ 8,288,499	\$ 326,283	\$ -	\$ 8,614,782
Public Time Deposits	PPFQECA11	Bridge Bank	\$ 10,000,000	3.57	3.57	9/19/22	3/20/23	\$ 27,386	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,386
Public Time Deposits	PPFTL68P0	Bank of San Francisco	10,000,000	4.69	4.69	12/5/22	6/5/23	36,478	-	-	36,478
Public Time Deposits	PPG03UL74	Bridge Bank	10,000,000	4.72	4.72	12/19/22	6/19/23	36,208	-	-	36,208
Public Time Deposits	PPFTLUBP3	Bank of San Francisco	10,000,000	4.85	4.85	1/11/23	7/10/23	37,722	-	-	37,722
Subtotals			\$ 40,000,000					\$ 137,795	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 137,795
Negotiable CDs	06367CSM0	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	\$ -	1.35	1.35	2/28/22	2/13/23	\$ 22,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,500
Negotiable CDs	89114WRW7	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	-	1.35	1.35	2/28/22	2/13/23	22,500	-	-	22,500
Negotiable CDs	89114WUU7	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	-	2.16	2.16	4/12/22	2/27/23	78,000	-	-	78,000
Negotiable CDs	89114WUU7	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	-	2.16	2.16	4/12/22	2/27/23	78,000	-	-	78,000
Negotiable CDs	06367CV46	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	2.60	2.60	5/17/22	3/27/23	101,111	-	-	101,111
Negotiable CDs	78012U524	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	2.58	2.58	5/24/22	3/27/23	100,333	-	-	100,333
Negotiable CDs	65602Y3E8	Norinchukin Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.20	5.20	11/9/22	5/8/23	202,222	-	-	202,222
Negotiable CDs	78012U6W0	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	3.71	3.71	6/21/22	6/15/23	144,278	-	-	144,278
Negotiable CDs	78012U7H2	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	3.68	3.68	6/28/22	6/15/23	143,111	-	-	143,111
Negotiable CDs	89115B3A6	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	3.60	3.60	7/5/22	6/15/23	140,000	-	-	140,000
Negotiable CDs	89115B3A6	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	3.60	3.60	7/5/22	6/15/23	140,000	-	-	140,000
Negotiable CDs	06367CX51	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	3.92	3.92	7/21/22	6/30/23	152,444	-	-	152,444
Negotiable CDs	89115BAW0	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	3.90	3.90	7/19/22	6/30/23	151,667	-	-	151,667
Negotiable CDs	06367CWT0	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	3.75	3.75	7/12/22	7/3/23	145,833	-	-	145,833
Negotiable CDs	06367CXA0	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	3.84	3.84	7/27/22	7/3/23	149,333	-	-	149,333
Negotiable CDs	06367D2M6	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	5.30	5.30	12/5/22	7/3/23	206,111	-	-	206,111
Negotiable CDs	06417MB87	Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch	50,000,000	3.73	3.73	8/1/22	7/3/23	145,056	-	-	145,056
Negotiable CDs	78015J3N5	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	3.73	3.73	7/12/22	7/3/23	145,056	-	-	145,056
Negotiable CDs	78015JAJ6	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	4.02	4.02	8/8/22	7/3/23	156,333	-	-	156,333
Negotiable CDs	65602Y7E4	Norinchukin Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.05	5.05	2/8/23	8/16/23	147,292	-	-	147,292
Negotiable CDs	06367CXR3	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	4.23	4.23	9/1/22	8/28/23	164,500	-	-	164,500
Negotiable CDs	78015JFJ1	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	4.75	4.75	9/20/22	9/20/23	184,722	-	-	184,722
Negotiable CDs	06367CY27	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	4.80	4.80	10/3/22	9/22/23	186,667	-	-	186,667
Negotiable CDs	78015JHJ9	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	4.81	4.81	9/30/22	9/22/23	187,056	-	-	187,056
Negotiable CDs	06367CXX0	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	4.82	4.82	9/28/22	9/25/23	187,444	-	-	187,444
Negotiable CDs	78015JH67	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	4.76	4.76	9/28/22	9/25/23	185,111	-	-	185,111
Negotiable CDs	06367CYA9	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	4.97	4.97	10/6/22	10/6/23	193,278	-	-	193,278
Negotiable CDs	78015JMJ3	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	5.46	5.46	11/16/22	10/23/23	212,333	-	-	212,333

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity	Earned Interest	Amort.	Realized	Earned Income
							Date		Expense	Gain/(Loss)	/Net Earnings
Negotiable CDs	89115BC73	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.57	5.57	11/2/22	10/23/23	216,611	-	-	216,611
Negotiable CDs	13606KRZ1	Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (New York)	50,000,000	5.32	5.32	1/10/23	11/6/23	206,889	-	-	206,889
Negotiable CDs	89115BJX9	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.51	5.51	12/2/22	11/20/23	214,278	-	-	214,278
Negotiable CDs	06417MN84	Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch	50,000,000	5.50	5.50	12/5/22	11/21/23	213,889	-	-	213,889
Negotiable CDs	78015JPE1	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	5.37	5.37	12/19/22	12/18/23	208,833	-	-	208,833
Negotiable CDs	78015JRE9	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	5.43	5.43	1/5/23	12/29/23	211,167	-	-	211,167
Negotiable CDs	78015JRE9	Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch	50,000,000	5.43	5.43	1/5/23	12/29/23	211,167	-	-	211,167
Negotiable CDs	89115BPB0	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.43	5.43	1/5/23	1/3/24	211,167	-	-	211,167
Negotiable CDs	89115BPF1	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.43	5.43	1/5/23	1/5/24	211,167	-	-	211,167
Negotiable CDs	06367D3V5	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	20,000,000	5.24	5.24	1/13/23	1/12/24	81,511	-	-	81,511
Negotiable CDs	06367D3V5	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	50,000,000	5.24	5.24	1/13/23	1/12/24	203,778	-	-	203,778
Negotiable CDs	89115BQB9	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.24	5.24	1/17/23	1/17/24	203,778	-	-	203,778
Negotiable CDs	89115BST8	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.21	5.21	1/30/23	1/29/24	202,611	-	-	202,611
Negotiable CDs	89115BST8	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	5.21	5.21	1/30/23	1/29/24	202,611	-	-	202,611
Negotiable CDs	06417MT47	Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch	50,000,000	5.43	5.43	2/10/23	2/9/24	143,292	-	-	143,292
Subtotals			\$ 1,920,000,000					\$ 7,015,039	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,015,039
Commercial Paper	62479MQD8	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	\$ 50,000,000	0.00	4.79	12/5/22	3/13/23	\$ -	\$ 182,778	\$ -	\$ 182,778
Commercial Paper	89233HQD9	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	50,000,000	0.00	4.63	11/15/22	3/13/23	-	176,556	-	176,556
Commercial Paper	62479MTG8	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	0.00	5.15	12/19/22	6/16/23	-	195,222	-	195,222
Commercial Paper	62479MTW3	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	0.00	5.16	12/21/22	6/30/23	-	195,611	-	195,611
Commercial Paper	62479MTW3	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	0.00	5.16	12/21/22	6/30/23	-	195,611	-	195,611
Commercial Paper	89233HTW4	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	50,000,000	0.00	5.31	11/8/22	6/30/23	-	200,278	-	200,278
Commercial Paper	89233HTW4	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	50,000,000	0.00	5.28	11/2/22	6/30/23	-	199,111	-	199,111
Commercial Paper	89233HTW4	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	50,000,000	0.00	4.66	10/3/22	6/30/23	-	176,167	-	176,167
Commercial Paper	62479MU35	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	0.00	5.23	12/5/22	7/3/23	-	197,944	-	197,944
Commercial Paper	62479MV26	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	0.00	5.10	2/7/23	8/2/23	-	151,861	-	151,861
Commercial Paper	62479MV75	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	0.00	5.10	2/7/23	8/7/23	-	151,861	-	151,861
Commercial Paper	89233HVB7	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	50,000,000	0.00	5.13	2/13/23	8/11/23	-	111,111	-	111,111
Commercial Paper	62479MVE0	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	0.00	5.05	1/30/23	8/14/23	-	191,333	-	191,333
Commercial Paper	62479MVU4	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	50,000,000	0.00	5.12	1/17/23	8/28/23	-	193,667	-	193,667
Commercial Paper	89233HVV1	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	50,000,000	0.00	5.15	2/10/23	8/30/23	-	132,208	-	132,208
Subtotals			\$ 750,000,000					\$ -	\$ 2,651,319	\$ -	\$ 2,651,319
Money Market Funds	09248U718	BlackRock Liquidity Funds - T-Fund	\$ 15,191,339	4.43	4.41	2/28/23	3/1/23	\$ 50,489	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,489
Money Market Funds	262006208	Dreyfus Government Cash Management Fi	300,618,386	4.47	4.48	2/28/23	3/1/23	1,356,534	-	-	1,356,534
Money Market Funds	31607A703	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Governme	707,492,754	4.50	4.49	2/28/23	3/1/23	1,249,109	-	-	1,249,109
Money Market Funds	608919718	Money Market Obligations Trust - Federate	12,848,872	4.44	4.45	2/28/23	3/1/23	43,398	-	-	43,398
Money Market Funds	61747C319	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Funds	10,631,130	4.46	4.43	2/28/23	3/1/23	35,681	-	-	35,681
Money Market Funds	85749T517	State Street Institutional U.S. Government	14,464,166	4.39	4.40	2/28/23	3/1/23	747,081	-	-	747,081
Subtotals			\$ 1,061,246,647					\$ 3,482,292	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,482,292

Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity		Earned Interest	Amort.	Realized	Earned Income
							Date	Expense		Gain/(Loss)	/Net Earnings	
Supranationals	459058JV6	International Bank for Reconstruction and [\$ 100,000,000	0.13	0.23	4/20/21	4/20/23	\$ 10,500	\$ 7,940	\$ -	\$ 18,440	
Supranationals	4581X0CC0	Inter-American Development Bank	25,756,000	3.00	0.66	12/15/21	10/4/23	64,390	(46,032)	-	18,358	
Supranationals	45906M3B5	International Bank for Reconstruction and [100,000,000	1.98	1.98	3/23/22	6/14/24	165,000	-	-	165,000	
Supranationals	4581X0EE4	Inter-American Development Bank	30,000,000	3.25	3.26	7/1/22	7/1/24	81,250	115	-	81,365	
Supranationals	4581X0EE4	Inter-American Development Bank	50,000,000	3.25	3.26	7/1/22	7/1/24	135,417	192	-	135,608	
Supranationals	459056HV2	International Bank for Reconstruction and [50,000,000	1.50	0.79	11/2/21	8/28/24	62,500	(26,756)	-	35,744	
Supranationals	4581X0DZ8	Inter-American Development Bank	50,000,000	0.50	0.78	11/4/21	9/23/24	20,833	10,746	-	31,579	
Supranationals	45950VQG4	International Finance Corporation	10,000,000	0.44	0.72	10/22/21	9/23/24	3,667	2,133	-	5,800	
Supranationals	4581X0CM8	Inter-American Development Bank	100,000,000	2.13	0.58	4/26/21	1/15/25	177,083	(116,859)	-	60,225	
Supranationals	459058JB0	International Bank for Reconstruction and [40,000,000	0.63	0.57	7/23/21	4/22/25	20,867	(1,759)	-	19,108	
Supranationals	4581X0DN5	Inter-American Development Bank	28,900,000	0.63	0.99	11/1/21	7/15/25	15,052	7,889	-	22,941	
Supranationals	45950VRU2	International Finance Corporation	50,000,000	4.02	4.02	1/26/23	1/26/26	167,625	-	-	167,625	
Supranationals	45950VRU2	International Finance Corporation	50,000,000	4.02	4.02	1/26/23	1/26/26	167,625	-	-	167,625	
Supranationals	45818WDG8	Inter-American Development Bank	19,500,000	0.82	0.75	8/25/21	2/27/26	13,325	(967)	-	12,358	
Subtotals			\$ 704,156,000					\$ 1,105,134	\$ (163,360)	\$ -	\$ 941,774	
Grand Totals			\$14,310,581,647					\$ 22,765,231	\$ 2,685,075	\$ -	\$ 25,450,306	

¹ Yield to maturity is calculated at purchase

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

For month ended February 28, 2023

Transaction	Settle	Maturity	Type of Investment	Issuer Name	CUSIP	Par Value	Coupon	YTM	Price	Interest	Transaction Amount
Purchase	2/1/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	BlackRock Liquidity Funds - T-Fund	09248U718	\$ 52,047	4.43	4.06	\$ 1.00	\$ -	\$ (52,047)
Purchase	2/2/23	2/3/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	313384BK4	25,000,000	0.00	4.42	99.99	-	(24,996,958)
Purchase	2/2/23	2/3/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	313384BK4	25,000,000	0.00	4.42	99.99	-	(24,996,958)
Purchase	2/2/23	2/3/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	313384BK4	25,000,000	0.00	4.42	99.99	-	(24,996,958)
Purchase	2/2/23	2/3/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	313384BK4	25,000,000	0.00	4.42	99.99	-	(24,996,958)
Purchase	2/3/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	135,000,000	4.50	4.43	1.00	-	(135,000,000)
Purchase	2/6/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	30,000,000	4.50	4.46	1.00	-	(30,000,000)
Purchase	2/7/23	8/7/23	Commercial Paper	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	62479MV75	50,000,000	0.00	4.87	97.50	-	(48,750,597)
Purchase	2/7/23	8/2/23	Commercial Paper	MUFG Bank - New York Branch	62479MV26	50,000,000	0.00	4.86	97.57	-	(48,785,111)
Purchase	2/8/23	8/16/23	Negotiable CDs	Norinchukin Bank - New York Branc	65602Y7E4	50,000,000	5.05	5.19	100.00	-	(50,000,000)
Purchase	2/9/23	2/6/26	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	3130AUTC8	21,100,000	4.01	4.14	99.46	(4,701)	(20,990,128)
Purchase	2/10/23	2/10/25	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPAG0	10,000,000	4.25	4.50	99.47	-	(9,947,200)
Purchase	2/10/23	2/10/25	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPAG0	29,875,000	4.25	4.50	99.47	-	(29,716,065)
Purchase	2/10/23	8/30/23	Commercial Paper	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	89233HVV1	50,000,000	0.00	4.94	97.20	-	(48,601,375)
Purchase	2/10/23	2/9/24	Negotiable CDs	Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Bran	06417MT47	50,000,000	5.43	5.44	100.00	-	(50,000,000)
Purchase	2/13/23	2/13/25	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	3130AUVZ4	50,000,000	4.50	4.58	99.84	-	(49,921,500)
Purchase	2/13/23	8/11/23	Commercial Paper	Toyota Motor Credit Corporation	89233HVB7	50,000,000	0.00	4.91	97.51	-	(48,756,944)
Purchase	2/14/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	60,000,000	4.50	4.48	1.00	-	(60,000,000)
Purchase	2/16/23	2/16/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	3130AUYG3	25,000,000	5.10	5.11	99.99	-	(24,996,500)
Purchase	2/17/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	25,000,000	4.50	4.49	1.00	-	(25,000,000)
Purchase	2/21/23	8/21/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPBF1	25,000,000	4.88	4.91	99.96	-	(24,990,000)
Purchase	2/21/23	8/21/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPBF1	20,000,000	4.88	4.91	99.96	-	(19,992,000)
Purchase	2/21/23	8/21/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPBF1	10,000,000	4.88	4.91	99.96	-	(9,995,700)
Purchase	2/23/23	2/23/26	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPBJ3	28,000,000	4.38	4.44	99.84	-	(27,954,080)
Purchase	2/23/23	2/23/26	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPBJ3	25,000,000	4.38	4.44	99.81	-	(24,953,500)
Purchase	2/23/23	8/23/27	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPBM6	10,000,000	4.13	4.19	99.74	-	(9,974,000)
Purchase	2/23/23	2/23/26	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EPBJ3	50,000,000	4.38	4.50	99.84	-	(49,918,000)
Purchase	2/24/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	50,000,000	4.50	4.50	1.00	-	(50,000,000)
Purchase	2/27/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	92,000,000	4.50	4.50	1.00	-	(92,000,000)
Purchase	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidit	61747C319	35,681	4.46	4.43	1.00	-	(35,681)
Purchase	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Dreyfus Government Cash Manager	262006208	1,356,534	4.47	4.48	1.00	-	(1,356,534)
Purchase	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	165,000,000	4.50	4.49	1.00	-	(165,000,000)
Purchase	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	1,249,109	4.50	4.49	1.00	-	(1,249,109)
Purchase	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Money Market Obligations Trust - F	608919718	43,398	4.44	4.45	1.00	-	(43,398)
Purchase	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	747,081	4.39	4.40	1.00	-	(747,081)
Subtotals						\$ 1,264,458,850	3.49	4.63	\$ 55.66	\$ (4,701)	\$ (1,258,714,384)
Sale	2/1/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Dreyfus Government Cash Manager	262006208	\$ (68,000,000)	4.47	4.23	\$ 1.00	\$ -	\$ 68,000,000
Sale	2/2/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Dreyfus Government Cash Manager	262006208	(160,000,000)	4.47	4.23	1.00	-	160,000,000
Sale	2/7/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(80,000,000)	4.39	4.35	1.00	-	80,000,000
Sale	2/8/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(65,000,000)	4.39	4.35	1.00	-	65,000,000
Sale	2/9/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(25,000,000)	4.39	4.34	1.00	-	25,000,000
Sale	2/10/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(65,000,000)	4.39	4.35	1.00	-	65,000,000
Sale	2/13/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Dreyfus Government Cash Manager	262006208	(50,000,000)	4.47	4.46	1.00	-	50,000,000
Sale	2/13/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(100,000,000)	4.39	4.34	1.00	-	100,000,000
Sale	2/15/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(35,000,000)	4.39	4.37	1.00	-	35,000,000
Sale	2/16/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(20,000,000)	4.39	4.37	1.00	-	20,000,000
Sale	2/17/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Dreyfus Government Cash Manager	262006208	(70,000,000)	4.47	4.46	1.00	-	70,000,000
Sale	2/21/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(55,000,000)	4.39	4.37	1.00	-	55,000,000
Sale	2/23/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Dreyfus Government Cash Manager	262006208	(40,000,000)	4.47	4.47	1.00	-	40,000,000
Sale	2/23/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	(50,000,000)	4.39	4.39	1.00	-	50,000,000
Subtotals						\$ (883,000,000)	4.43	4.34	\$ 1.00	\$ -	\$ 883,000,000

Investment Transactions

Pooled Fund

Transaction	Settle	Maturity	Type of Investment	Issuer Name	CUSIP	Par Value	Coupon	YTM	Price	Interest	Transaction Amount
Maturity	2/1/23	2/1/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	313384BH1	\$ (10,400,000)	0.00	4.31	\$ 100.00	\$ -	\$ 10,400,000
Maturity	2/3/23	2/3/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	313384BK4	(100,000,000)	0.00	4.42	100.00	-	100,000,000
Maturity	2/3/23	2/3/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EMPH9	(45,500,000)	0.13	4.69	100.00	-	45,500,000
Maturity	2/6/23	2/6/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	3133827H0	(44,400,000)	2.14	2.97	100.00	-	44,400,000
Maturity	2/10/23	2/10/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133ENDQ0	(50,000,000)	0.16	4.69	100.00	-	50,000,000
Maturity	2/13/23	2/13/23	Negotiable CDs	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	06367CSM0	(50,000,000)	1.35	10.86	100.00	-	50,000,000
Maturity	2/13/23	2/13/23	Negotiable CDs	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York	89114WRW7	(50,000,000)	1.35	10.86	100.00	-	50,000,000
Maturity	2/15/23	2/15/23	U.S. Treasuries	United States Department of The Tr	912828Z86	(100,000,000)	1.38	1.37	100.00	-	100,000,000
Maturity	2/27/23	2/27/23	Negotiable CDs	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York	89114WUU7	(100,000,000)	2.16	4.51	100.00	-	100,000,000
Subtotals						\$ (550,300,000)	1.09	4.98	\$ 100.00	\$ -	\$ 550,300,000
Interest	2/1/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	BlackRock Liquidity Funds - T-Fund	09248U718	---	4.43	4.06	---	\$ -	52,047
Interest	2/3/23	2/3/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EMPH9	---	0.13	4.69	---	-	28,438
Interest	2/6/23	2/6/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	3133827H0	---	2.14	2.97	---	-	475,080
Interest	2/10/23	8/10/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EM2E1	---	0.16	4.92	---	-	40,000
Interest	2/10/23	2/10/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133ENDQ0	---	0.16	4.69	---	-	40,000
Interest	2/13/23	2/12/25	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	3137EAEPO	---	1.50	4.59	---	-	1,001,490
Interest	2/13/23	2/13/23	Negotiable CDs	Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch	06367CSM0	---	1.35	10.86	---	-	656,250
Interest	2/13/23	2/13/23	Negotiable CDs	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York	89114WRW7	---	1.35	10.86	---	-	656,250
Interest	2/13/23	2/13/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	3130AFW94	---	2.50	5.02	---	-	487,625
Interest	2/14/23	2/14/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133ELNE0	---	1.43	5.12	---	-	146,539
Interest	2/15/23	2/15/24	U.S. Treasuries	United States Department of The Tr	912828B66	---	2.75	5.05	---	-	687,500
Interest	2/15/23	8/15/24	U.S. Treasuries	United States Department of The Tr	91282CCT6	---	0.38	4.91	---	-	93,750
Interest	2/15/23	2/15/23	U.S. Treasuries	United States Department of The Tr	912828Z86	---	1.38	1.37	---	-	687,500
Interest	2/24/23	8/24/23	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp	3137EAEV7	---	0.25	5.02	---	-	50,970
Interest	2/27/23	8/25/25	Federal Agencies	Federal National Mortgage Associat	3135G05X7	---	0.38	4.68	---	-	182,813
Interest	2/27/23	2/25/26	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133ENJ35	---	3.32	4.51	---	-	581,000
Interest	2/27/23	8/26/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133ENJ84	---	3.38	5.11	---	-	843,750
Interest	2/27/23	2/26/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding	3133EMRZ7	---	0.25	5.18	---	-	137,500
Interest	2/27/23	2/27/26	Supranationals	Inter-American Development Bank	45818WDG8	---	0.82	4.82	---	-	79,950
Interest	2/27/23	2/27/23	Negotiable CDs	Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York	89114WUU7	---	2.16	4.51	---	-	1,926,000
Interest	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity	61747C319	---	4.46	4.43	---	-	35,681
Interest	2/28/23	2/28/24	Federal Agencies	Federal Home Loan Banks	3130ARHG9	---	2.13	5.20	---	-	382,500
Interest	2/28/23	8/31/26	U.S. Treasuries	United States Department of The Tr	91282CCW9	---	0.75	4.41	---	-	187,500
Interest	2/28/23	2/28/25	U.S. Treasuries	United States Department of The Tr	912828ZC7	---	1.13	4.82	---	-	562,500
Interest	2/28/23	8/28/24	Supranationals	International Bank for Reconstructio	459056HV2	---	1.50	5.13	---	-	375,000
Interest	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Dreyfus Government Cash Manager	262006208	---	4.47	4.48	---	-	1,356,534
Interest	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go	31607A703	---	4.50	4.49	---	-	1,249,109
Interest	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	Money Market Obligations Trust - Fc	608919718	---	4.44	4.45	---	-	43,398
Interest	2/28/23	3/1/23	Money Market Funds	State Street Institutional U.S. Govern	85749T517	---	4.39	4.40	---	-	747,081
Subtotals						\$ -	2.57	5.05	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,793,755
Grand Totals		35	Purchases								
		(14)	Sales								
		(9)	Maturities / Calls								
		12	Change in number of positions								

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Committee of the Whole - Update on Findings and Recommendations Regarding Law Enforcement Practices
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 2:56:00 PM
Attachments: [CRI BOS FINAL Presentation.pdf](#)
[In Progress CRI Matrix.pdf](#)
[CRI Recommendations Tracking Matrix.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached copy of the SFPD presentation for the Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, March 14, 2023.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Malouf, Rima (POL) <rima.malouf@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2023 1:41 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Oliva-Aroche, Diana (POL) <diana.oliva-aroche@sfgov.org>; Gamero, Lili (POL) <lili.gamero@sfgov.org>
Subject: Committee of the Whole - Update on Findings and Recommendations Regarding Law Enforcement Practices

Madam Clerk,

For next week's Hearing - *Committee of the Whole - Update on Findings and Recommendations Regarding Law Enforcement Practices* attached is a copy of the SFPD final presentation, a list of the completed and in-progress police reform recommendations.

Thank you,

Rima Malouf
Legislative Liaison
Policy & Public Affairs | San Francisco Police Department
Desk: 415-575-7007

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure

is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE UPDATE



SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

March 14, 2023




COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE STATUS BY CATEGORY

CA Department of Justice CRI Phase 1-3 Results

Category	Recommendations	Substantially Completed	In Progress
Use of Force	58	51	7
Bias	54	47	7
Community Policing	60	54	6
Accountability	68	61	7
Recruitment, Hiring & Personnel Practices	32	32	0
Total	272	245	27

SFPD CRI RECOMMENDATIONS PHASE 1 - 3 OCTOBER 2019 – OCTOBER 31, 2021




SFPD CRI Recommendations Phase 1 - 3
October 2019 - October 31, 2021



CRI REFORM SUSTAINABILITY



CRI REFORM SUSTAINABILITY BY OBJECTIVE




Of the 245 recommendations in substantial compliance, 170 require “targeted” Review.

USE OF FORCE

- Use of Force Data Collection
 - Electronic Use of Force Form
 - Quarterly Activity & Data Report (QADR)
- Updated Use of Force policy (DGO 5.01)
- Field Tactics and Force Options continued review of Use of Force incidents
- Quarterly Use of Force audits by the Early Interventions System
- Entered contract for new records management system
- Required Crisis Intervention training for all newly promoted members.
 - Required distribution of Crisis Intervention Trained Officers across all shifts



USE OF FORCE



Data presented represents total use of force count under the 2016 and 2022 Policies.



BIAS FREE POLICING

- Quarterly audits by the Internal Affairs Division (IAD) of electronic devices, presented to the Police Commission
- Bi-annual Bias training audits to ensure continuous training updates
- Station Captains required to review quarterly reports of traffic stops and arrest data in their districts to review for trends and/or disparities.
- Budget negotiations with vendors for continued development of management tools
- Professional development opportunities to understand historical and deep-rooted trauma tied to the policing profession.
- Policy Development: Department General Order 9.07-*Curtailing Pre-text stops*



COMMUNITY POLICING

- Maintaining foot beat presence in community corridors.
- Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC) to align resources and support the Homeless Outreach Teams.
- Annual strategic plans on Community Policing Plans by all Department Captains.
- Development of Department General Order 3.09 – *Department Awards*, which adds awards to recognize community policing and the guardian mindset.
- Youth incorporated into the working group towards development of Department General Order 7.01 – *Policies and Procedures for Juveniles Detention, Arrest, and Custody*.
- Early drafts of the *Community Policing and Problem-Solving Manual & the Chief's Advisory Forum Manual* were shared with the Department of Police Accountability.
- Community collaboration recent examples include Mission & 21st/Capp and Tenderloin partnerships.



COMMUNITY POLICING



San Francisco
Police Department

Get Service

Stay Safe

News

Community

Your SFPD

Contact Us

Related Links

Community Policing Strategic Plan

View our Community Policing Strategic Plan (PDF)

[COMMUNITY POLICING STRATEGIC PLAN](#)

Community Policing Annual Summary Report

View our Community Policing Annual Summary Report (PDF)

[COMMUNITY POLICING ANNUAL REPORT](#)

DOJ Recommendations

View Community Related DOJ Recommendation updates.

[CRI 3: COMMUNITY POLICING](#)



Community Policing Annual Plans

****Updated for 2023****

Annual Plans By Station

2023

- [Bayview Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [Central Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [Ingleside Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [Mission Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [Northern Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [Park Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [Richmond Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [Southern Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [TaraVal Station \(PDF\)](#)
- [Tenderloin Station \(PDF\)](#)

ACCOUNTABILITY

- Bi-Annual training required between Internal Affairs Division (IAD) and the Department of Police Accountability
- Analyst position added to the Internal Affairs Division to assist with data collection and analysis.
- Contract enhancements for continued development of management tools
- Principled Policing Training required for all members
- All IAD members are trained quarterly in the Standard Operating Procedures
- Quarterly Audit of IAD and ISD case tracking sheets



RECRUITMENT, HIRING, AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES

- **Applicant Standards Improvements:** SFPD is improving the applicant process and creating alignment with other agencies to complete with police recruits by updating height & weight requirements and physical standards.
- **Community Engagement and Outreach:** SFPD's Recruitment Team attended and hosted 239 events in 2022. Many of these events were local San Francisco and national career fairs, job fairs, military bases, government, public safety, and law enforcement-specific recruiting events. School outreach and presentations were also conducted at high schools, colleges, universities, and law enforcement testing centers.
- **SFPD's recruitment team hosted "1-Day Testing Events:"** to conduct all 3 initial tests such as the Physical Ability Test (PAT), Oral Interview, and Written Test. These events reduce up to 3 months off the hiring process for those who pass the 3 tests (reduction from 6 months to 3 months)
- **Department of Human Resources Partnership:** SFPD has engaged with DHR in Quarterly Hiring Meetings. The meetings are utilized to discuss issues that arise, problem solve, and collaborate regarding strategies to address potential disparities
- **Media and Marketing:** SFPD has implemented a robust and expansive advertisement campaign that includes advertising recruitment in social media, digital platforms, local newspapers, and magazines, local radio & television, and billboards and transportation ads at Muni buses, BART, and Bay Area Bus Routes. SFPD also launched a new SFPD Recruitment Website – January 2023 (Joinsfpd.com).
- **Women Centered Recruitment:** In October 2022, SFPD is formally participating in the 30 x 30 national campaign to increase women in policing hosted by the National Association of Women in Law Enforcement Executives and the New York University Policing Project. The initiatives' overall goal is to recruit 30% of women recruits by 2030.
- **Recruitment Evaluation:** SFPD and the Controller's Office are working closely to develop a recruitment performance metrics to measure and evaluate the success of current recruitment strategies.



REMAINING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PHASE 3 PLUS



PROJECT PLANS

Tracking and Analyzing Arrests & Uses of Force

Project Plan # 1

20.1

20.2

20.3

20.4

Project Plan # 2

21.1

22.1

Community Policing Annual Plans & Advisory Forums

Project Plan #3

26.1

40.6

48.1

48.2

Data-Informed Personnel Development

Project Plan #4

28.1

28.4

28.5

30.3

30.4

35.3

68.1

79.1

79.2

79.3

Management Tools & discipline Metrics/Reporting

Project Plan #5

69.2

69.3



INDEPENDENT RECOMMENDATIONS

USE OF FORCE

1.1

1.1 – Currently underway. Qualitative Research Plan submitted and under PSPPU review

COMMUNITY POLICING

39.1

40.2

41.1

39.1 – Community Policing Strategic Plan
40.2 – Strategic Plan
41.1 – Community Policing Manual

ACCOUNTABILITY

55.2

55.2 - Internal Affairs reporting aggregate data regarding complaints against department members



IMPLEMENTATION NEEDS

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PEOPLE</u>	<u>TECHNOLOGY/SERVICES</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Records Management System (collecting UOF and arrests data) <p><i>Project Plans: 1 & 2</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation personnel Maintenance personnel <p><i>Project Plans: 1, 2, 4 & 5</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hardware; Infrastructure; Software as a Service (SaaS); implementation services <p><i>Project Plans: 1, 4, & 5</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of UOF and arrests data <p><i>Project Plans: 1 & 2</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysts – reporting; data interpretation <p><i>Project Plans: 1, 2, 4, & 5</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training for analytical personnel handling new, larger data sets <p><i>Project Plans: 4 & 5</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data-informed personnel management (dashboard) <p><i>Project Plan: 4</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysts – partnering with technology vendor to develop metrics <p><i>Project Plans: 1, 2, 4, & 5</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology customization services <p><i>Project Plans: 1, 4, & 5</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discipline data and general data reporting <p><i>Project Plan: 5</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysts – reporting; data interpretation <p><i>Project Plan 1, 2, 4, & 5</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training for analytical personnel handling new, larger data sets <p><i>Project Plans: 1, 4, & 5</i></p>

Personnel and technology are tied to Department budget needs.



**THANK YOU.
ANY QUESTIONS?**





**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Leadership/ Management Culture	1	The majority of deadly use of force incidents by SFPD involved persons of color.	1.1	SFPD must commit to reviewing and understanding the reasons for the disparate use of deadly force. Specifically, SFPD needs to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner with a research institution to evaluate the circumstances that give rise to deadly force, particularly those involving persons of color. • Develop and enhance relationships in those communities most impacted by deadly officer involved shootings and monitor trends in calls for service and community complaints to ensure appropriate police interaction occurs as a matter of routine police engagement. • Provide ongoing training for officers throughout the Department on how to assess and engage in encounters involving conflict with a potential for use of force with a goal of minimizing the level of force needed to successfully and safely resolve such incidents. 	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. James Tacchini
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	20	The SFPD does not capture sufficient data on arrest and use of force incidents to support strong scientific analysis. Because of limitations in the manner in which use of force and arrest data were collected by the SFPD, assessment team members were unable to perform a multivariate frequency analysis, which would have shed light on whether individuals who are members of racial minorities were subjected to force more often than White individuals during arrests.	20.1	The SFPD needs to develop reliable electronic in-custody arrest data. It needs to ensure that these arrest data accurately reflect the incident number from the event, and the number should be cross-referenced on both the booking card and the use of force reporting form.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Gordon Brussow, Manager
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	20	The SFPD does not capture sufficient data on arrest and use of force incidents to support strong scientific analysis. Because of limitations in the manner in which use of force and arrest data were collected by the SFPD, assessment team members were unable to perform a multivariate frequency analysis, which would have shed light on whether individuals who are members of racial minorities were subjected to force more often than White individuals during arrests.	20.2	The SFPD needs to audit arrest data and use of force data monthly to ensure proper recording of use of force incidents related to arrest incidents. An audit of these data should occur immediately upon publication of this report and monthly thereafter.	Immediate	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood & William Sanson-Mosier
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	20	The SFPD does not capture sufficient data on arrest and use of force incidents to support strong scientific analysis. Because of limitations in the manner in which use of force and arrest data were collected by the SFPD, assessment team members were unable to perform a multivariate frequency analysis, which would have shed light on whether individuals who are members of racial minorities were subjected to force more often than White individuals during arrests.	20.3	The SFPD needs to advocate for better coordination with the San Francisco Sheriff's Department to ensure that the recording of SFPD arrest data is accurate and corresponds with SFPD incident report and arrest data.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Gordon Brussow, Manager
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	20	The SFPD does not capture sufficient data on arrest and use of force incidents to support strong scientific analysis. Because of limitations in the manner in which use of force and arrest data were collected by the SFPD, assessment team members were unable to perform a multivariate frequency analysis, which would have shed light on whether individuals who are members of racial minorities were subjected to force more often than White individuals during arrests.	20.4	The SFPD should identify a research partner to further refine its use of force data collection and to explore the data findings of this report to identify appropriate data for measurement and to determine causal factors.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	21	Community members' race or ethnicity was not significantly associated with the severity of force used or injury arising from an officer's use of force.	21.1	The SFPD should continue to collect and analyze use of force data to identify patterns and trends over time consistent with recommendations in finding 20.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	22	When only minority officers were involved in a use of force incident, the severity of force used and the injuries sustained by community members increased.	22.1	The SFPD needs to improve data collection on use of force so that further analysis can be conducted to better understand this finding.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
2 - Bias	Community Policing	26	There is limited community input on the SFPD's actions regarding its anti-bias policies and practices.	26.1	The Chief's Advisory Forum should be re-invigorated and allow for diverse communities to have meaningful input into bias training, policies, and the SFPD's other anti-bias programming. The chief should ensure that marginalized communities are given a meaningful opportunity to be a part of the Advisory Forum.	Medium	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Phil Lohaus
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.1	The SFPD should investigate complaints of bias transparently and openly and recognize its potential impact upon the larger group of officers who do not hold such views and upon the affected communities of San Francisco. To address these concerns, the department should <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · identify specific roles and responsibilities for supervision of officers regarding biased behavior; · analyze E-585 traffic stop incident report data and enforcement actions with a lens for possible bias or disparate treatment and require supervisors to review these analyses; · identify intervention mechanisms beyond discipline to deal with potentially biased behaviors. 	Medium	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Rachael Kilshaw
2 - Bias	Leadership/ Management Culture	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.4	The SFPD needs to engage in early identification of and intervention in behaviors that are indicative of bias through direct supervision, data review, and observation of officer activity.	Immediate	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya
2 - Bias	Training	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.5	The SFPD needs to train supervisors to recognize behaviors that are indicative of bias and intervene effectively.	Immediate	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	30	The weight of the evidence indicates that African-American drivers were disproportionately stopped compared to their representation in the driving population. Citywide, African-American drivers were 24 percent more likely to be stopped by the police than their estimated representation in the driving population, and they were 9 percent more likely to be stopped given their estimated representation among potential traffic violators.	30.3	The SFPD should provide supervisors with the results of timely data analyses regarding the E-585 traffic stop incident report activity of their officers that allow them to identify and proactively intervene when outlier officers are identified.	Low	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	30	The weight of the evidence indicates that African-American drivers were disproportionately stopped compared to their representation in the driving population. Citywide, African-American drivers were 24 percent more likely to be stopped by the police than their estimated representation in the driving population, and they were 9 percent more likely to be stopped given their estimated representation among potential traffic violators.	30.4	Until the data are electronic, supervisors should be provided with monthly paper reports regarding the E-585 traffic stop incident report activity of officers under their command.	High	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	35	The SFPD does not have sufficient systems, tools, or resources needed to integrate and develop the appropriate data required to support a modern, professional police department. Many of the department's technology and information sharing systems are outdated and not integrated and do not support ready access for analysis to inform management decisions. Progressive police supervision requires timely access to accurate information regarding officer activity, traffic and pedestrian stops, use of force, and resident complaints to help analyze officers' actions and trends. The SFPD must conduct an assessment across the whole organization and determine how to prioritize the implementation of IT solutions for key management and operational practices.	35.3	SFPD leadership should make a concerted effort to focus on data collection and to create systems and analysis protocols that will inform supervisors where incidents of potential bias or disparate treatment occur or where patterns in officer behavior exist that warrant further examination or monitoring.	Medium	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.1	The SFPD needs to develop a comprehensive organizational strategic plan with supporting plans for the key reform areas identified within this report specifically directed at community policing, bias, and maintaining diversity within the department.	Medium	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Jason Cunningham, Program Manager
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.2	As part of recommendation 39.3, the SFPD should direct the Strategic Planning Steering Committee to develop a strategic plan within six months of the issuance of this report that clearly defines the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The department's vision, mission, and values statements. Once these statements are in place, the committee should establish agency-wide objectives and individual goals as the guiding principles that codify the SFPD's collective beliefs. · The department's strategic framework for the planning process. This framework will ensure that the process results in a plan that supports the coordination of priorities and objectives across individuals, work groups, and key operating divisions. · The department's strategy to engage the community, obtain community input, and develop support for the plan and its success. · The department's strategy to drive the plan down to the officer level by creating objectives that allow for individual goals that contribute to the overall plan. · The department's measurement processes for individual performance and participation towards accomplishing departmental goals. 	High	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Jason Cunningham, Program Manager



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.6	The SFPD should develop and implement a community policing practices review and development process within 90 days of the issuance of this report so SFPD units can collaborate regarding community policing efforts.	Immediate	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Cmdr. Denise Flaherty
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	41	The SFPD's community policing order Department General Order 1.08 – Community Policing (effective 9/28/11) and its Community Policing and Problem Solving manual are out of date and no longer relevant. These overarching directives do not sufficiently reflect the vision, plan, or goals of the SFPD with regard to community policing. They need to be updated and maintained as living documents that guide the community policing activities of the organization.	41.1	The SFPD should work with the newly convened Strategic Planning Steering Committee (recommendation 40.2) to draft a new community policing and problem solving manual for SFPD members within 12 months of the issuance of this report	Low	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Raymond Cruz
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	48	The SFPD needs to develop a robust, broad-based community forum for input on policing priorities across all communities.	48.1	The chief's community forum groups—African American, Arab American, Asian Pacific Islander, Business, Hispanic, Interfaith, LGBT, Young Adults, Youth, and Youth Providers—need to be re-established and structured to engage in problem solving and action regarding issues affecting the groups they represent.	Medium	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Torrie Grady
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	48	The SFPD needs to develop a robust, broad-based community forum for input on policing priorities across all communities.	48.2	The department needs to develop an annual reporting and measurement process of the issues raised at the forum and the progress made by the group in resolving them.	Low	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Torrie Grady
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	55	The SFPD is not transparent around officer discipline practices. During the community listening sessions and interviews with community members, there was a consistently stated belief, especially in the African-American and Hispanic communities, that officers are not held accountable for misconduct.	55.2	Consistent with the current practice on Early Intervention System data, the SFPD should develop and report aggregate data regarding complaints against Department members, their outcome, and trends in complaints and misconduct for both internal and external publication.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Andrew Cox
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	68	The SFPD has poor data collection and analysis, which significantly impacts effective overall organization management and accountability. The technology in the SFPD requires significant updating. However, poor data collection practices, including lack of supervisory review and accountability for improperly completed reports and form sets, contributes to the poor data environment.	68.1	As part of its technological capacity improvement strategy, the SFPD should develop a plan to advance its capacity to digest information it currently possesses in a consistent, easily accessible format such as a template containing key data points including officer performance indicators and crime indicators that could provide management with real-time information to inform their practice.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	69	The SFPD does not consistently apply the principles of procedural justice.	69.2	The SFPD should task a committee to review internal discipline on a quarterly basis to assure the fairness and impartiality of the process overall and particularly to ensure that there is not bias in determination and application of discipline. This analysis should be multi-levelled to include aggregate data, trend analysis, and outcome impact on officer demographics including prior discipline and adherence to the discipline matrix.	Medium	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Angela Wilhelm
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	69	The SFPD does not consistently apply the principles of procedural justice.	69.3	The SFPD should report annually to the Police Commission the analysis of discipline including officer demographics and prior discipline histories.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Phil Lohaus



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	79	Evaluation of employee performance is not an institutionalized practice in the SFPD. SFPD personnel interviewed did not recall having or conducting a performance evaluation within the department.	79.1	The SFPD should adopt a policy and implement the practice of completing regular performance evaluations of all department employees tailored to goals and objectives, job functions, and desired behavior and performance indicators.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Robert Kobold
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	79	Evaluation of employee performance is not an institutionalized practice in the SFPD. SFPD personnel interviewed did not recall having or conducting a performance evaluation within the department.	79.2	SFPD leadership needs to create a system to ensure that all personnel are being evaluated at least twice a year.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Robert Kobold
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	79	Evaluation of employee performance is not an institutionalized practice in the SFPD. SFPD personnel interviewed did not recall having or conducting a performance evaluation within the department.	79.3	The SFPD should use performance evaluations as an evaluation factor in promotions.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Robert Kobold



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Leadership/ Management Culture	1	The majority of deadly use of force incidents by SFPD involved persons of color.	1.1	SFPD must commit to reviewing and understanding the reasons for the disparate use of deadly force. Specifically, SFPD needs to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner with a research institution to evaluate the circumstances that give rise to deadly force, particularly those involving persons of color. • Develop and enhance relationships in those communities most impacted by deadly officer involved shootings and monitor trends in calls for service and community complaints to ensure appropriate police interaction occurs as a matter of routine police engagement. • Provide ongoing training for officers throughout the Department on how to assess and engage in encounters involving conflict with a potential for use of force with a goal of minimizing the level of force needed to successfully and safely resolve such incidents. 	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. James Tacchini
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	2	The SFPD has closed only one deadly use of force incident investigation for the time frame 2013 to 2015. The SFPD has been involved in nine deadly use of force incidents during the time frame of review for this assessment, 2013–2015. All but one remains open, pending a decision by the district attorney on whether the officers' actions were lawful. It is unacceptable for officer-involved shooting investigations to remain open for years.	2.1	SFPD must work with the City and County of San Francisco to develop a process that provides for timely, transparent, and factual outcomes for officer-involved shooting incidents.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Graig Wells
1 - Use of Force	Leadership/ Management Culture	3	The SFPD and the Police Commission collaboratively worked with community stakeholders to update Department General Order 5.01 - Use of Force policy. Department General Order 5.01 was last revised in 1995. The draft revision, dated June 22, 2016, reflects policy enhancements that progressive police departments across the country have implemented, including incorporating recommendations from the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. However, because of collective bargaining practices the policy has not yet been implemented by the Police Commission as of the date of this report.	3.1	The Police Commission, SFPD leadership, and elected officials should work quickly and proactively to ensure that the Department is ready to issue these use of force policies and procedures to all Department employees immediately following the collective bargaining meet and confer process. The process should not be drawn out, because the goal should be immediate implementation once the process has been completed.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	01/30/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	DC Michael Connolly & Rania Adwan
1 - Use of Force	Leadership/ Management Culture	3	The SFPD and the Police Commission collaboratively worked with community stakeholders to update Department General Order 5.01 - Use of Force policy. Department General Order 5.01 was last revised in 1995. The draft revision, dated June 22, 2016, reflects policy enhancements that progressive police departments across the country have implemented, including incorporating recommendations from the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. However, because of collective bargaining practices the policy has not yet been implemented by the Police Commission as of the date of this report.	3.2	The SFPD should work with the Police Commission to obtain input from the stakeholder group and conduct an after-action review of the meet and confer process to identify ways to improve input and expedite the process in the future for other policy development.	Low	Substantial Compliance	05/28/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Rachael Kilshaw
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	4	The Use of Force Log captures insufficient information about use of force incidents. The SFPD does not have a separate use of force report for personnel to complete after a use of force incident. Rather, the specific articulable facts leading to the force incident are documented in the narrative of a regular incident report form and a paper use of force log, making it difficult to collect accurate and complete data or analyze aggregate use of force data. In addition, it requires staff to manually log the information into the Early Intervention System.	4.1	The SFPD needs to create an electronic use of force reporting system so that data can be captured in real time.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/07/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Darwin Naval



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	4	The Use of Force Log captures insufficient information about use of force incidents. The SFPD does not have a separate use of force report for personnel to complete after a use of force incident. Rather, the specific articulable facts leading to the force incident are documented in the narrative of a regular incident report form and a paper use of force log, making it difficult to collect accurate and complete data or analyze aggregate use of force data. In addition, it requires staff to manually log the information into the Early Intervention System.	4.2	In developing an electronic report system, SFPD must review current practice regarding reporting use of force, including reporting on level of resistance by the individual, level and escalation of control tactics used by the officer, and sequencing of the individual's resistance and control by the officer.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Darwin Naval
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	4	The Use of Force Log captures insufficient information about use of force incidents. The SFPD does not have a separate use of force report for personnel to complete after a use of force incident. Rather, the specific articulable facts leading to the force incident are documented in the narrative of a regular incident report form and a paper use of force log, making it difficult to collect accurate and complete data or analyze aggregate use of force data. In addition, it requires staff to manually log the information into the Early Intervention System.	4.3	In the interim, SFPD should implement the use of force report that is under development within the Early Intervention System Unit and require it be completed for every use of force incident. The assessment team identified this report to be a good start to a robust reporting system for use of force incidents in SFPD. The SFPD should eliminate the use of force log (SFPD 128) rev. 0316)).	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Darwin Naval
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	4	The Use of Force Log captures insufficient information about use of force incidents. The SFPD does not have a separate use of force report for personnel to complete after a use of force incident. Rather, the specific articulable facts leading to the force incident are documented in the narrative of a regular incident report form and a paper use of force log, making it difficult to collect accurate and complete data or analyze aggregate use of force data. In addition, it requires staff to manually log the information into the Early Intervention System.	4.4	To facilitate the implementation of Recommendation 4.3, a training bulletin describing the form, its purpose, and how to accurately complete it should accompany the form introduction. The bulletin should be implemented within 90 days of the issuance of this report.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	08/12/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	4	The Use of Force Log captures insufficient information about use of force incidents. The SFPD does not have a separate use of force report for personnel to complete after a use of force incident. Rather, the specific articulable facts leading to the force incident are documented in the narrative of a regular incident report form and a paper use of force log, making it difficult to collect accurate and complete data or analyze aggregate use of force data. In addition, it requires staff to manually log the information into the Early Intervention System.	4.5	The SFPD should continue the manual entry of use of force data until the electronic use of force report is operational. To ensure consistency and accuracy in the data, this entry should be conducted in a single unit rather than multiple units.	High	Substantial Compliance	01/30/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Cmdr. Peter Walsh
1 - Use of Force	Leadership/ Management Culture	4	The Use of Force Log captures insufficient information about use of force incidents. The SFPD does not have a separate use of force report for personnel to complete after a use of force incident. Rather, the specific articulable facts leading to the force incident are documented in the narrative of a regular incident report form and a paper use of force log, making it difficult to collect accurate and complete data or analyze aggregate use of force data. In addition, it requires staff to manually log the information into the Early Intervention System.	4.6	The SFPD should audit use of force data on a quarterly basis and hold supervisors accountable for ongoing deficiencies.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/15/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Training	4	The Use of Force Log captures insufficient information about use of force incidents. The SFPD does not have a separate use of force report for personnel to complete after a use of force incident. Rather, the specific articulable facts leading to the force incident are documented in the narrative of a regular incident report form and a paper use of force log, making it difficult to collect accurate and complete data or analyze aggregate use of force data. In addition, it requires staff to manually log the information into the Early Intervention System.	4.7	The SFPD should assign the Training and Education Division to synthesize the issues emerging from the use of force reports and create announcements for roll call on emerging trends. The announcements can include scenarios from incidents that were troubling or complicated in some way and encourage officers to discuss with one another in advance about how they would communicate and approach such situations.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/07/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. John Crudo
1 - Use of Force	Training	5	The SFPD does not consistently document the types of force used by officers. Out of a sample of more than 500 reported incidents of use of force, only five had documented the type of use of force on the Use of Force Log. Department Bulletin 14-111 – Documenting Use of Force, drafted April 4, 2014, requires officers to document the type and amount of force used, including the use of impact weapons, with supervisors responsible for ensuring compliance with the policy. However, through 2015, the team found that force data remained incomplete. The overall lack of consistent data collection is indicative of limited oversight of force reporting.	5.1	The SFPD needs to develop and train to a consistent reporting policy for use of force.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/23/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
1 - Use of Force	Leadership/ Management Culture	5	The SFPD does not consistently document the types of force used by officers. Out of a sample of more than 500 reported incidents of use of force, only five had documented the type of use of force on the Use of Force Log. Department Bulletin 14-111 – Documenting Use of Force, drafted April 4, 2014, requires officers to document the type and amount of force used, including the use of impact weapons, with supervisors responsible for ensuring compliance with the policy. However, through 2015, the team found that force data remained incomplete. The overall lack of consistent data collection is indicative of limited oversight of force reporting.	5.2	The SFPD needs to hold supervisors and officers accountable for failure to properly document use of force incidents.	High	Substantial Compliance	05/28/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Darwin Naval
1 - Use of Force	Training	6	The SFPD has not developed comprehensive formal training specifically related to use of force practices. A number of training issues on emerging operational practices in the SFPD and those highlighted in the <i>Final Report of the President's Task Force of 21st Century Policing</i> , such as de-escalation, have not been adequately addressed.	6.1	The Training and Education Division should adopt and implement a formal Learning Needs Assessment model that identifies and prioritizes training needs, and should subsequently design and present them in the most effective and efficient ways possible.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/26/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. John Crudo
1 - Use of Force	Training	6	The SFPD has not developed comprehensive formal training specifically related to use of force practices. A number of training issues on emerging operational practices in the SFPD and those highlighted in the <i>Final Report of the President's Task Force of 21st Century Policing</i> , such as de-escalation, have not been adequately addressed.	6.2	To support policies mandated through recent Department Bulletins, as well as to ensure implementation of best practices and policies outlined in the Final Report of the President's Task Force of 21st Century Policing, The SFPD's Training and Education Division should prepare training on the following topics at minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced de-escalation Sanctity of life Enhanced service-oriented interactions with homeless individuals Improved dispatch protocols for cases requiring Crisis Intervention Team response 	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/02/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Mario Molina



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	6	The SFPD has not developed comprehensive formal training specifically related to use of force practices. A number of training issues on emerging operational practices in the SFPD and those highlighted in the <i>Final Report of the President's Task Force of 21st Century Policing</i> , such as de-escalation, have not been adequately addressed.	6.3	SFPD training records should be fully automated and training data easily accessible.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/21/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Capt. Jack Hart
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	7	SFPD officers have not been trained on operational field use of the mandated 36" baton. Department Bulletin 16-071, which was published on April 30, 2016, requires all officers to carry a 36-inch baton as part of their daily uniform requirements. The assessment team was concerned that the Training Academy staff did not have advance knowledge of the baton policy change. During the team's visit, Training Academy staff members were drafting training guidelines for use of the 36-inch baton after the policy had already been issued. There must be good communication before and following the publication of orders that affect daily activities or provide for a change in organizational focus. This would allow for smoother implementation and ensure that appropriate training is available, particularly for key orders.	7.1	The SFPD must develop a policy on the use of the 36-inch baton for the use of interacting with individuals with edged weapons. The policy should also dictate the proper handling of the baton, and the policy should dictate when it's appropriate to use a two-hand stance and when a one-hand approach is needed.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/08/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Cmdr. Peter Walsh
1 - Use of Force	Training	7	SFPD officers have not been trained on operational field use of the mandated 36" baton. Department Bulletin 16-071, which was published on April 30, 2016, requires all officers to carry a 36-inch baton as part of their daily uniform requirements. The assessment team was concerned that the Training Academy staff did not have advance knowledge of the baton policy change. During the team's visit, Training Academy staff members were drafting training guidelines for use of the 36-inch baton after the policy had already been issued. There must be good communication before and following the publication of orders that affect daily activities or provide for a change in organizational focus. This would allow for smoother implementation and ensure that appropriate training is available, particularly for key orders.	7.2	The SFPD must develop training on the use of the 36-inch baton for the use of interacting with individuals with edged weapons. Once developed, the training should be deployed to all officers.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/08/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Cmdr. Peter Walsh
1 - Use of Force	Training	7	SFPD officers have not been trained on operational field use of the mandated 36" baton. Department Bulletin 16-071, which was published on April 30, 2016, requires all officers to carry a 36-inch baton as part of their daily uniform requirements. The assessment team was concerned that the Training Academy staff did not have advance knowledge of the baton policy change. During the team's visit, Training Academy staff members were drafting training guidelines for use of the 36-inch baton after the policy had already been issued. There must be good communication before and following the publication of orders that affect daily activities or provide for a change in organizational focus. This would allow for smoother implementation and ensure that appropriate training is available, particularly for key orders.	7.3	The SFPD should prohibit the use of the 36-inch baton until all officers are properly trained in the intended use.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	01/29/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Jennifer Dorantes



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	8	SFPD supervisors are not required to respond to the scene of all use of force incidents and are not required to fully document their actions. Supervisors are not appropriately tasked in relation to use of force incidents. Supervisors are required to respond to the scene for use of force incidents only when injuries are reported injuries and are not required to document their actions in the incident report. Furthermore, during the review period officers and supervisors continued to inconsistently complete use of force reporting forms.	8.1	The SFPD should immediately require supervisors to respond to events in which officers use force instruments or cause injury, regardless of whether there is a complaint of injury by the individual. This will allow the Department to gain greater oversight of its use of force.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	04/23/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
1 - Use of Force	Leadership/ Management Culture	8	SFPD supervisors are not required to respond to the scene of all use of force incidents and are not required to fully document their actions. Supervisors are not appropriately tasked in relation to use of force incidents. Supervisors are required to respond to the scene for use of force incidents only when injuries are reported injuries and are not required to document their actions in the incident report. Furthermore, during the review period officers and supervisors continued to inconsistently complete use of force reporting forms.	8.2	Supervisors should be held accountable for ensuring accurate and complete entry for all use of force data reporting.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	01/30/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	8	SFPD supervisors are not required to respond to the scene of all use of force incidents and are not required to fully document their actions. Supervisors are not appropriately tasked in relation to use of force incidents. Supervisors are required to respond to the scene for use of force incidents only when injuries are reported injuries and are not required to document their actions in the incident report. Furthermore, during the review period officers and supervisors continued to inconsistently complete use of force reporting forms.	8.3	Supervisors should be required to document their actions regarding the investigation of the use of force incident within the incident report. As recommended in this section (Recommendation 3.2), a stand-alone use of force report should be developed, and when completed, should contain a section for supervisory actions relative to the incident and signature.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/07/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Darwin Naval
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	9	The SFPD is inconsistent in providing timely notifications to all external oversight partners following an officer-involved shooting. Members of SFPD acknowledged that there are occasionally notification delays because of administrative issues and the time it takes to notify required parties of an incident. Regardless of the reason, delayed notification to key partners means that those partners are not present at the earliest stages of an officer-involved shooting investigation. Notifying external oversight partners, (including the District Attorney and Office of Citizen Complaint [OCC]), promptly allows for timely arrival on the scene and facilitates effective and transparent external oversight of officer-involved shooting investigations.	9.1	The SFPD should work with the Department of Emergency Management to provide it with primary responsibility for timely notification to all stakeholders on the call-out list used immediately after an officer-involved shooting incident.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/08/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Capt. Jack Hart



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	9	The SFPD is inconsistent in providing timely notifications to all external oversight partners following an officer-involved shooting. Members of SFPD acknowledged that there are occasionally notification delays because of administrative issues and the time it takes to notify required parties of an incident. Regardless of the reason, delayed notification to key partners means that those partners are not present at the earliest stages of an officer-involved shooting investigation. Notifying external oversight partners, (including the District Attorney and Office of Citizen Complaint [OCC]), promptly allows for timely arrival on the scene and facilitates effective and transparent external oversight of officer-involved shooting investigations.	9.2	Until the Department of Emergency Management protocol is established, when activating the protocols for notification following an officer-involved shooting incident, the Operations Center should notify representatives of IAD, the District Attorney's Office, and OCC, with no lag time occurring in any of the notifications. The Operations Center log for notifications should be included as part of the investigation report case file to accurately and fully depict notifications.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/15/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Capt. Jack Hart
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	9	The SFPD is inconsistent in providing timely notifications to all external oversight partners following an officer-involved shooting. Members of SFPD acknowledged that there are occasionally notification delays because of administrative issues and the time it takes to notify required parties of an incident. Regardless of the reason, delayed notification to key partners means that those partners are not present at the earliest stages of an officer-involved shooting investigation. Notifying external oversight partners, (including the District Attorney and Office of Citizen Complaint [OCC]), promptly allows for timely arrival on the scene and facilitates effective and transparent external oversight of officer-involved shooting investigations.	9.3	All notified responders should be required to notify the Department of Emergency management of the time of their arrival. This will create a comprehensive permanent record of the time of notifications and responses of the units to the scene.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	10/31/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Capt. Jack Hart
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	9	The SFPD is inconsistent in providing timely notifications to all external oversight partners following an officer-involved shooting. Members of SFPD acknowledged that there are occasionally notification delays because of administrative issues and the time it takes to notify required parties of an incident. Regardless of the reason, delayed notification to key partners means that those partners are not present at the earliest stages of an officer-involved shooting investigation. Notifying external oversight partners, (including the District Attorney and Office of Citizen Complaint [OCC]), promptly allows for timely arrival on the scene and facilitates effective and transparent external oversight of officer-involved shooting investigations.	9.4	The SFPD should explore the option for timely electronic notification to all oversight partners.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/08/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Capt. Jack Hart



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	10	<p>There is a lack of coordination and collaboration for responding to and investigating an officer-involved shooting.</p> <p>The SFPD's investigative protocols are comparable to those followed by other professional, major city police departments. However, IAD staff members, along with some of SFPD's partners, such as members of the District Attorney's Office and the OCC assigned to respond to such incidents, are not as integrated.</p> <p>Lack of collaboration and cooperation in investigating officer-involved shooting incidents can undermine procedural justice and transparency for the Department. The SFPD needs to develop protocols and memoranda of agreement to ensure the highest level of cooperation and oversight into the investigation of officer-involved shooting incidents. Joint training protocols ensuring all parties are appropriately trained and working to the highest professional standards should become a matter of routine practice. These protocol agreements and practices will become more important as OCC assumes its responsibility to independently investigate SFPD officer-involved shooting incidents. The team will monitor the implementation of the new law during the CRI-TA implementation phase.</p>	10.1	The SFPD should establish a formal protocol to ensure that a representative of the Homicide Detail provides OCC and District Attorney's Office investigators a timely briefing about the facts of the case and to make arrangements for a formal walk-through or gain investigative access to the incident scene as soon as possible. The highest-ranking officer on the scene should be responsible for ensuring compliance with this recommendation.	High	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Tony Damato
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	10	<p>There is a lack of coordination and collaboration for responding to and investigating an officer-involved shooting.</p> <p>The SFPD's investigative protocols are comparable to those followed by other professional, major city police departments. However, IAD staff members, along with some of SFPD's partners, such as members of the District Attorney's Office and the OCC assigned to respond to such incidents, are not as integrated.</p> <p>Lack of collaboration and cooperation in investigating officer-involved shooting incidents can undermine procedural justice and transparency for the Department. The SFPD needs to develop protocols and memoranda of agreement to ensure the highest level of cooperation and oversight into the investigation of officer-involved shooting incidents. Joint training protocols ensuring all parties are appropriately trained and working to the highest professional standards should become a matter of routine practice. These protocol agreements and practices will become more important as OCC assumes its responsibility to independently investigate SFPD officer-involved shooting incidents. The team will monitor the implementation of the new law during the CRI-TA implementation phase.</p>	10.2	The SFPD should work with its accountability partners the OCC and the District Attorney's Office in officer-involved shootings to develop a formal training program in which representatives of the District Attorney's Office, SFPD Homicide Detail, and the OCC engage in regular training regarding best practices for investigating such cases. This training should be developed and implemented within 120 days of the issuance of this report.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	07/09/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. William Braconi
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	11	<p>The Firearm Discharge Review Board is limited in scope and fails to identify policy, training, or other tactical considerations.</p> <p>The FDRB is a good practice but has devolved to essentially determining whether the shooting officer's actions were consistent in policy. However, several other layers of authority also conduct this determination. The FDRB is better served following its policy mandate to ensure that the Department is continually reviewing its training, policy, and procedures as they relate to officer-involved shooting incidents.</p>	11.1	SFPD should update the Department General Order 3.10— Firearm Discharge Review Board to require written evaluation of policy, training, and tactical considerations of discharge incidents, specifically identifying whether the incident was influenced by a failure of policy, training, or tactics and should include recommendations for addressing any issues identified.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/26/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Joe Minner



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Training	11	The Firearm Discharge Review Board is limited in scope and fails to identify policy, training, or other tactical considerations. The FDRB is a good practice but has devolved to essentially determining whether the shooting officer's actions were consistent in policy. However, several other layers of authority also conduct this determination. The FDRB is better served following its policy mandate to ensure that the Department is continually reviewing its training, policy, and procedures as they relate to officer-involved shooting incidents.	11.2	SFPD should update existing programs and develop training to address policy gaps and lessons learned. The Training and Education Division should work with the FDRB and Homicide Detail to create a presentation to inform Department personnel about key issues that contribute for officer discharge incidents and to help mitigate the need for firearm discharge incidents.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/02/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Capt. Michelle Jean
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	11	The Firearm Discharge Review Board is limited in scope and fails to identify policy, training, or other tactical considerations. The FDRB is a good practice but has devolved to essentially determining whether the shooting officer's actions were consistent in policy. However, several other layers of authority also conduct this determination. The FDRB is better served following its policy mandate to ensure that the Department is continually reviewing its training, policy, and procedures as they relate to officer-involved shooting incidents.	11.3	The SFPD should update the DGO to ensure that the FDRB is staffed with the training and education division representative as an advisory member to ensure an appropriate focus on development of responsive training protocols.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/26/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Joe Minner
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	11	The Firearm Discharge Review Board is limited in scope and fails to identify policy, training, or other tactical considerations. The FDRB is a good practice but has devolved to essentially determining whether the shooting officer's actions were consistent in policy. However, several other layers of authority also conduct this determination. The FDRB is better served following its policy mandate to ensure that the Department is continually reviewing its training, policy, and procedures as they relate to officer-involved shooting incidents.	11.4	Officer-involved shooting events need to be reviewed in a more timely fashion as it relates to policy, training, and procedures. The FDRB should review incidents at the conclusion of the IAD investigation rather than waiting for the District Attorney's letter of declination for charging of an officer-involved shooting incident, which can take up to two years.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	03/09/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Graig Wells
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	12	The SFPD has significantly expanded its Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training program; however, SFPD does not have a strong operations protocol for CIT response. Crisis Intervention Team training instructs officers how to effectively manage behavioral crisis situations in the field. Since February 2015, all recruits complete the 40-hour Crisis Intervention Team training before they leave the Academy. As of March 2016, 593 members- 27 percent of the department have received crisis intervention training (CIT). Although there is a policy that supervisors are to be requested at the scene of an incident wherein a member of the public in mental health crisis is armed, more must be in place to address such situations. The team learned that CIT-trained officers are not pre-identified to facilitate their assignment to calls related to persons in mental health crisis. However, given the data issues facing SFPD, the ability to clearly track and confirm policy adherence for identifying CIT-trained officers remains an issue.	12.1	SFPD should work with the Department of Emergency Management to ensure sound CIT protocols, namely the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that dispatchers are notified at the beginning of each shift which units have CIT trained officers assigned so they are appropriately dispatched to calls for persons with mental health disabilities. • Develop protocols to ensure that mental health crisis calls for service are answered by intake personnel at the Department of Emergency Management and the information is appropriately relayed to field personnel. 	Low	Substantial Compliance	09/04/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Mario Molina



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	12	The SFPD has significantly expanded its Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training program; however, SFPD does not have a strong operations protocol for CIT response. Crisis Intervention Team training instructs officers how to effectively manage behavioral crisis situations in the field. Since February 2015, all recruits complete the 40-hour Crisis Intervention Team training before they leave the Academy. As of March 2016, 593 members- 27 percent of the department have received crisis intervention training (CIT). Although there is a policy that supervisors are to be requested at the scene of an incident wherein a member of the public in mental health crisis is armed, more must be in place to address such situations. The team learned that CIT-trained officers are not pre-identified to facilitate their assignment to calls related to persons in mental health crisis. However, given the data issues facing SFPD, the ability to clearly track and confirm policy adherence for identifying CIT-trained officers remains an issue.	12.2	SFPD should ensure an appropriate distribution of CIT trained personnel across all shifts in all districts.	Low	Substantial Compliance	05/28/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Mario Molina
1 - Use of Force	Training	12	The SFPD has significantly expanded its Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training program; however, SFPD does not have a strong operations protocol for CIT response. Crisis Intervention Team training instructs officers how to effectively manage behavioral crisis situations in the field. Since February 2015, all recruits complete the 40-hour Crisis Intervention Team training before they leave the Academy. As of March 2016, 593 members- 27 percent of the department have received crisis intervention training (CIT). Although there is a policy that supervisors are to be requested at the scene of an incident wherein a member of the public in mental health crisis is armed, more must be in place to address such situations. The team learned that CIT-trained officers are not pre-identified to facilitate their assignment to calls related to persons in mental health crisis. However, given the data issues facing SFPD, the ability to clearly track and confirm policy adherence for identifying CIT-trained officers remains an issue.	12.3	Newly promoted supervisors should also receive CIT training as part of their training for their new assignments.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/13/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Mario Molina
1 - Use of Force	Community Policing	13	The SFPD engages with the community following an officer-involved shooting incident through a town hall meeting in the community where the event occurred. The town hall meetings following an officer-involved shooting in the relevant neighborhood is a promising practice.	13.1	The practice of hosting a town hall meeting in the community shortly after the incident should continue with a focus on only releasing known facts.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	07/22/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Michael Andraychak
1 - Use of Force	Community Policing	14	The SFPD does not have a strategy to engage with the broader community following a fatal officer involved shooting until its conclusion. The SFPD does not keep as active an engagement during the investigative process, and consideration should be given to publishing findings once an investigation is completed to ensure community closure.	14.1	The SFPD should develop an ongoing communication strategy for officer involved shootings.	High	Substantial Compliance	09/15/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Michael Andraychak



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Community Policing	14	The SFPD does not have a strategy to engage with the broader community following a fatal officer involved shooting until its conclusion. The SFPD does not keep as active an engagement during the investigative process, and consideration should be given to publishing findings once an investigation is completed to ensure community closure.	14.2	The SFPD should ensure that media outreach is immediate and that information conveyed is succinct and accurate.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/05/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Michael Andraychak
1 - Use of Force	Community Policing	14	The SFPD does not have a strategy to engage with the broader community following a fatal officer involved shooting until its conclusion. The SFPD does not keep as active an engagement during the investigative process, and consideration should be given to publishing findings once an investigation is completed to ensure community closure.	14.3	The SFPD should use social media as a tool to relay critical and relevant information during the progression of the investigation.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	10/22/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Michael Andraychak
1 - Use of Force	Community Policing	15	The SFPD does not adequately educate the public and the media on issues related to use of force and officer-involved shootings.	15.1	The SFPD needs to create outreach materials related to educating the public and the media on use of force and officer-involved shooting investigations and protocols. These materials should be disseminated widely through the various community engagement events and district station meetings.	Low	Substantial Compliance	09/09/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Michael Andraychak
1 - Use of Force	Community Policing	15	The SFPD does not adequately educate the public and the media on issues related to use of force and officer-involved shootings.	15.2	The SFPD should host town hall presentations to educate the public and the media on use of force and officer-involved shooting investigations and protocols.	Low	Substantial Compliance	09/09/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Michael Andraychak
1 - Use of Force	Community Policing	16	Currently, SFPD officers are not authorized to carry electronic control weapons (ECW, i.e., Tasers). These tools are less-lethal weapons that are meant to help control persons who are acting aggressively. Many police agencies use these tools and report that they have helped reduce injury to officers and community members and lead to fewer officer-involved shootings. Promising practices suggest that the use of ECWs can result in less use of force.	16.1	Working with all key stakeholders and community members, the SFPD and the Police Commission should make an informed decision based on expectations, sentiment, and information from top experts in the country.	Low	Substantial Compliance	09/19/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Lynn Reilly
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	16	Currently, SFPD officers are not authorized to carry electronic control weapons (ECW, i.e., Tasers). These tools are less-lethal weapons that are meant to help control persons who are acting aggressively. Many police agencies use these tools and report that they have helped reduce injury to officers and community members and lead to fewer officer-involved shootings. Promising practices suggest that the use of ECWs can result in less use of force.	16.2	The City and County of San Francisco should strongly consider deploying ECWs.	Low	Substantial Compliance	08/27/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Capt. Carl Fabbri
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	17	Currently, the SFPD authorizes personnel to use the carotid restraint technique. This technique poses a significant risk in the community and is not a routinely adopted force option in many law enforcement agencies. Contemporary policing discussions regarding use of force suggest that police agencies should carefully weigh any perceived benefit of the use of carotid restraint against potential harm. It is challenging to maintain the appropriate leverage and placement in close-encounter struggles, thereby increasing the risk on an unintended, harmful outcome. The department's pending draft order on use of force would eliminate the use of the carotid restraint.	17.1	The SFPD should immediately prohibit the carotid restraint technique as a use of force option.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	07/25/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Darwin Naval



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	18	The SFPD does not adequately investigate officer use of force. At present, the level of investigations in the SFPD is not sufficient as it relates to officer use of force. There is minimal documentation of witnesses, no separate or summarized interview of witnesses, no routine collection of photographic evidence, and minimal analysis of the event from an evidentiary standpoint. If a supervisor does not respond, then it falls to the officer who used force to complete the investigation, which is unacceptable.	18.1	The SFPD needs to develop a policy for investigation standards and response for all officer use of force.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	04/23/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Capt. John Jaimerena
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	18	The SFPD does not adequately investigate officer use of force. At present, the level of investigations in the SFPD is not sufficient as it relates to officer use of force. There is minimal documentation of witnesses, no separate or summarized interview of witnesses, no routine collection of photographic evidence, and minimal analysis of the event from an evidentiary standpoint. If a supervisor does not respond, then it falls to the officer who used force to complete the investigation, which is unacceptable.	18.2	The SFPD should create an on-scene checklist for use of force incidents.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	07/27/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Michael Nevin
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	18	The SFPD does not adequately investigate officer use of force. At present, the level of investigations in the SFPD is not sufficient as it relates to officer use of force. There is minimal documentation of witnesses, no separate or summarized interview of witnesses, no routine collection of photographic evidence, and minimal analysis of the event from an evidentiary standpoint. If a supervisor does not respond, then it falls to the officer who used force to complete the investigation, which is unacceptable.	18.3	The SFPD needs to develop a protocol for proper development and handling of officer statements.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	07/27/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Michael Nevin
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	19	The SFPD does not maintain complete and consistent officer-involved shooting files. The SFPD maintains two separate officer-involved shooting files, one with the Homicide Detail and one with IAD. The files are incomplete with no consistent report structure. The team encountered a lack of consistency as to the investigations as well. The fact that some investigative evidence is digital while other evidence is still in paper format may contribute to this inconsistency. Because Homicide Detail and IAD do not share protocols or standards for investigations of officer-involved shooting incidents, there is likelihood that evidence will not be properly identified or assessed, particularly with dual investigative approaches. Photos, crime scene logs, and video collection were referenced in many reports. However, these items were inventoried elsewhere without copies in the investigative files. Investigative files did not contain preliminary finding reports or draft reports—even files that were years old. Within Homicide Detail, many files contained an initial summary report but did not document basic records of who was called to attend the scene or who was on the scene.	19.1	The SFPD needs to develop a standard officer-involved shooting protocol within 90 days of the release of this report.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	10/20/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Graig Wells



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	19	The SFPD does not maintain complete and consistent officer-involved shooting files. The SFPD maintains two separate officer-involved shooting files, one with the Homicide Detail and one with IAD. The files are incomplete with no consistent report structure. The team encountered a lack of consistency as to the investigations as well. The fact that some investigative evidence is digital while other evidence is still in paper format may contribute to this inconsistency. Because Homicide Detail and IAD do not share protocols or standards for investigations of officer-involved shooting incidents, there is likelihood that evidence will not be properly identified or assessed, particularly with dual investigative approaches. Photos, crime scene logs, and video collection were referenced in many reports. However, these items were inventoried elsewhere without copies in the investigative files. Investigative files did not contain preliminary finding reports or draft reports—even files that were years old. Within Homicide Detail, many files contained an initial summary report but did not document basic records of who was called to attend the scene or who was on the scene.	19.2	The SFPD needs to create a template for all officer-involved shooting files. This template should detail report structure and handling of evidence. SFPD should refer to Officer-Involved Shootings: A Guide for Law Enforcement Leaders.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	10/20/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Graig Wells
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	19	The SFPD does not maintain complete and consistent officer-involved shooting files. The SFPD maintains two separate officer-involved shooting files, one with the Homicide Detail and one with IAD. The files are incomplete with no consistent report structure. The team encountered a lack of consistency as to the investigations as well. The fact that some investigative evidence is digital while other evidence is still in paper format may contribute to this inconsistency. Because Homicide Detail and IAD do not share protocols or standards for investigations of officer-involved shooting incidents, there is likelihood that evidence will not be properly identified or assessed, particularly with dual investigative approaches. Photos, crime scene logs, and video collection were referenced in many reports. However, these items were inventoried elsewhere without copies in the investigative files. Investigative files did not contain preliminary finding reports or draft reports—even files that were years old. Within Homicide Detail, many files contained an initial summary report but did not document basic records of who was called to attend the scene or who was on the scene.	19.3	The SFPD should ensure that all officer-involved shooting investigations are appropriately reviewed by all levels of supervision.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	07/10/20	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. James Tacchini
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	20	The SFPD does not capture sufficient data on arrest and use of force incidents to support strong scientific analysis. Because of limitations in the manner in which use of force and arrest data were collected by the SFPD, assessment team members were unable to perform a multivariate frequency analysis, which would have shed light on whether individuals who are members of racial minorities were subjected to force more often than White individuals during arrests.	20.1	The SFPD needs to develop reliable electronic in-custody arrest data. It needs to ensure that these arrest data accurately reflect the incident number from the event, and the number should be cross-referenced on both the booking card and the use of force reporting form.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Gordon Brussow, Manager



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	20	The SFPD does not capture sufficient data on arrest and use of force incidents to support strong scientific analysis. Because of limitations in the manner in which use of force and arrest data were collected by the SFPD, assessment team members were unable to perform a multivariate frequency analysis, which would have shed light on whether individuals who are members of racial minorities were subjected to force more often than White individuals during arrests.	20.2	The SFPD needs to audit arrest data and use of force data monthly to ensure proper recording of use of force incidents related to arrest incidents. An audit of these data should occur immediately upon publication of this report and monthly thereafter.	Immediate	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood & William Sanson-Mosier
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	20	The SFPD does not capture sufficient data on arrest and use of force incidents to support strong scientific analysis. Because of limitations in the manner in which use of force and arrest data were collected by the SFPD, assessment team members were unable to perform a multivariate frequency analysis, which would have shed light on whether individuals who are members of racial minorities were subjected to force more often than White individuals during arrests.	20.3	The SFPD needs to advocate for better coordination with the San Francisco Sheriff's Department to ensure that the recording of SFPD arrest data is accurate and corresponds with SFPD incident report and arrest data.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Gordon Brussow, Manager
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	20	The SFPD does not capture sufficient data on arrest and use of force incidents to support strong scientific analysis. Because of limitations in the manner in which use of force and arrest data were collected by the SFPD, assessment team members were unable to perform a multivariate frequency analysis, which would have shed light on whether individuals who are members of racial minorities were subjected to force more often than White individuals during arrests.	20.4	The SFPD should identify a research partner to further refine its use of force data collection and to explore the data findings of this report to identify appropriate data for measurement and to determine causal factors.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	21	Community members' race or ethnicity was not significantly associated with the severity of force used or injury arising from an officer's use of force.	21.1	The SFPD should continue to collect and analyze use of force data to identify patterns and trends over time consistent with recommendations in finding 20.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
1 - Use of Force	IT/Data Business Processes	22	When only minority officers were involved in a use of force incident, the severity of force used and the injuries sustained by community members increased.	22.1	The SFPD needs to improve data collection on use of force so that further analysis can be conducted to better understand this finding.	Low	In Progress		Chief of Staff	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Stacy Youngblood
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	23	The SFPD allows members to shoot at moving vehicles under certain circumstances pursuant to Department General Order 5.02 – Use of Firearms. SFPD policy provides for a variety of exceptions that allow officers to shoot at a moving vehicle, which effectively nullifies the general statement that officers are prohibited from discharging their firearm at the operator or occupant of a moving vehicle. The department's pending draft order on use of force allows shooting at vehicles when there is an immediate threat of death or injury by means other than the vehicle.	23.1	The SFPD should immediately implement this provision of the draft policy.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	07/09/19	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Lt. Arline Gilmore



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
1 - Use of Force	Doctrine/ Policy Development	23	The SFPD allows members to shoot at moving vehicles under certain circumstances pursuant to Department General Order 5.02 – Use of Firearms. SFPD policy provides for a variety of exceptions that allow officers to shoot at a moving vehicle, which effectively nullifies the general statement that officers are prohibited from discharging their firearm at the operator or occupant of a moving vehicle. The department’s pending draft order on use of force allows shooting at vehicles when there is an immediate threat of death or injury by means other than the vehicle.	23.2	The FDRB should be tasked with review of all prior officer-involved shooting and discharge incidents in which firearms are discharged at a moving vehicle to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · evaluate and identify commonalities with recommendations for policy and training as a result of the review; · oversee training and policy development aimed at eliminating the need for such actions; · report to the Police Commission about the outcomes of the review and the actions taken to overcome those situations that contribute to such incidents. 	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/07/21	Chief of Staff	Lt. Eric Altorfer	Sgt. Graig Wells
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	24	The SFPD did not conduct a comprehensive audit of official electronic communications, including department-issued e-mails, communications on mobile data terminals, and text messages on department-issued phones following the texting incidents. The advice in the memo (found in appendix K on page 390) sent on May 5, 2016, has not been completed by the SFPD. The recommended audit is to ensure organizational integrity regarding the potential for bias in departmental electronic communications.	24.1	The SFPD should immediately implement the bias audit as recommended by the U.S. Department of Justice COPS Office on May 5, 2016 (see appendix K).	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/04/19	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Peter Walsh
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	24	The SFPD did not conduct a comprehensive audit of official electronic communications, including department-issued e-mails, communications on mobile data terminals, and text messages on department-issued phones following the texting incidents. The advice in the memo (found in appendix K on page 390) sent on May 5, 2016, has not been completed by the SFPD. The recommended audit is to ensure organizational integrity regarding the potential for bias in departmental electronic communications.	24.2	Upon completion of recommendation 24.1, the outcome should be presented to the Police Commission.	High	Substantial Compliance	09/04/19	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Peter Walsh & Rania Adwan
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	24	The SFPD did not conduct a comprehensive audit of official electronic communications, including department-issued e-mails, communications on mobile data terminals, and text messages on department-issued phones following the texting incidents. The advice in the memo (found in appendix K on page 390) sent on May 5, 2016, has not been completed by the SFPD. The recommended audit is to ensure organizational integrity regarding the potential for bias in departmental electronic communications.	24.3	The SFPD should immediately establish a policy and practice for ongoing audit of electronic communication devices to determine whether they are being used to communicate bias.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/04/19	special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Peter Walsh
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	24	The SFPD did not conduct a comprehensive audit of official electronic communications, including department-issued e-mails, communications on mobile data terminals, and text messages on department-issued phones following the texting incidents. The advice in the memo (found in appendix K on page 390) sent on May 5, 2016, has not been completed by the SFPD. The recommended audit is to ensure organizational integrity regarding the potential for bias in departmental electronic communications.	24.4	The SFPD should implement a policy and a Department General Order stipulating that there is no right to privacy in any use of department-owned equipment or facilities.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	01/08/19	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Arline Gilmore, Christine Fountain & Sgt. Michael Andraychak



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	24	The SFPD did not conduct a comprehensive audit of official electronic communications, including department-issued e-mails, communications on mobile data terminals, and text messages on department-issued phones following the texting incidents. The advice in the memo (found in appendix K on page 390) sent on May 5, 2016, has not been completed by the SFPD. The recommended audit is to ensure organizational integrity regarding the potential for bias in departmental electronic communications.	24.5	The SFPD should require all members to acknowledge appropriate use standards for electronic communications. This should be a signed acknowledgement, retained in the personnel file of the member, and department personnel should receive an alert reminding them of appropriate use whenever they sign onto SFPD systems.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	08/18/20	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Sgt. Chandra Medina
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	24	The SFPD did not conduct a comprehensive audit of official electronic communications, including department-issued e-mails, communications on mobile data terminals, and text messages on department-issued phones following the texting incidents. The advice in the memo (found in appendix K on page 390) sent on May 5, 2016, has not been completed by the SFPD. The recommended audit is to ensure organizational integrity regarding the potential for bias in departmental electronic communications.	24.6	The SFPD should report twice a year to the Police Commission on the outcome of these audits, including the number completed, the number and types of devices audited, the findings of the audit, and the personnel outcomes where biased language or other conduct violations are discovered.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/09/20	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Rachael Kilshaw
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	25	The SFPD's General Orders prohibiting biased policing, discrimination, harassment, and retaliation are outdated and do not reflect current practices surrounding these key areas.	25.1	The SFPD should immediately update Department General Order 5.17 – Policy Prohibiting Biased Policing (effective May 4, 2011) and Department General Order 11.07 – Discrimination and Harassment (effective May 6, 2009) to reflect its current initiatives and align with best practices.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	08/31/20	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Teresa Ewins
2 - Bias	Training	25	The SFPD's General Orders prohibiting biased policing, discrimination, harassment, and retaliation are outdated and do not reflect current practices surrounding these key areas.	25.2	Upon meeting recommendation 25.1, SFPD leadership should release a roll-call video explaining the Department General Orders and reinforcing that a bias-free department is a priority.	High	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Teresa Ewins
2 - Bias	Training	25	The SFPD's General Orders prohibiting biased policing, discrimination, harassment, and retaliation are outdated and do not reflect current practices surrounding these key areas.	25.3	The SFPD should develop and publish a comprehensive strategy to address bias. The strategy should create a framework for the SFPD to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · be informed by the preliminary action planning that was initiated during the command-level training in Fair and Impartial Policing, which addressed policy, recruitment, and hiring; training; leadership, supervision, and accountability; operations; measurement; and outreach to diverse communities; · update policies prohibiting biased policing to include specific discipline outcomes for failure to follow policy; · continue to expand recruitment and hiring from diverse communities (see recommendation 84.2); · partner with the communities and stakeholders in San Francisco on anti-bias outreach (see recommendation 26.1); · improve data collection and analysis to facilitate greater knowledge and transparency around policing practices in the SFPD; · expand its focus on initiatives relating to anti-bias and fully implement existing programs as part of the overall bias strategy, including the existing Not on My Watch program aimed at engaging officers and the community on addressing issues of bias. 	High	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Teresa Ewins & Phillip Lohaus
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	25	The SFPD's General Orders prohibiting biased policing, discrimination, harassment, and retaliation are outdated and do not reflect current practices surrounding these key areas.	25.4	As part of its overall strategy, the SFPD should assess its needs for anti-bias programs across the organization, such as gender bias in sexual assault investigations.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Phil Lohaus



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	Community Policing	26	There is limited community input on the SFPD's actions regarding its anti-bias policies and practices.	26.1	The Chief's Advisory Forum should be re-invigorated and allow for diverse communities to have meaningful input into bias training, policies, and the SFPD's other anti-bias programming. The chief should ensure that marginalized communities are given a meaningful opportunity to be a part of the Advisory Forum.	Medium	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Phil Lohaus
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	26	There is limited community input on the SFPD's actions regarding its anti-bias policies and practices.	26.2	The SFPD should more clearly describe its anti-bias policies and practices for reporting police misconduct and its commitment to ensuring that policing in San Francisco will be bias-free.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	12/14/20	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Lauren Nelson
2 - Bias	Community Policing	26	There is limited community input on the SFPD's actions regarding its anti-bias policies and practices.	26.3	The SFPD should implement an immediate public education campaign on the policies and procedures for reporting misconduct as centered on anti-bias and the initiatives underway.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Rachael Kilshaw
2 - Bias	Community Policing	26	There is limited community input on the SFPD's actions regarding its anti-bias policies and practices.	26.4	The SFPD should work with the Police Commission to convene a community focus group to obtain input on the policies and practices as they are being developed.	Low	Substantial Compliance	08/31/20	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Teresa Ewins & Phillip Lohaus
2 - Bias	Training	27	The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the-trainers session. The SFPD is to be commended for participating in the development of "train the trainers" for Fair and Impartial Policing. However, this training opportunity now needs to be integrated into an organizational approach to developing training delivery across the SFPD. Robust and ongoing training that addresses explicit and implicit biases must be a top priority, not only for the chief of police, the command staff, and the Training and Education Division, but for every member of the department.	27.1	The SFPD should develop a training plan based on a training needs assessment specific to the delivery of anti-bias training as part of an ongoing strategic approach to addressing bias in the SFPD.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	07/01/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Al Duarte
2 - Bias	Training	27	The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the-trainers session. The SFPD is to be commended for participating in the development of "train the trainers" for Fair and Impartial Policing. However, this training opportunity now needs to be integrated into an organizational approach to developing training delivery across the SFPD. Robust and ongoing training that addresses explicit and implicit biases must be a top priority, not only for the chief of police, the command staff, and the Training and Education Division, but for every member of the department.	27.2	The SFPD should begin anti-bias and cultural competency training of department members immediately and should not await the outcome of the training needs assessment. All officers should complete implicit bias training and cultural competency training, which should include the following topics: · Implicit bias awareness and skills for promoting bias-free policing · The definition of cultural competence · Disparate treatment, prejudice, and related terms and their application in law enforcement · The history of various cultures and underrepresented groups in society · Self-assessment of cultural competency and strategies for enhancing one's proficiency in this area · Culturally proficient leadership and law enforcement in communities	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	07/01/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Wilfred Williams & Ofc. Al Duarte
2 - Bias	Training	27	The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the-trainers session. The SFPD is to be commended for participating in the development of "train the trainers" for Fair and Impartial Policing. However, this training opportunity now needs to be integrated into an organizational approach to developing training delivery across the SFPD. Robust and ongoing training that addresses explicit and implicit biases must be a top priority, not only for the chief of police, the command staff, and the Training and Education Division, but for every member of the department.	27.3	Training addressing explicit and implicit biases should employ teaching methodologies that implement interactive adult learning concepts rather than straight lecture-based training delivery.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/01/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Wilfred Williams & Ofc. Al Duarte



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	Leadership/ Management Culture	27	The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the-trainers session. The SFPD is to be commended for participating in the development of “train the trainers” for Fair and Impartial Policing. However, this training opportunity now needs to be integrated into an organizational approach to developing training delivery across the SFPD. Robust and ongoing training that addresses explicit and implicit biases must be a top priority, not only for the chief of police, the command staff, and the Training and Education Division, but for every member of the department.	27.4	To ensure first-line supervisors understand the key role they play in addressing bias, supervisor training should include coaching, mentoring, and direct engagement with problem officers.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	07/26/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Sgt. Meghan McMilton
2 - Bias	Training	27	The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the-trainers session. The SFPD is to be commended for participating in the development of “train the trainers” for Fair and Impartial Policing. However, this training opportunity now needs to be integrated into an organizational approach to developing training delivery across the SFPD. Robust and ongoing training that addresses explicit and implicit biases must be a top priority, not only for the chief of police, the command staff, and the Training and Education Division, but for every member of the department.	27.5	All officers and supervisors should be fully trained on bias and cultural competency within 18 months of the release of this report.	Low	Substantial Compliance	03/15/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Bernadette Robinson
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	27	The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the-trainers session. The SFPD is to be commended for participating in the development of “train the trainers” for Fair and Impartial Policing. However, this training opportunity now needs to be integrated into an organizational approach to developing training delivery across the SFPD. Robust and ongoing training that addresses explicit and implicit biases must be a top priority, not only for the chief of police, the command staff, and the Training and Education Division, but for every member of the department.	27.6	The SFPD should measure the efficacy of such training through careful data collection and analysis practices, ideally in partnership with an academic researcher.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/26/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Teresa Ewins
2 - Bias	Training	27	The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the-trainers session. The SFPD is to be commended for participating in the development of “train the trainers” for Fair and Impartial Policing. However, this training opportunity now needs to be integrated into an organizational approach to developing training delivery across the SFPD. Robust and ongoing training that addresses explicit and implicit biases must be a top priority, not only for the chief of police, the command staff, and the Training and Education Division, but for every member of the department.	27.7	The SFPD should implement Force Options Training in a manner that reduces the impact of demographics on split-second use of force decisions and should ensure that in-service officers receive this training at least annually.	High	Substantial Compliance	04/02/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Sgt. Chandra Medina



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.1	The SFPD should investigate complaints of bias transparently and openly and recognize its potential impact upon the larger group of officers who do not hold such views and upon the affected communities of San Francisco. To address these concerns, the department should <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · identify specific roles and responsibilities for supervision of officers regarding biased behavior; · analyze E-585 traffic stop incident report data and enforcement actions with a lens for possible bias or disparate treatment and require supervisors to review these analyses; · identify intervention mechanisms beyond discipline to deal with potentially biased behaviors. 	Medium	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Rachael Kilshaw
2 - Bias	Leadership/ Management Culture	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.2	The SFPD should provide for open, ongoing command engagement around the issue of bias, both internal and external to the department.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	08/12/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Sgt. Rich Cibotti
2 - Bias	Training	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.3	The SFPD should establish routine, ongoing roll-call training requirements for supervisors on key leadership issues, including their role in promoting fair and impartial policing.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	03/15/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Captain Jack Hart
2 - Bias	Leadership/ Management Culture	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.4	The SFPD needs to engage in early identification of and intervention in behaviors that are indicative of bias through direct supervision, data review, and observation of officer activity.	Immediate	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	Training	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.5	The SFPD needs to train supervisors to recognize behaviors that are indicative of bias and intervene effectively.	Immediate	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.6	The SFPD must address practices within the organization that reflect explicit biases and intervene with firm, timely disciplinary responses.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Lauren Nelson
2 - Bias	Leadership/ Management Culture	28	The SFPD's failure to fully and adequately address incidents of biased misconduct contributed to a perception of institutional bias in the department. The SFPD responded to the racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic texts by a large group of officers by investigating the incident and disciplining the officers directly involved. However, given the nature of the officers' open and flagrant behavior, the SFPD should have taken action to ensure that this was not an institutionalized problem, including steps to address the behavior at the organizational level. Community perceptions that biased behaviors exist in the SFPD were exacerbated by the explicit bias demonstrated by SFPD officers in the texting scandals and the subsequent failure to take appropriate action.	28.7	The SFPD needs to encourage all personnel to report biased behavior to the appropriate officials.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	01/07/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Chris Canning
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	29	Allegations of biased policing by community members have not been sustained against an officer in more than three years.	29.1	The SFPD and OCC should establish shared protocols for investigating bias that do not relying solely on witness statements, given that bias incidents are often reported as one-on-one occurrences.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/14/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Andrew Cox
2 - Bias	Training	29	Allegations of biased policing by community members have not been sustained against an officer in more than three years.	29.2	The SFPD should ensure that supervisors are trained on bias investigations, including all of the following: · How to identify biased police practices when reviewing investigatory stop, arrest, and use of force data · How to respond to a complaint of biased police practices, including conducting a preliminary investigation of the complaint in order to preserve key evidence and potential witnesses · How to evaluate complaints of improper pedestrian stops for potential biased police practices	High	Substantial Compliance	09/13/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Andrew Cox



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	29	Allegations of biased policing by community members have not been sustained against an officer in more than three years.	29.3	The SFPD should work with the City and County of San Francisco to ensure quality bias investigation training to all oversight investigators.	High	Substantial Compliance	09/13/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Andrew Cox
2 - Bias	Community Policing	29	Allegations of biased policing by community members have not been sustained against an officer in more than three years.	29.4	SFPD leadership should explore the options for alternate dispute resolutions regarding bias complaints, including mediation. This is an opportunity to bring police and community members together to foster an improved understanding of police practices and community perceptions. Because bias complaints are rooted in perception and often difficult to sustain, mediation provides for a timelier, more transparent, and potentially more procedurally just resolution for the community member who lodged the complaint.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/09/20	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Rachael Kilshaw
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	30	The weight of the evidence indicates that African-American drivers were disproportionately stopped compared to their representation in the driving population. Citywide, African-American drivers were 24 percent more likely to be stopped by the police than their estimated representation in the driving population, and they were 9 percent more likely to be stopped given their estimated representation among potential traffic violators.	30.1	The SFPD should develop a plan to conduct further review and analysis of traffic stop data to identify the reasons and potential solutions for the traffic stop data disparities. The plan should be developed within 180 days of the issuance of this report.	High	Substantial Compliance	09/07/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Kathryn Winters
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	30	The weight of the evidence indicates that African-American drivers were disproportionately stopped compared to their representation in the driving population. Citywide, African-American drivers were 24 percent more likely to be stopped by the police than their estimated representation in the driving population, and they were 9 percent more likely to be stopped given their estimated representation among potential traffic violators.	30.2	Upon completion of recommendation 30.1, the SFPD should implement the plan to review and analyze traffic stop data to identify the reasons and potential solutions for the traffic stop data disparities.	Low	Substantial Compliance	09/07/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Kathryn Winters
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	30	The weight of the evidence indicates that African-American drivers were disproportionately stopped compared to their representation in the driving population. Citywide, African-American drivers were 24 percent more likely to be stopped by the police than their estimated representation in the driving population, and they were 9 percent more likely to be stopped given their estimated representation among potential traffic violators.	30.3	The SFPD should provide supervisors with the results of timely data analyses regarding the E-585 traffic stop incident report activity of their officers that allow them to identify and proactively intervene when outlier officers are identified.	Low	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	30	The weight of the evidence indicates that African-American drivers were disproportionately stopped compared to their representation in the driving population. Citywide, African-American drivers were 24 percent more likely to be stopped by the police than their estimated representation in the driving population, and they were 9 percent more likely to be stopped given their estimated representation among potential traffic violators.	30.4	Until the data are electronic, supervisors should be provided with monthly paper reports regarding the E-585 traffic stop incident report activity of officers under their command.	High	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya
2 - Bias	Training	30	The weight of the evidence indicates that African-American drivers were disproportionately stopped compared to their representation in the driving population. Citywide, African-American drivers were 24 percent more likely to be stopped by the police than their estimated representation in the driving population, and they were 9 percent more likely to be stopped given their estimated representation among potential traffic violators.	30.5	SFPD supervisors must be trained (pursuant to recommendation 27.1) to review and assess E-585 traffic stop incident report data for disparate outcomes, particularly in relation to peer groups within the unit.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/27/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Mike Petuya



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	30	The weight of the evidence indicates that African-American drivers were disproportionately stopped compared to their representation in the driving population. Citywide, African-American drivers were 24 percent more likely to be stopped by the police than their estimated representation in the driving population, and they were 9 percent more likely to be stopped given their estimated representation among potential traffic violators.	30.6	The SFPD should implement the data collection recommendations regarding improving traffic stop data provided in appendix F. The timing of the implementation needs to be identified in the technology plan.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/02/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Kathryn Winters
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	31	African-American and Hispanic drivers were disproportionately searched and arrested compared to White drivers. In addition, African-American drivers were more likely to be warned and less likely to be ticketed than White drivers. The racial disparity in traffic stops and post-stop outcomes appears to be large and statistically significant.	31.1	The SFPD needs to analyze the data and look for trends and patterns over time to reduce the racial and ethnic disparities in post-stop outcomes.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/07/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Kathryn Winters
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	32	Not only are African-American and Hispanic drivers disproportionately searched following traffic stops but they are also less likely to be found with contraband than White drivers.	32.1	As stated in finding 31, the SFPD should complete recommendations 31.1.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/07/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Kathryn Winters
2 - Bias	Training	32	Not only are African-American and Hispanic drivers disproportionately searched following traffic stops but they are also less likely to be found with contraband than White drivers.	32.2	The SFPD needs better training on the Fourth Amendment and applicable state laws on search and seizure.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/13/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Sean Perdomo
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	33	The current E-585 traffic stop incident report does not collect sufficient or appropriate information to allow for a robust analysis of possible bias by SFPD officers.	33.1	The SFPD should implement the data collection recommendations in appendix F to allow for better information and analysis of stop data.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/02/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Sgt. Chandra Medina
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	34	The SFPD does not routinely collect or analyze data on stops involving pedestrian and nonmotorized conveyances.	34.1	The SFPD should prioritize the collection, analysis, and reporting of all nonconsensual stop data, including pedestrian and nonmotorized conveyances.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/29/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director & Dandy Wong
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	34	The SFPD does not routinely collect or analyze data on stops involving pedestrian and nonmotorized conveyances.	34.2	The SFPD should mandate the collection of stop report data on any stop or detention of a pedestrian or person riding a nonmotorized conveyance, such as a bicycle, skateboard, or scooter. This should begin immediately and not wait until AB 953 requires such action in April 2019.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	01/29/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director & Dandy Wong
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	34	The SFPD does not routinely collect or analyze data on stops involving pedestrian and nonmotorized conveyances.	34.3	The SFPD should consider expanding the functionality of the E-585 traffic stop incident report data collection system to include data collection for all pedestrian and nonmotorized conveyances.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	01/08/19	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Susan Merritt, Director
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	35	The SFPD does not have sufficient systems, tools, or resources needed to integrate and develop the appropriate data required to support a modern, professional police department. Many of the department's technology and information sharing systems are outdated and not integrated and do not support ready access for analysis to inform management decisions. Progressive police supervision requires timely access to accurate information regarding officer activity, traffic and pedestrian stops, use of force, and resident complaints to help analyze officers' actions and trends. The SFPD must conduct an assessment across the whole organization and determine how to prioritize the implementation of IT solutions for key management and operational practices.	35.1	The SFPD should adopt new policies and procedures for collecting traffic and pedestrian stop data, public complaints, and enforcement actions. Information for these events should be recorded accurately.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/02/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Kathryn Winters



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	35	The SFPD does not have sufficient systems, tools, or resources needed to integrate and develop the appropriate data required to support a modern, professional police department. Many of the department's technology and information sharing systems are outdated and not integrated and do not support ready access for analysis to inform management decisions. Progressive police supervision requires timely access to accurate information regarding officer activity, traffic and pedestrian stops, use of force, and resident complaints to help analyze officers' actions and trends. The SFPD must conduct an assessment across the whole organization and determine how to prioritize the implementation of IT solutions for key management and operational practices.	35.2	The SFPD should analyze its existing technology capacity and develop a strategic plan for how data are identified, collected, and used to advance sound management practices.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/06/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Ofc. Kathryn Winters
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	35	The SFPD does not have sufficient systems, tools, or resources needed to integrate and develop the appropriate data required to support a modern, professional police department. Many of the department's technology and information sharing systems are outdated and not integrated and do not support ready access for analysis to inform management decisions. Progressive police supervision requires timely access to accurate information regarding officer activity, traffic and pedestrian stops, use of force, and resident complaints to help analyze officers' actions and trends. The SFPD must conduct an assessment across the whole organization and determine how to prioritize the implementation of IT solutions for key management and operational practices.	35.3	SFPD leadership should make a concerted effort to focus on data collection and to create systems and analysis protocols that will inform supervisors where incidents of potential bias or disparate treatment occur or where patterns in officer behavior exist that warrant further examination or monitoring.	Medium	In Progress		Special Operations	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Ofc. Mike Petuya
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	35	The SFPD does not have sufficient systems, tools, or resources needed to integrate and develop the appropriate data required to support a modern, professional police department. Many of the department's technology and information sharing systems are outdated and not integrated and do not support ready access for analysis to inform management decisions. Progressive police supervision requires timely access to accurate information regarding officer activity, traffic and pedestrian stops, use of force, and resident complaints to help analyze officers' actions and trends. The SFPD must conduct an assessment across the whole organization and determine how to prioritize the implementation of IT solutions for key management and operational practices.	35.4	The SFPD should continue participating in the White House Police Data Initiative and seek to expand its data collection and reporting consistent with those recommendations and the goals of the initiative. Finding 36	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/15/19	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Paris Deshong
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	36	The SFPD does not have an organizational performance approach to evaluating the impact of policies, practices, and procedures aimed at reducing bias within the department.	36.1	The SFPD should develop an audit practice to evaluate the impact on the department of the implementation of new training programs.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	04/05/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Sgt. Leonard Poggio
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	36	The SFPD does not have an organizational performance approach to evaluating the impact of policies, practices, and procedures aimed at reducing bias within the department.	36.2	The SFPD should incorporate ongoing review and audit of anti-bias programs into a quarterly report that includes promising practices and lessons learned.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	05/26/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Lt. Wilfred Williams
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	36	The SFPD does not have an organizational performance approach to evaluating the impact of policies, practices, and procedures aimed at reducing bias within the department.	36.3	The SFPD should review all of its policies, procedures, manuals, training curricula, forms, and other materials to eliminate the use of archaic or biased language. For example, the SFPD should review the use of the word "citizen" in policies and forms, such as the Citizen Complaint Form (SFPD/OCC 293). This assessment should be completed within 120 days of the issuance of this report.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	05/28/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Phil Lohaus



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
2 - Bias	Doctrine/ Policy Development	37	The policy for the use of Field Interview cards fails to outline sufficient guidance on when they should be completed.	37.1	The SFPD should establish policy that specifically governs when and how Field Interview cards are completed. This should be accomplished within 180 days of the issuance of this report.	High	Substantial Compliance	07/28/21	special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Teresa Ewins
2 - Bias	IT/Data Business Processes	37	The policy for the use of Field Interview cards fails to outline sufficient guidance on when they should be completed.	37.2	The SFPD needs to reassess its use, storage, and collection of Field Interview cards to ensure data retention and collection are in accord with legal requirements. Annual audit of Field Interview cards should be part of the data retention practices.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/28/21	Special Operations	Sgt. Chandra Medina	Cmdr. Teresa Ewins
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	38	There is a strong perception among community members that the SFPD is not committed to the principles of procedural justice. The assessment team heard from community members who expressed concerns over being treated unfairly, not being given a voice, or not being able to participate in policing decisions that affect the community.	38.1	The SFPD needs to expand its outreach to its communities in a manner designed to demonstrate its commitment to procedural justice.	High	Substantial Compliance	12/07/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Torrie Grady
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	38	There is a strong perception among community members that the SFPD is not committed to the principles of procedural justice. The assessment team heard from community members who expressed concerns over being treated unfairly, not being given a voice, or not being able to participate in policing decisions that affect the community.	38.2	SFPD leadership should take an active and direct role in community engagement at the neighborhood level.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	05/11/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Troy Dangerfield & Sgt. Kin Lee
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	38	There is a strong perception among community members that the SFPD is not committed to the principles of procedural justice. The assessment team heard from community members who expressed concerns over being treated unfairly, not being given a voice, or not being able to participate in policing decisions that affect the community.	38.3	The SFPD should engage community members in the implementation of the recommendations in this report.	High	Substantial Compliance	01/07/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Torrie Grady
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.1	The SFPD needs to develop a comprehensive organizational strategic plan with supporting plans for the key reform areas identified within this report specifically directed at community policing, bias, and maintaining diversity within the department.	Medium	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Jason Cunningham, Program Manager
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.2	SFPD leadership should lead, mentor, and champion a community-based strategic planning initiative.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	07/26/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Jason Cunningham, Program Manager
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.3	The SFPD should establish a Strategic Planning Steering Committee composed of representatives from the community and various sections of the department within 90 days of the issuance of this report. This committee should collaborate to develop policies and strategies for policing communities and neighborhoods disproportionately affected by crime and for deploying resources that aim to reduce crime by improving relationships and increasing community engagement.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	07/23/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Jason Cunningham, Program Manager
3 - Community Policing	Training	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.4	A training needs analysis must be conducted to support the training requirements recommended in this assessment. The SFPD must conduct an analysis of the needs across the organization, identify the benchmark for training, and develop a prioritized training plan based on the needs analysis. This will require solid support from the Office of the Chief of Police and the command staff if it is to succeed in strengthening the content, quality, and timeliness of the department's training. This should be completed within nine months of the issuance of this report.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	07/23/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Jack Hart



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.5	A technology needs analysis must be conducted on how to address the technology gaps identified in this assessment. Organizational needs should be identified, and a structured plan supported by budget forecasting should be in place to address the development of the IT enterprise for the SFPD. Existing systems should be integrated to ensure full value of the data already in place in the SFPD and that IT systems and practices remain up to date. The SFPD must analyze and expound its information technology capabilities that provide the right management information to drive key decisions on officer misconduct and overall employee performance.	Low	Substantial Compliance	06/02/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.6	The SFPD must conduct a gap analysis comparing the current state of the department's information gathering, analyzing, and sharing assets and capabilities with the established modern best practices. This should be completed within six months of the issuance of this report.	High	Substantial Compliance	06/02/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.7	The SFPD must conduct a portfolio management assessment to identify opportunities for consolidating platform and product offerings, providing enterprise solutions across the organization instead of silos or one-off product sets. This should be completed within six months of the issuance of this report.	High	Substantial Compliance	06/02/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.8	The SFPD must create a five-year technology initiative roadmap to facilitate migrating current platforms to the modern state architecture. This should be completed within 12 months of the issuance of this report.	Low	Substantial Compliance	06/02/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	39	The SFPD does not have a department-wide strategic plan that articulates a mission and identifies the goals and objectives necessary to deliver overall policing services.	39.9	The SFPD must establish clear life-cycle management policies and procedures for enterprise application maintenance, support, and replacement strategies for sustaining improved data collection, analysis, and dissemination technologies. This should be completed within 12 months of the issuance of this report.	Low	Substantial Compliance	06/02/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.1	As part of the Strategic Plan (recommendation 39.1), the SFPD should develop a strategic community policing plan that identifies goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes for all units.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/27/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Cmdr. David Lazar, Lt. Julian Ng & Lt. Georgia Sawyer



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.2	As part of recommendation 39.3, the SFPD should direct the Strategic Planning Steering Committee to develop a strategic plan within six months of the issuance of this report that clearly defines the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The department's vision, mission, and values statements. Once these statements are in place, the committee should establish agency-wide objectives and individual goals as the guiding principles that codify the SFPD's collective beliefs. The department's strategic framework for the planning process. This framework will ensure that the process results in a plan that supports the coordination of priorities and objectives across individuals, work groups, and key operating divisions. The department's strategy to engage the community, obtain community input, and develop support for the plan and its success. The department's strategy to drive the plan down to the officer level by creating objectives that allow for individual goals that contribute to the overall plan. The department's measurement processes for individual performance and participation towards accomplishing departmental goals. 	High	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Jason Cunningham, Program Manager
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.3	As part of its plan, the SFPD should consider the role of the beat and its place within its priorities. Prioritizing beat-aligned policing would require some realignment of dispatch priorities and directed patrol.	High	Substantial Compliance	08/18/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Angela Wilhelm
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.4	The SFPD should evaluate whether implementation of foot patrol and bicycle patrol would bridge the trust gap and effectively solve crime problems in San Francisco's communities.	High	Substantial Compliance	03/10/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Pete Hamilton
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.5	The SFPD should develop specific measurable goals for community policing engagement within six months of the issuance of this report and ensure these measurements are incorporated into the department's CompStat processes.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/22/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Torrie Grady



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.6	The SFPD should develop and implement a community policing practices review and development process within 90 days of the issuance of this report so SFPD units can collaborate regarding community policing efforts.	Immediate	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Cmdr. Denise Flaherty
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.7	The SFPD should develop strategic partnerships on key community issues such as homelessness and organizational transparency to work in a collaborative environment to problem solve and develop co-produced plans to address the issues.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/13/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Wayman Young
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	40	The SFPD does not formalize community engagement in support of community policing practices. The SFPD does not have a comprehensive, strategic community policing plan that focuses priorities, resources, programs, and activities for the department. Community policing involves partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation. In order to be a true community policing department, the SFPD needs to ensure the entire department is following the tenets of community policing systematically and strategically. The SFPD needs to bring the community to the table in order to establish comprehensive community policing resources, programs, and activities.	40.8	The SFPD should publish and post its annual review of progress toward the community policing goals and objectives.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/27/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Jennifer Jackson
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	41	The SFPD's community policing order Department General Order 1.08 – Community Policing (effective 9/28/11) and its Community Policing and Problem Solving manual are out of date and no longer relevant. These overarching directives do not sufficiently reflect the vision, plan, or goals of the SFPD with regard to community policing. They need to be updated and maintained as living documents that guide the community policing activities of the organization.	41.1	The SFPD should work with the newly convened Strategic Planning Steering Committee (recommendation 40.2) to draft a new community policing and problem solving manual for SFPD members within 12 months of the issuance of this report	Low	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Raymond Cruz
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	41	The SFPD's community policing order Department General Order 1.08 – Community Policing (effective 9/28/11) and its Community Policing and Problem Solving manual are out of date and no longer relevant. These overarching directives do not sufficiently reflect the vision, plan, or goals of the SFPD with regard to community policing. They need to be updated and maintained as living documents that guide the community policing activities of the organization.	41.2	The SFPD should work with the Police Commission to draft a new community policing order that reflects the priorities, goals, and actions of the department.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Chris DelGaudio



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	42	The SFPD conducts community policing in silos but does not ensure community policing is systematically occurring across the department. Without an overall strategy, the SFPD's community policing activities represent only a collection of programs aimed at engaging with the community. Some SFPD district captains are creatively engaging the community and identifying promising practices; however, by not systematically identifying these practices they are working in silos. Every unit in the SFPD must have a community policing plan that is measurable and also coordinates with, supports, and is accountable to the organizational strategic plan. Ensuring that the whole of the organization is actively engaged with the community supports community policing goals, develops a culture that is consistent with true police-community partnerships, and allows the department to more effectively respond to community needs.	42.1	The SFPD should continue to grant district captains the authority to serve the diverse populations represented in their districts within the tenets of community policing. However, the department needs to provide structure and support to these initiatives in accordance with the proposed strategic community policing plan.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	07/27/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Torrie Grady
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	42	The SFPD conducts community policing in silos but does not ensure community policing is systematically occurring across the department. Without an overall strategy, the SFPD's community policing activities represent only a collection of programs aimed at engaging with the community. Some SFPD district captains are creatively engaging the community and identifying promising practices; however, by not systematically identifying these practices they are working in silos. Every unit in the SFPD must have a community policing plan that is measurable and also coordinates with, supports, and is accountable to the organizational strategic plan. Ensuring that the whole of the organization is actively engaged with the community supports community policing goals, develops a culture that is consistent with true police-community partnerships, and allows the department to more effectively respond to community needs.	42.2	The SFPD should create an overall structure to manage the department's approach to community policing driven by a committee of senior leaders and district captains.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	02/01/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Jason Cherniss
3 - Community Policing	Leadership/ Management Culture	42	The SFPD conducts community policing in silos but does not ensure community policing is systematically occurring across the department. Without an overall strategy, the SFPD's community policing activities represent only a collection of programs aimed at engaging with the community. Some SFPD district captains are creatively engaging the community and identifying promising practices; however, by not systematically identifying these practices they are working in silos. Every unit in the SFPD must have a community policing plan that is measurable and also coordinates with, supports, and is accountable to the organizational strategic plan. Ensuring that the whole of the organization is actively engaged with the community supports community policing goals, develops a culture that is consistent with true police-community partnerships, and allows the department to more effectively respond to community needs.	42.3	The SFPD should recognize those district captains engaged in best practices and use them as peer trainers for other captains.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	06/21/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Tim Falvey



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	42	The SFPD conducts community policing in silos but does not ensure community policing is systematically occurring across the department. Without an overall strategy, the SFPD's community policing activities represent only a collection of programs aimed at engaging with the community. Some SFPD district captains are creatively engaging the community and identifying promising practices; however, by not systematically identifying these practices they are working in silos. Every unit in the SFPD must have a community policing plan that is measurable and also coordinates with, supports, and is accountable to the organizational strategic plan. Ensuring that the whole of the organization is actively engaged with the community supports community policing goals, develops a culture that is consistent with true police-community partnerships, and allows the department to more effectively respond to community needs.	42.4	The SFPD should provide information technology support to districts to help develop newsletters that are easily populated and more professional in appearance. Creating a uniform newsletter architecture and consistent format that allows for easy data and content uploading would create efficiencies and help develop a greater sense of community.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/13/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Angela Wilhelm
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	43	The SFPD engages in a range of successful activities, programs, and community partnerships that support community policing tenets, particularly those coordinated through the Youth and Community Engagement Unit. The SFPD partners on a variety of projects and is to be commended. As the department expands its work with the local communities, it must continue to ensure cultural sensitivity to projects it is implementing and when seeking to partner with additional members of the community. Public perception and community customs need to be at the forefront of the decision process.	43.1	The SFPD should continue to actively support the programs aimed at community engagement, including Coffee with a Cop, the San Francisco Police Activities League, San Francisco Safety Awareness for Everyone, and The Garden Project.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	10/23/19	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Kin Lee
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	43	The SFPD engages in a range of successful activities, programs, and community partnerships that support community policing tenets, particularly those coordinated through the Youth and Community Engagement Unit. The SFPD partners on a variety of projects and is to be commended. As the department expands its work with the local communities, it must continue to ensure cultural sensitivity to projects it is implementing and when seeking to partner with additional members of the community. Public perception and community customs need to be at the forefront of the decision process.	43.2	The SFPD should expand its partnership with and further support neighborhood organizations that work to provide art, sports, educational, and leadership development opportunities for young people in the community.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	12/09/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Kin Lee & Sgt. Laxman Dharmani
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	43	The SFPD engages in a range of successful activities, programs, and community partnerships that support community policing tenets, particularly those coordinated through the Youth and Community Engagement Unit. The SFPD partners on a variety of projects and is to be commended. As the department expands its work with the local communities, it must continue to ensure cultural sensitivity to projects it is implementing and when seeking to partner with additional members of the community. Public perception and community customs need to be at the forefront of the decision process.	43.3	The SFPD should consider reinvigorating its community police academy program to educate the community about the department's policing practices. The training should range from basic police orientation to ride-alongs with district police officers.	Low	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Kin Lee
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	43	The SFPD engages in a range of successful activities, programs, and community partnerships that support community policing tenets, particularly those coordinated through the Youth and Community Engagement Unit. The SFPD partners on a variety of projects and is to be commended. As the department expands its work with the local communities, it must continue to ensure cultural sensitivity to projects it is implementing and when seeking to partner with additional members of the community. Public perception and community customs need to be at the forefront of the decision process.	43.4	The SFPD needs to reach out to members of activist groups and those groups who are not fully supportive of the department to seek to develop areas of mutual concern and work towards trust building and resolution of shared issues.	High	Substantial Compliance	07/28/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Torrie Grady



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	44	The Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau's mission, role, and responsibilities as they relate to community policing are not clearly defined or implemented. In the absence of structured goals and objectives, the Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau has little influence in guiding the community policing-related activities.	44.1	The chief of police should give the deputy chief of Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau the responsibility of advancing community policing throughout the entire department and the communities of San Francisco.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	02/17/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Deputy Chief David Lazar
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	44	The Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau's mission, role, and responsibilities as they relate to community policing are not clearly defined or implemented. In the absence of structured goals and objectives, the Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau has little influence in guiding the community policing-related activities.	44.2	The chief of police should empower the deputy chief of the Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau to create a strategy and plan to implement, with urgency, the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Task Force recommendations contained in Pillar Four and the recommendations in the CRI-TA assessment.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	01/27/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Torrie Grady
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	44	The Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau's mission, role, and responsibilities as they relate to community policing are not clearly defined or implemented. In the absence of structured goals and objectives, the Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau has little influence in guiding the community policing-related activities.	44.3	The SFPD should adequately resource the Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau to reflect the diversity of the community it serves and the officers of the SFPD in order to effectively coordinate community policing efforts throughout the city.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	02/17/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Michael Andraychak
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	44	The Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau's mission, role, and responsibilities as they relate to community policing are not clearly defined or implemented. In the absence of structured goals and objectives, the Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau has little influence in guiding the community policing-related activities.	44.4	The SFPD, through the Principle Policing and Professional Standards Bureau, should engage and support all units by facilitating quarterly meetings among supervisors and managers to discuss cross-organizational goals and community policing plans and outcomes. These meetings should be supported by routine electronic engagement through a shared platform for sharing information.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	07/23/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Carl Fabbri
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	45	The SFPD is not focused on community policing efforts across the entire department.	45.1	The SFPD should expand community policing programs throughout the entire agency and ensure each unit has a written strategic plan embracing community policing and measurable goals and progress, regardless of the unit's specialty.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/23/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Torrie Grady
3 - Community Policing	Training	45	The SFPD is not focused on community policing efforts across the entire department.	45.2	SFPD leadership should provide short video messages on the importance of the entire agency understanding and embracing community policing.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/17/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	David Stevenson, Director & Sgt. Michael Andraychak
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	45	The SFPD is not focused on community policing efforts across the entire department.	45.3	The SFPD should consider mandating annual community policing training to the entire agency.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/17/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Jack Hart
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	46	The SFPD does not collect data around community policing nor measure success within community policing functions and programs.	46.1	The SFPD needs to prioritize data collection practices measuring community policing and should consider reinstating Form 509 or other such instruments to allow for consistency in data collection and reporting.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/23/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Gavin McEachern
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	46	The SFPD does not collect data around community policing nor measure success within community policing functions and programs.	46.2	The SFPD should regularly assess existing community engagement programs to ensure effectiveness in a framework predicated upon sound measurement practices. Assessments should include input from participants and trusted community partners.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/23/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Chris Wilhelm
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	46	The SFPD does not collect data around community policing nor measure success within community policing functions and programs.	46.3	The SFPD should establish formal mechanisms to measure and support information sharing and the development of shared good practice among SFPD members, particularly district captains.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/23/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Cmdr. Teresa Ewins
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	46	The SFPD does not collect data around community policing nor measure success within community policing functions and programs.	46.4	The SFPD should create a feedback mechanism for community engagement events to determine efficacy, replicability, and depth of relationship with community partners. A community survey could be one feedback mechanism.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/17/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Chris Wilhelm



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	46	The SFPD does not collect data around community policing nor measure success within community policing functions and programs.	46.5	The SFPD should publish and post any community survey results.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/17/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	47	The SFPD does not consistently seek out feedback or engage in ongoing communication with the community relative to its policing practices and how the community perceives its services. The Bay Area is home to several academic institutions, and a partnership arrangement should be considered not only for the community survey but also as a means to measure overall progress of the department's reform efforts. Such an arrangement would allow for ongoing transparent evaluation of the reforms that have been publicly promised to the residents of San Francisco.	47.1	The department should conduct periodic surveys to measure whether the SFPD is providing fair and impartial treatment to all residents and to identify gaps in service (see recommendation 46.5).	Low	Substantial Compliance	06/21/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Catherine McGuire, Executive Director
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	47	The SFPD does not consistently seek out feedback or engage in ongoing communication with the community relative to its policing practices and how the community perceives its services. The Bay Area is home to several academic institutions, and a partnership arrangement should be considered not only for the community survey but also as a means to measure overall progress of the department's reform efforts. Such an arrangement would allow for ongoing transparent evaluation of the reforms that have been publicly promised to the residents of San Francisco.	47.2	The department should create easy points of access for community feedback and input, such as providing "community feedback" or "talk to your captain" links on its website and social media pages.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/13/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	David Stevenson, Director & Sgt. Michael Andraychak
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	47	The SFPD does not consistently seek out feedback or engage in ongoing communication with the community relative to its policing practices and how the community perceives its services. The Bay Area is home to several academic institutions, and a partnership arrangement should be considered not only for the community survey but also as a means to measure overall progress of the department's reform efforts. Such an arrangement would allow for ongoing transparent evaluation of the reforms that have been publicly promised to the residents of San Francisco.	47.3	The role of the Director of Community Engagement should be aligned with organizational communication and outreach to enhance overall messaging and community awareness of the SFPD's community policing initiatives and ongoing programs.	Low	Substantial Compliance	03/16/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	David Stevenson, Director
3 - Community Policing	Community Policing	48	The SFPD needs to develop a robust, broad-based community forum for input on policing priorities across all communities.	48.1	The chief's community forum groups—African American, Arab American, Asian Pacific Islander, Business, Hispanic, Interfaith, LGBT, Young Adults, Youth, and Youth Providers—need to be re-established and structured to engage in problem solving and action regarding issues affecting the groups they represent.	Medium	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Torrie Grady
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	48	The SFPD needs to develop a robust, broad-based community forum for input on policing priorities across all communities.	48.2	The department needs to develop an annual reporting and measurement process of the issues raised at the forum and the progress made by the group in resolving them.	Low	In Progress		Community Engagement Division	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Torrie Grady
3 - Community Policing	Training	49	Many in the SFPD lack an understanding of current and emerging community policing practices such as procedural justice.	49.1	The SFPD should ensure that all department personnel, including civilians, undergo training in community policing as well as customer service and engagement.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/07/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Mark Im
3 - Community Policing	Training	49	Many in the SFPD lack an understanding of current and emerging community policing practices such as procedural justice.	49.2	Consideration should be given to using Field Training Officers to help develop and deliver training in the field regarding key community policing concepts as a way to augment and expand the training currently provided at the Training Academy.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/08/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Mark Im



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	Training	49	Many in the SFPD lack an understanding of current and emerging community policing practices such as procedural justice.	49.3	The SFPD's training needs to expand beyond traditional community policing and include the foundation and concepts of procedural justice as related concepts.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/01/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Jack Hart
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	50	The SFPD does not require agency personnel to read the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.	50.1	The SFPD should require all agency personnel to read the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	08/18/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Jennifer Jackson
3 - Community Policing	Leadership/ Management Culture	50	The SFPD does not require agency personnel to read the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.	50.2	The SFPD should encourage supervisors and captains to continue conversations on the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing through roll calls, in-service training, and community meetings.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	11/16/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Jennifer Jackson
3 - Community Policing	Training	51	Training curricula do not address the complex emerging community issues in the current law enforcement environment.	51.1	The SFPD should provide procedural justice and explicit and implicit bias training to all department personnel including civilian staff. This training should become a permanent part of the Academy's curriculum and should be reviewed with each officer during the department's annual officer training sessions.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/05/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Jack Hart
3 - Community Policing	Training	51	Training curricula do not address the complex emerging community issues in the current law enforcement environment.	51.2	The SFPD should engage in peer-to-peer training exchanges for exposure to other departments' training curricula to identify areas for potential improvement. Areas of focus should include de-escalation training, use of force training with a focus on the sanctity of life, impartial policing, and procedural justice.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	05/19/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Capt. Jack Hart
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	52	The SFPD has not fully engaged with all institutional and community partners to coordinate service provision to the homeless community. Significant amounts of SFPD resources are directed at responding to issues involving the homeless community. The SFPD needs to assess and ensure that these resources are being used to their greatest value	52.1	The SFPD should review and strategically align resources to support the Homeless Outreach Teams, which are currently providing service to the homeless community.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/13/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Joseph Mendiola
3 - Community Policing	Doctrine/ Policy Development	52	The SFPD has not fully engaged with all institutional and community partners to coordinate service provision to the homeless community. Significant amounts of SFPD resources are directed at responding to issues involving the homeless community. The SFPD needs to assess and ensure that these resources are being used to their greatest value	52.2	The SFPD should engage with the City and County of San Francisco to conduct joint strategic planning with all of its appropriate federal, state, and local partners to clearly define roles, responsibilities, and goals in continuing to address the issue of homelessness and ensure a more consistent and coordinated response to the needs of this growing segment of the city's population	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/13/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Angelique Marin
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	52	The SFPD has not fully engaged with all institutional and community partners to coordinate service provision to the homeless community. Significant amounts of SFPD resources are directed at responding to issues involving the homeless community. The SFPD needs to assess and ensure that these resources are being used to their greatest value	52.3	The SFPD should engage in data collection and analysis to measure the effectiveness of strategies aimed at all community policing issues, particularly its response to the homeless community. The analysis should be part of an ongoing review and publication and reflect the commitment to greater transparency and community engagement.	Low	Substantial Compliance	05/11/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Wayman Young
3 - Community Policing	IT/Data Business Processes	53	The SFPD does not incorporate the tenets of community policing in its evaluation of employee performance.	53.1	Performance evaluations should include officers' behaviors and efforts to meet the SFPD's community policing goals of community engagement, positive police-community interaction, and problem resolution. Establishing consistent performance evaluations is covered under recommendation 79.1.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/26/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Sgt. Davin Cole
3 - Community Policing	Leadership/ Management Culture	54	The SFPD does not have multi-levels of awards and recognition that reward organizational values and goals, such as community engagement and recognition, discretion under duress, and strategic problem solving. Rewarding behaviors and actions that reflect the values of a guardian mindset is one way to institutionalize the department's community policing goals.	54.1	The SFPD should support and recognize proper exercise of power and authority with good community outcomes in addition to traditionally recognized acts of bravery.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/08/20	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Rachael Kilshaw



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
3 - Community Policing	Leadership/ Management Culture	54	The SFPD does not have multi-levels of awards and recognition that reward organizational values and goals, such as community engagement and recognition, discretion under duress, and strategic problem solving. Rewarding behaviors and actions that reflect the values of a guardian mindset is one way to institutionalize the department's community policing goals.	54.2	The SFPD should implement department-wide recognition for an officer of the month as one way to begin to advance a culture of guardianship and reward good community policing practices.	Low	Substantial Compliance	05/19/21	Community Engagement Division	Sgt. Ryan Crockett	Lt. Sean Frost
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	55	The SFPD is not transparent around officer discipline practices. During the community listening sessions and interviews with community members, there was a consistently stated belief, especially in the African-American and Hispanic communities, that officers are not held accountable for misconduct.	55.1	The SFPD should expand its current reporting process on complaints, discipline, and officer-involved shootings to identify ways to create better transparency for the community regarding officer misconduct.	High	Substantial Compliance	08/13/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Michael Andraychak
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	55	The SFPD is not transparent around officer discipline practices. During the community listening sessions and interviews with community members, there was a consistently stated belief, especially in the African-American and Hispanic communities, that officers are not held accountable for misconduct.	55.2	Consistent with the current practice on Early Intervention System data, the SFPD should develop and report aggregate data regarding complaints against Department members, their outcome, and trends in complaints and misconduct for both internal and external publication.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Andrew Cox
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	56	The SFPD does not engage in community outreach and information regarding the discipline process and rights of the community. The absence of information and education about the complaint system and its outcome contributes to the negative perceptions of the SFPD by residents.	56.1	The SFPD should work with the OCC and Police Commission to minimize obstacles to transparency as allowed by law to improve communications to complainants and the public regarding investigation status, timeliness, disposition, and outcome.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/15/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Robert Yick
4 - Accountability	Community Policing	56	The SFPD does not engage in community outreach and information regarding the discipline process and rights of the community. The absence of information and education about the complaint system and its outcome contributes to the negative perceptions of the SFPD by residents.	56.2	The SFPD should allocate appropriate staff and resources to enhance community outreach initiatives and to incorporate customer service protocols for periodic follow-up and status communications with complainants for the duration of their open cases.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	10/23/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Angela Wilhelm & Sgt. Dianne Khuu
4 - Accountability	Community Policing	56	The SFPD does not engage in community outreach and information regarding the discipline process and rights of the community. The absence of information and education about the complaint system and its outcome contributes to the negative perceptions of the SFPD by residents.	56.3	The SFPD should work with the OCC to facilitate the same actions and outreach to the community as best suits the independence of the OCC.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/15/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Robert Yick
4 - Accountability	Community Policing	56	The SFPD does not engage in community outreach and information regarding the discipline process and rights of the community. The absence of information and education about the complaint system and its outcome contributes to the negative perceptions of the SFPD by residents.	56.4	The SFPD should ensure that the OCC public complaint informational materials are readily available in the community and in particular prominently displayed in district stations for access by the public. These materials should be designed to educate the public about confidentiality limitations on sharing investigative information to inform residents of the type of feedback they may reasonably expect, and they should be provided in multiple languages.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/10/19	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Nicholas Rainsford
4 - Accountability	Community Policing	56	The SFPD does not engage in community outreach and information regarding the discipline process and rights of the community. The absence of information and education about the complaint system and its outcome contributes to the negative perceptions of the SFPD by residents.	56.5	The SFPD should work with the OCC and the Police Commission to conduct community workshops on the complaint process and the roles and responsibilities of each agency relative to the overall process within nine months of the issuance of this report.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/15/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Robert Yick
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	56	The SFPD does not engage in community outreach and information regarding the discipline process and rights of the community. The absence of information and education about the complaint system and its outcome contributes to the negative perceptions of the SFPD by residents.	56.6	The SFPD should encourage the OCC and IAD to identify obstacles that interfere with optimal complaints investigations and accountability, with a goal of implementing changes to better support their intended missions.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/15/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Robert Yick



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	57	The SFPD does not provide leadership in its role with respect to complaints against SFPD personnel. Promising practices emphasize the role of effective investigation of complaints in building community trust. Procedural justice informs us that members of the public are more likely to trust law enforcement agencies when they believe their issues are handled with dignity and respect.	57.1	The SFPD needs to update its policies and educate personnel to appropriately recognize the importance of the first interaction between police personnel and members of the public who have complaints against the police.	Low	Substantial Compliance	11/16/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Jack Hart
4 - Accountability	Leadership/ Management Culture	57	The SFPD does not provide leadership in its role with respect to complaints against SFPD personnel. Promising practices emphasize the role of effective investigation of complaints in building community trust. Procedural justice informs us that members of the public are more likely to trust law enforcement agencies when they believe their issues are handled with dignity and respect.	57.2	The SFPD should institutionalize the process of explaining and assisting community members who file complaints against officers.	High	Substantial Compliance	10/10/19	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Jennifer Jackson
4 - Accountability	Training	57	The SFPD does not provide leadership in its role with respect to complaints against SFPD personnel. Promising practices emphasize the role of effective investigation of complaints in building community trust. Procedural justice informs us that members of the public are more likely to trust law enforcement agencies when they believe their issues are handled with dignity and respect.	57.3	The SFPD should ensure that all personnel are trained and educated on the public complaint process and the location for the appropriate forms.	High	Substantial Compliance	01/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Michael Nevin
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	57	The SFPD does not provide leadership in its role with respect to complaints against SFPD personnel. Promising practices emphasize the role of effective investigation of complaints in building community trust. Procedural justice informs us that members of the public are more likely to trust law enforcement agencies when they believe their issues are handled with dignity and respect.	57.4	The SFPD should develop "next steps" and "know your rights" handouts for complainants who file complaints at department facilities.	High	Substantial Compliance	10/10/19	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Nicholas Rainsford
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	58	The SFPD does not have a tracking system for complaints received at a district station.	58.1	The SFPD should establish a record system for ensuring that complaints received at a district station are forwarded properly and in a timely matter to the OCC. E-mail and fax should be considered for ensuring delivery and creating a record.	High	Substantial Compliance	05/21/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Andrew Cox
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	59	SFPD Internal Affairs Administrative Investigations and Internal Affairs Criminal Investigations are not effectively collaborating.	59.1	Members, including investigators, of the IA Administrative Unit and IA Criminal Investigations Unit should meet regularly to discuss processes, practices, and the flow of assigned cases to ensure that administrative violations are timely and properly addressed.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	11/16/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Kathryn Waaland
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	60	Internal Affairs case tracking is insufficient to ensure the timely progression of investigations and achieving key deadlines.	60.1	The SFPD and OCC should jointly develop a case tracking system with sufficient security protections to assure independence that would identify each open investigation, where it is assigned, and the date the case expires for the purposes of compliance with California Government Code Section 3304(d)1, which requires the completion of an administrative investigation into misconduct within one year of the agency discovery.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	12/17/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Mark Cota
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	60	Internal Affairs case tracking is insufficient to ensure the timely progression of investigations and achieving key deadlines.	60.2	The SFPD and OCC should establish an investigative protocol within 120 days of the issuance of this report that allocates specific time parameters for accomplishing investigative responsibilities and transfer of cases if criminal allegations are made against SFPD officers.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	02/12/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Andrew Cox
4 - Accountability	Leadership/ Management Culture	60	Internal Affairs case tracking is insufficient to ensure the timely progression of investigations and achieving key deadlines.	60.3	Supervisors should be held accountable for ensuring timely transfer of cases to SFPD Internal Affairs Administrative Investigations from SFPD Internal Affairs Criminal investigations when appropriate.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	12/17/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Mark Cota



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	61	The SFPD's Internal Affairs Division does not have standard operating procedures or templates for investigation reporting. By not having specific protocols and templates, miscommunication is occurring with the investigations.	61.1	The SFPD should develop a Standard Operating Procedures Manual detailing the scope of responsibility for all functions within the IAD. Standard operating procedures should provide guidance and advice on conflict reduction, whether internal or external to the SFPD.	Low	Substantial Compliance	12/17/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Angela Wilhelm & Sgt. Dianne Khuu
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	61	The SFPD's Internal Affairs Division does not have standard operating procedures or templates for investigation reporting. By not having specific protocols and templates, miscommunication is occurring with the investigations.	61.2	The SFPD must establish clear responsibilities and timelines for the progression of administrative investigations, and supervisors should be held to account for ensuring compliance.	Low	Substantial Compliance	12/17/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Angela Wilhelm & Sgt. Dianne Khuu
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	62	Files stored with the SFPD's Internal Affairs Division are secured, but compelled statements are not isolated. During the file reviews, the assessment team did not find any compelled statements isolated.	62.1	The SFPD needs to establish standard operating procedures for maintaining file separation and containment of criminal investigations. This is critical to ensuring that officers' rights are protected and that criminal investigations can be fully investigated.	Low	Substantial Compliance	12/17/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Angela Wilhelm & Sgt. Dianne Khuu
4 - Accountability	Leadership/ Management Culture	63	The SFPD does not fully support members performing internal affairs functions. SFPD officers identified a department culture that is hostile and in some cases detrimental to the accountability role of the IAD, thereby limiting the effectiveness of the process. At present, the culture of the SFPD is not directed toward building an environment of accountability. Policies are disregarded, and investigations are not robust. The lack of coordination between institutional partners for investigations is a real challenge to building trust within the community. Even IAD members perceive a lack of support from the department as a whole. According to these members, not all SFPD line officers and supervisors support the need for internal investigations in ensuring transparency and building effective community relationships. IAD personnel reported arriving at a district to interview an officer and encountering district personnel, including supervisors, who would protect or conceal the officer from the investigators. From the perspective of leadership and management communications, all SFPD members need to feel valued and supported by the organization. Internal Affairs should be seen as a rewarding assignment, one that is valued by the organization.	63.1	The SFPD should clearly define the authority of IAD and reinforce that cooperation and collaboration with IAD is mandatory.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	04/21/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Andrew Cox



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	Leadership/ Management Culture	63	The SFPD does not fully support members performing internal affairs functions. SFPD officers identified a department culture that is hostile and in some cases detrimental to the accountability role of the IAD, thereby limiting the effectiveness of the process. At present, the culture of the SFPD is not directed toward building an environment of accountability. Policies are disregarded, and investigations are not robust. The lack of coordination between institutional partners for investigations is a real challenge to building trust within the community. Even IAD members perceive a lack of support from the department as a whole. According to these members, not all SFPD line officers and supervisors support the need for internal investigations in ensuring transparency and building effective community relationships. IAD personnel reported arriving at a district to interview an officer and encountering district personnel, including supervisors, who would protect or conceal the officer from the investigators. From the perspective of leadership and management communications, all SFPD members need to feel valued and supported by the organization. Internal Affairs should be seen as a rewarding assignment, one that is valued by the organization.	63.2	The SFPD should continue to implement the tenets of procedural justice and ensure training include instruction on the importance of the IAD's functions to the integrity of the department and connection to the community.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	02/06/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Jennifer Jackson
4 - Accountability	Leadership/ Management Culture	63	The SFPD does not fully support members performing internal affairs functions. SFPD officers identified a department culture that is hostile and in some cases detrimental to the accountability role of the IAD, thereby limiting the effectiveness of the process. At present, the culture of the SFPD is not directed toward building an environment of accountability. Policies are disregarded, and investigations are not robust. The lack of coordination between institutional partners for investigations is a real challenge to building trust within the community. Even IAD members perceive a lack of support from the department as a whole. According to these members, not all SFPD line officers and supervisors support the need for internal investigations in ensuring transparency and building effective community relationships. IAD personnel reported arriving at a district to interview an officer and encountering district personnel, including supervisors, who would protect or conceal the officer from the investigators. From the perspective of leadership and management communications, all SFPD members need to feel valued and supported by the organization. Internal Affairs should be seen as a rewarding assignment, one that is valued by the organization.	63.3	SFPD leadership should demonstrate its support of the IAD's role and responsibility within the department and provide recognition and support for good investigative practices.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	12/17/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Capt. Chris Pedrini
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	64	The SFPD does not routinely collaborate with the Office of Citizen Complaints. The transparency of the complaint and disciplinary process is negatively affected by the working relationship between SFPD IAD and OCC. The lack of engagement undermines the effectiveness of both in fulfilling their respective roles and responsibilities. Issues with respect to information sharing between the two entities, timeliness of complaint investigations, and bases for recommending progressive discipline potentially impede the investigative and adjudication processes, potentially eroding the overall integrity of the public complaint resource.	64.1	The SFPD should convene a joint review process within 90 days of the issuance of this report, co-chaired by OCC and SFPD senior staff, to evaluate existing complaint and disciplinary processes, policies, and liaison relationships to enhance trust and legitimacy around these issues.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	05/19/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Angela Wilhelm & Sgt. Dianne Khuu



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	64	The SFPD does not routinely collaborate with the Office of Citizen Complaints. The transparency of the complaint and disciplinary process is negatively affected by the working relationship between SFPD IAD and OCC. The lack of engagement undermines the effectiveness of both in fulfilling their respective roles and responsibilities. Issues with respect to information sharing between the two entities, timeliness of complaint investigations, and bases for recommending progressive discipline potentially impede the investigative and adjudication processes, potentially eroding the overall integrity of the public complaint resource.	64.2	The SFPD should immediately accept OCC's recommendation, as reported in the First Quarter 2016 Sparks' Report, to convene quarterly meetings between OCC staff and SFPD staff.	High	Substantial Compliance	11/16/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Leadership/ Management Culture	64	The SFPD does not routinely collaborate with the Office of Citizen Complaints. The transparency of the complaint and disciplinary process is negatively affected by the working relationship between SFPD IAD and OCC. The lack of engagement undermines the effectiveness of both in fulfilling their respective roles and responsibilities. Issues with respect to information sharing between the two entities, timeliness of complaint investigations, and bases for recommending progressive discipline potentially impede the investigative and adjudication processes, potentially eroding the overall integrity of the public complaint resource.	64.3	The SFPD should seek to improve interagency communications and identify ways of improving collaboration on investigative practices to ensure timely conclusion of investigations, shared information on prior complaints and finding of misconduct, and appropriate entry of discipline, designed to improve the overall discipline system that holds officers to account.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	05/21/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Angela Wilhelm
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	64	The SFPD does not routinely collaborate with the Office of Citizen Complaints. The transparency of the complaint and disciplinary process is negatively affected by the working relationship between SFPD IAD and OCC. The lack of engagement undermines the effectiveness of both in fulfilling their respective roles and responsibilities. Issues with respect to information sharing between the two entities, timeliness of complaint investigations, and bases for recommending progressive discipline potentially impede the investigative and adjudication processes, potentially eroding the overall integrity of the public complaint resource.	64.4	The SFPD should work with OCC to develop standards within 120 days of the issuance of this report regarding timeliness of complaint investigations, and consistency of investigative findings and practices to ensure progressive discipline is appropriately recommended.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	05/19/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Angela Wilhelm & Sgt. Dianne Khuu
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	64	The SFPD does not routinely collaborate with the Office of Citizen Complaints. The transparency of the complaint and disciplinary process is negatively affected by the working relationship between SFPD IAD and OCC. The lack of engagement undermines the effectiveness of both in fulfilling their respective roles and responsibilities. Issues with respect to information sharing between the two entities, timeliness of complaint investigations, and bases for recommending progressive discipline potentially impede the investigative and adjudication processes, potentially eroding the overall integrity of the public complaint resource.	64.5	The SFPD should engage with OCC to ensure that the classification for complaints and their findings are reported consistently between the two agencies to ensure better transparency.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	12/09/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Angela Wilhelm & Sgt. Dianne Khuu
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	65	The SFPD does not sufficiently analyze Office of Citizen Complaints reports and analyses of its complaints, investigations, and case dispositions. This information is shared with the SFPD and largely available publicly on the OCC website. However, the SFPD rarely uses complaint information or aggregated data to inform change management priorities in areas such as professional conduct, community and police relations, training, and policy.	65.1	The SFPD should develop a department-internal priority to regularly review and analyze OCC complaint reporting to identify priorities for intervention in terms of workforce culture, training, policy clarification, or leadership development.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	05/19/21	Administration	Ofc. Lauren Nelson	Lt. Andrew Cox



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	65	The SFPD does not sufficiently analyze Office of Citizen Complaints reports and analyses of its complaints, investigations, and case dispositions. This information is shared with the SFPD and largely available publicly on the OCC website. However, the SFPD rarely uses complaint information or aggregated data to inform change management priorities in areas such as professional conduct, community and police relations, training, and policy.	65.2	The SFPD should raise district captains' awareness of this information by requiring IAD to present a trends analysis report of OCC case activity, emerging issues, and concerns at CompStat meetings every quarter.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	05/19/21	Administration	Ofc. Lauren Nelson	Lt. Andrew Cox
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	66	The SFPD is not required to take action on the recommendations put forth in the Office of Citizen Complaints Sparks Report. OCC provides the Sparks Report quarterly to the Police Commission. The Sparks Report provides recommendations on policy and revisions.	66.1	The SFPD should meet with OCC on a quarterly basis following the release of the Sparks Report to discuss the recommendations	Medium	Substantial Compliance	10/23/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	66	The SFPD is not required to take action on the recommendations put forth in the Office of Citizen Complaints Sparks Report. OCC provides the Sparks Report quarterly to the Police Commission. The Sparks Report provides recommendations on policy and revisions.	66.2	The SFPD should make it mandatory for the Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau to review the Sparks Report and direct action where appropriate.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	10/23/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	66	The SFPD is not required to take action on the recommendations put forth in the Office of Citizen Complaints Sparks Report. OCC provides the Sparks Report quarterly to the Police Commission. The Sparks Report provides recommendations on policy and revisions.	66.3	The SFPD should provide twice-yearly reports to the Police Commission regarding actions resulting from the Sparks Report, including whether the OCC recommendation is supported and a timeline for implementation or correction to existing practice and policy.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/23/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	67	The SFPD does not analyze trends in complaints, situations that give rise to complaints, or variations between units or peer groups in relation to complaints and misconduct. In part, this is because the SFPD does not have appropriate data systems to allow for data-led management and policing decisions.	67.1	The SFPD must work to develop practices that measure, analyze, and assess trends in public complaints and employee misconduct.	Low	Substantial Compliance	06/21/21	Administration	Ofc. Lauren Nelson	Lt. Andrew Cox
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	67	The SFPD does not analyze trends in complaints, situations that give rise to complaints, or variations between units or peer groups in relation to complaints and misconduct. In part, this is because the SFPD does not have appropriate data systems to allow for data-led management and policing decisions.	67.2	Supervisors should be provided with quarterly reports that integrate individual actions, as is currently reported by the Early Intervention Systems Unit, with aggregated information that provides complaint and misconduct data trends for the watch, district, and city.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Ofc. Lauren Nelson	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	68	The SFPD has poor data collection and analysis, which significantly impacts effective overall organization management and accountability. The technology in the SFPD requires significant updating. However, poor data collection practices, including lack of supervisory review and accountability for improperly completed reports and form sets, contributes to the poor data environment.	68.1	As part of its technological capacity improvement strategy, the SFPD should develop a plan to advance its capacity to digest information it currently possesses in a consistent, easily accessible format such as a template containing key data points including officer performance indicators and crime indicators that could provide management with real-time information to inform their practice.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	68	The SFPD has poor data collection and analysis, which significantly impacts effective overall organization management and accountability. The technology in the SFPD requires significant updating. However, poor data collection practices, including lack of supervisory review and accountability for improperly completed reports and form sets, contributes to the poor data environment.	68.2	Supervisors and officers who fail to properly collect and enter information must be held accountable through discipline. Absent proper collection of data, little to no analysis can occur.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	04/15/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Henry Ha
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	68	The SFPD has poor data collection and analysis, which significantly impacts effective overall organization management and accountability. The technology in the SFPD requires significant updating. However, poor data collection practices, including lack of supervisory review and accountability for improperly completed reports and form sets, contributes to the poor data environment.	68.3	The SFPD should increase transparency by collecting and providing data, policies, and procedures to the public in multiple languages relevant to the local community through official SFPD website and municipal open data portals.	Low	Substantial Compliance	08/13/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	69	The SFPD does not consistently apply the principles of procedural justice.	69.1	SFPD leadership should examine opportunities to incorporate procedural justice into the internal discipline process, placing additional importance on values adherence rather than adherence to rules. The Police Commission, OCC, IAD, and POA leadership should be partners in this process. Albeit conclusions are drawn from a small sample, the assessment team is concerned that in review of some investigations, the officers who received discipline were primarily ethnic or racial minorities or women. In an organization where very few officers received suspensions for misconduct, this discrepancy stood out.	Low	Substantial Compliance	09/03/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Cmdr. Denise Flaherty
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	69	The SFPD does not consistently apply the principles of procedural justice.	69.2	The SFPD should task a committee to review internal discipline on a quarterly basis to assure the fairness and impartiality of the process overall and particularly to ensure that there is not bias in determination and application of discipline. This analysis should be multi-levelled to include aggregate data, trend analysis, and outcome impact on officer demographics including prior discipline and adherence to the discipline matrix.	Medium	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Angela Wilhelm
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	69	The SFPD does not consistently apply the principles of procedural justice.	69.3	The SFPD should report annually to the Police Commission the analysis of discipline including officer demographics and prior discipline histories.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Phil Lohaus
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	70	The process to update Department General Orders is overly protracted and does not allow the SFPD to respond in a timely manner to emerging policing issues. As a result, many of the Department General Orders are from the mid-1990s and do not fully reflect current policing practices.	70.1	The SFPD should work with the Police Commission to develop a nimble process for reviewing and approving existing and new Department General Orders that supports policing operations with codified, transparent policies.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/23/19	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	70	The process to update Department General Orders is overly protracted and does not allow the SFPD to respond in a timely manner to emerging policing issues. As a result, many of the Department General Orders are from the mid-1990s and do not fully reflect current policing practices.	70.2	The SFPD should commit to updating all Department General Orders in alignment with current laws and statutes, community expectations, and national best practices every three years.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/01/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	70	The process to update Department General Orders is overly protracted and does not allow the SFPD to respond in a timely manner to emerging policing issues. As a result, many of the Department General Orders are from the mid-1990s and do not fully reflect current policing practices.	70.3	Prior to promulgation of policies and procedures, the SFPD should ensure that comments are sought from members and units most affected by any practice, policy, or procedure during the initial stages of development.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Ofc. Walker Bardsley
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	70	The process to update Department General Orders is overly protracted and does not allow the SFPD to respond in a timely manner to emerging policing issues. As a result, many of the Department General Orders are from the mid-1990s and do not fully reflect current policing practices.	70.4	Input and review from external stakeholders must be completed before implementation of the practice, policy, or procedure.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	71	The SFPD does not have an effective process for the development and distribution of Department General Orders and Bulletins. Clearly articulated policies are needed to help SFPD personnel make the right decisions.	71.1	The SFPD needs to work with the Police Commission to create a process to make timely and necessary updates to key policies.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	02/28/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	71	The SFPD does not have an effective process for the development and distribution of Department General Orders and Bulletins. Clearly articulated policies are needed to help SFPD personnel make the right decisions.	71.2	The SFPD should develop a general order review matrix predicated upon area of risk, operational need, and public concern to allow for timely update and review of prioritized orders.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	10/23/19	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	72	Department Bulletins are used as a workaround for the Department General Order approval process.	72.1	The SFPD should present all Department Bulletins that substantively change or countermand a Department General Order to the Police Commission before implementation and publish them on their website after approval is received.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	10/23/19	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	72	Department Bulletins are used as a workaround for the Department General Order approval process.	72.2	All Department Class A Bulletins and any Department Bulletin that modifies an existing Department General Order should be posted on the SFPD's website.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	10/23/19	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	David Stevenson, Director
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	72	Department Bulletins are used as a workaround for the Department General Order approval process.	72.3	The SFPD should limit the use of Department Bulletins to short-term direction and eliminate the authority to continue a Department Bulletin after two years.	Low	Substantial Compliance	10/23/19	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	73	The SFPD does not have an effective mechanism for determining whether an officer has accepted a policy and therefore could be held to account for its provisions.	73.1	The SFPD should develop a mechanism by which to track when a Department General Order or Department Bulletin has been accessed and acknowledged by a SFPD member.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	02/19/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Henry Ha
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	73	The SFPD does not have an effective mechanism for determining whether an officer has accepted a policy and therefore could be held to account for its provisions.	73.2	Once a mechanism is established, the SFPD should create a protocol for notification, noncompliance, and accountability.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	02/19/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Henry Ha
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	74	The SFPD does not provide sufficient training, supervision support, and guidance when releasing new Department Bulletins. Training is critical, particularly when associated with risk issues such as use of force, bias, stop and seizure. It was rare that any training accompanied new policies outlined in Department Bulletins, as evidenced in the lack of training development before the introduction of the mandatory requirement to carry the 36-inch baton.	74.1	The SFPD should conduct a thorough and structured approach when creating new policies and procedures via Department Bulletins.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	03/15/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Michael Nevin
4 - Accountability	Training	74	The SFPD does not provide sufficient training, supervision support, and guidance when releasing new Department Bulletins. Training is critical, particularly when associated with risk issues such as use of force, bias, stop and seizure. It was rare that any training accompanied new policies outlined in Department Bulletins, as evidenced in the lack of training development before the introduction of the mandatory requirement to carry the 36-inch baton.	74.2	The SFPD should ensure that Bulletins are accompanied by appropriate training, supervision, and consistent reinforcement of the intended purpose of the policies.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/26/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Lt. Michael Nevin
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	75	The SFPD does not devote sufficient administrative or command-level resources to the process of creating, implementing, maintaining, and updating Department General Orders and Bulletins. The team found that Department Bulletins updating provisions within Department General Orders were repeatedly renewed to meet the two year sunset, often without receiving any substantive updates and in place of addressing the issue within the appropriate Department General Order.	75.1	The SFPD should task the Principled Policing and Professional Standards Bureau with overall responsibility for development, maintenance, training, and implementation planning for Department General Orders.	Low	Substantial Compliance	03/01/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	75	The SFPD does not devote sufficient administrative or command-level resources to the process of creating, implementing, maintaining, and updating Department General Orders and Bulletins. The team found that Department Bulletins updating provisions within Department General Orders were repeatedly renewed to meet the two year sunset, often without receiving any substantive updates and in place of addressing the issue within the appropriate Department General Order.	75.2	The Written Directives Unit should be tasked to work with subject matter experts from OCC and the Police Commission to ensure policies are adopted in a timely manner and appropriately updated.	Low	Substantial Compliance	02/06/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Ryan Jones



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	75	The SFPD does not devote sufficient administrative or command-level resources to the process of creating, implementing, maintaining, and updating Department General Orders and Bulletins. The team found that Department Bulletins updating provisions within Department General Orders were repeatedly renewed to meet the two year sunset, often without receiving any substantive updates and in place of addressing the issue within the appropriate Department General Order.	75.3	The Written Directives Unit should be sufficiently staffed with personnel and resources to enable the unit to function as the project managers for Department General Orders at the direction of the Police Commission.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/09/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Joelle Harrell
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	76	Although the SFPD internally provides Department General Orders and Department Bulletins that are electronically available, the documents are not easily accessible. Absent an easily cross-referenced system, particularly one where Department Bulletins can supersede a Department General Order, policy failure or incorrect action can occur.	76.1	Department General Orders and Department Bulletins should be stored in a searchable digital central repository for ease of access by officers and for administrative purposes.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/09/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	76	Although the SFPD internally provides Department General Orders and Department Bulletins that are electronically available, the documents are not easily accessible. Absent an easily cross-referenced system, particularly one where Department Bulletins can supersede a Department General Order, policy failure or incorrect action can occur.	76.2	The SFPD should provide department members access to an online electronic system for Department General Orders and Department Bulletins to provide timely updates, cross-referencing, and reporting and monitoring capabilities for managers.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/09/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	William Sanson-Mosier, Acting Director
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	77	The SFPD does not conduct routine, ongoing organizational audits, even where such practices are established in policy.	77.1	The SFPD should prioritize auditing as a means to ensure organizational accountability and risk management and develop mechanisms to support such practices.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	03/09/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Sgt. Henry Ha
4 - Accountability	IT/Data Business Processes	77	The SFPD does not conduct routine, ongoing organizational audits, even where such practices are established in policy.	77.2	The SFPD should develop an auditing plan and schedule for both routine and risk audits within 90 days of issuance of this report. Staffing, resources, and training need to be allocated to the process to ensure an active and robust auditing schedule.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	09/03/21	Administration	Ofc. Lauren Nelson	Catherine McGuire, Executive Director
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	78	The SFPD does not engage in any outside evaluations of its practices, data, or reporting.	78.1	The SFPD should consider partnering with local academic institutions to evaluate its reform program, particularly as it seeks to implement the recommendations in this report.	Low	Substantial Compliance	07/29/20	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	Jason Cunningham, Program Manager
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	79	Evaluation of employee performance is not an institutionalized practice in the SFPD. SFPD personnel interviewed did not recall having or conducting a performance evaluation within the department.	79.1	The SFPD should adopt a policy and implement the practice of completing regular performance evaluations of all department employees tailored to goals and objectives, job functions, and desired behavior and performance indicators.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Robert Kobold
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	79	Evaluation of employee performance is not an institutionalized practice in the SFPD. SFPD personnel interviewed did not recall having or conducting a performance evaluation within the department.	79.2	SFPD leadership needs to create a system to ensure that all personnel are being evaluated at least twice a year.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Robert Kobold
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	79	Evaluation of employee performance is not an institutionalized practice in the SFPD. SFPD personnel interviewed did not recall having or conducting a performance evaluation within the department.	79.3	The SFPD should use performance evaluations as an evaluation factor in promotions.	Low	In Progress		Administration	A/Lt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Robert Kobold



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	80	The SFPD does not have internal protocols for collaboration with regard to criminal investigations conducted by the district attorney or the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California. Police misconduct uncovered during any type of covert investigation should be reported pursuant to established protocols and protect the integrity of the investigating officers. In situations with shared areas of jurisdiction or responsibility for officer conduct, there should be protocols for roles and responsibilities for all partners.	80.1	The SFPD should create a policy governing the reporting of criminal activity and administrative misconduct uncovered during any type of covert investigation. Such policies will prepare the department for complex legal situations with multijurisdictional responsibilities for either criminal or administrative investigations into officer conduct.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	A/Capt. Eric Altorfer/ Sgt. Frank Pereira
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	80	The SFPD does not have internal protocols for collaboration with regard to criminal investigations conducted by the district attorney or the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California. Police misconduct uncovered during any type of covert investigation should be reported pursuant to established protocols and protect the integrity of the investigating officers. In situations with shared areas of jurisdiction or responsibility for officer conduct, there should be protocols for roles and responsibilities for all partners.	80.2	Clear communication protocols, responsibilities, and roles need to be established among the key partners responsible for investigations into criminal conduct and address administrative misconduct by officers.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	A/Capt. Eric Altorfer/ Sgt. Frank Pereira
4 - Accountability	Doctrine/ Policy Development	80	The SFPD does not have internal protocols for collaboration with regard to criminal investigations conducted by the district attorney or the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California. Police misconduct uncovered during any type of covert investigation should be reported pursuant to established protocols and protect the integrity of the investigating officers. In situations with shared areas of jurisdiction or responsibility for officer conduct, there should be protocols for roles and responsibilities for all partners.	80.3	The SFPD should develop clear and defined policies and protocols to address reporting and confidentiality requirements for officers investigating criminal activity and administrative misconduct of other police officers uncovered during any type of investigation.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Frank Pereira	A/Capt. Eric Altorfer/ Sgt. Frank Pereira
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	81	Despite a relatively good record in hiring diverse candidates, perception remains in the community that the SFPD seeks to eliminate diverse candidates from its hiring pool. A lack of community engagement perpetuates this perception over hiring requirements.	81.1	The SFPD should clearly articulate its hiring and background standards as a matter of building community trust and ensuring applicants are prepared.	High	Substantial Compliance	03/10/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	A/Lt. Lloyd Martin & Sgt. Christina Serrano
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	81	Despite a relatively good record in hiring diverse candidates, perception remains in the community that the SFPD seeks to eliminate diverse candidates from its hiring pool. A lack of community engagement perpetuates this perception over hiring requirements.	81.2	The SFPD should publish annual statistics on the demographics of applicants for each stage of the hiring process.	Low	Substantial Compliance	03/10/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Nicole Jones & Celeste Berg
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	81	Despite a relatively good record in hiring diverse candidates, perception remains in the community that the SFPD seeks to eliminate diverse candidates from its hiring pool. A lack of community engagement perpetuates this perception over hiring requirements.	81.3	The SFPD should develop and implement applicant tracking and hiring data collection and reporting procedures to capture information such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · recruitment sources for applicants who are hired and not hired; · whether applicants are the result of personal referral, Internet, career center, print media, job fair, community or other outreach event, school career center, radio, television, outplacement service, or social media; · passage rate by gender, race, and ethnicity for each major selection hurdle including written test, physical abilities, oral interview, polygraph, psychological assessment, hiring panel, and medical; · selection rates by race, gender, and national origin; · attrition rates by race, gender, national origin, and phase in training. 	Low	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	A/Lt. Lloyd Martin & Sgt. Christina Serrano



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Community Policing	82	The SFPD does not fully engage its applicants throughout the hiring process. Given the lengthy and intensive process for hiring, the SFPD needs to develop a program for engaging quality candidates early on and keeping them interested in and involved with the department.	82.1	The SFPD should develop an active social media and website presence to entice qualified candidates and keep them engaged throughout the application process.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/11/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Christina Serrano
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	82	The SFPD does not fully engage its applicants throughout the hiring process. Given the lengthy and intensive process for hiring, the SFPD needs to develop a program for engaging quality candidates early on and keeping them interested in and involved with the department.	82.2	The SFPD should consider creating information boards and "applicant only" websites and providing ongoing updates and department information to applicants during the hiring process.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/11/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	A/Lt. Lloyd Martin & Sgt. Christina Serrano
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Training	83	The SFPD is not administering a physical ability test (PAT) The SFPD sought to update or eliminate the PAT requirement to repeatedly pull a firearm trigger. As a result, the entire PAT must be redesigned and validated. As of the date of this report, the PAT is not part of the selection process and was therefore not a part of the assessment. However, a selection process that does not include a physical abilities test is not optimal because physical skills are important for police officers. PATs are supposed to ensure a police officer's ability to perform effectively and simulate police officer work. However, some elements of the test for SFPD applicants may be outdated and inconsistent with emerging practices.	83.1	The SFPD should work with City HR to reinstitute a valid PAT that is aligned with current policing and state POST requirements within 180 days of this report.	High	Substantial Compliance	01/11/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Christina Serrano
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Training	83	The SFPD is not administering a physical ability test (PAT) The SFPD sought to update or eliminate the PAT requirement to repeatedly pull a firearm trigger. As a result, the entire PAT must be redesigned and validated. As of the date of this report, the PAT is not part of the selection process and was therefore not a part of the assessment. However, a selection process that does not include a physical abilities test is not optimal because physical skills are important for police officers. PATs are supposed to ensure a police officer's ability to perform effectively and simulate police officer work. However, some elements of the test for SFPD applicants may be outdated and inconsistent with emerging practices.	83.2	The SFPD should continuously evaluate the PAT process to ensure no unintended impact for any of the diverse candidates it seeks to hire.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/11/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Christina Serrano



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	84	SFPD recruitment and hiring practices are disjointed. The SFPD currently has three separate units within two bureaus that handle recruitment and hiring practices, each reporting to different organizational chains of command. The SFPD's recruitment and hiring functions are spread across two different bureaus and several chains of command. The Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau oversees the Recruitment Unit, which has the responsibility to market the department to attract qualified, diverse candidates. Thereafter, SFPD's Administration Bureau, under the command of a deputy chief, has primary responsibility for the majority of the functions related to the hiring process and training recruits. The Background Investigation Unit, a component of the Staff Services Division of the Administration Bureau, is responsible for investigating and adjudicating the backgrounds of employment applicants. The Personnel Unit of the Staff Services Division of the Administration Bureau is responsible for human resources functions including the appointment and processing of new hires, promotions, and separations. Finally, the Training and Education Division of the Administration Bureau is responsible for all formalized training functions for the Department and includes the Academy, the Field Training Office, the Office of Education and Training, and the Firearms Range. Each of these units, divisions, and bureaus plays a critical role in advancing diversity in the SFPD. However, by splitting up the chains of command, recruitment and hiring practices become disjointed.	84.1	The SFPD should reorganize its recruitment and hiring practices under one bureau to provide cohesion and ensure resources are strategically used toward recruiting and hiring goals.	Low	Substantial Compliance	12/02/20	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	84	SFPD recruitment and hiring practices are disjointed. The SFPD currently has three separate units within two bureaus that handle recruitment and hiring practices, each reporting to different organizational chains of command. The SFPD's recruitment and hiring functions are spread across two different bureaus and several chains of command. The Professional Standards and Principled Policing Bureau oversees the Recruitment Unit, which has the responsibility to market the department to attract qualified, diverse candidates. Thereafter, SFPD's Administration Bureau, under the command of a deputy chief, has primary responsibility for the majority of the functions related to the hiring process and training recruits. The Background Investigation Unit, a component of the Staff Services Division of the Administration Bureau, is responsible for investigating and adjudicating the backgrounds of employment applicants. The Personnel Unit of the Staff Services Division of the Administration Bureau is responsible for human resources functions including the appointment and processing of new hires, promotions, and separations. Finally, the Training and Education Division of the Administration Bureau is responsible for all formalized training functions for the Department and includes the Academy, the Field Training Office, the Office of Education and Training, and the Firearms Range. Each of these units, divisions, and bureaus plays a critical role in advancing diversity in the SFPD. However, by splitting up the chains of command, recruitment and hiring practices become disjointed.	84.2	The SFPD should establish a recruiting and hiring committee to continuously improve and streamline processes for applicants. The process should be as user-friendly as possible.	Low	Substantial Compliance	03/09/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	85	The SFPD's Recruitment Unit has implemented an active recruitment program focused on diversity and targeted recruiting throughout San Francisco but does not measure or validate the effectiveness of their outreach and events.	85.1	The SFPD should continue supporting and overseeing this initiative and ensure the Recruitment Unit continues to implement best practices for recruitment, training, and outreach to improve diversity and cultural and linguistic responsiveness of the SFPD.	Low	Substantial Compliance	09/10/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Christina Serrano
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Community Policing	85	The SFPD's Recruitment Unit has implemented an active recruitment program focused on diversity and targeted recruiting throughout San Francisco but does not measure or validate the effectiveness of their outreach and events.	85.2	The SFPD should consider assigning more resources, by way of community outreach and recruiting officers, to further engage underrepresented communities.	High	Substantial Compliance	01/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Christina Serrano
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Community Policing	85	The SFPD's Recruitment Unit has implemented an active recruitment program focused on diversity and targeted recruiting throughout San Francisco but does not measure or validate the effectiveness of their outreach and events.	85.3	The SFPD should expand its community partnerships and outreach to create a community ambassador program to identify and train community leaders to aid in the SFPD's recruitment process.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Christina Serrano
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Community Policing	85	The SFPD's Recruitment Unit has implemented an active recruitment program focused on diversity and targeted recruiting throughout San Francisco but does not measure or validate the effectiveness of their outreach and events.	85.4	The SFPD should explore approaches to measure or validate the effectiveness of their recruitment outreach and events. The SFPD could do a community satisfaction survey or conduct GIS analysis to see whether all communities have access to these events.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Christina Serrano
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	86	The Background Investigation Unit is staffed by part-time investigators and is comprised of a mix of modified duty officers and retired officers.	86.1	The SFPD should staff the Background Investigation Unit with full-time investigative personnel who have the required training and requisite experience and who are invested in the area of investigations.	Low	Substantial Compliance	04/12/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	A/Lt. Lloyd Martin
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Leadership/ Management Culture	86	The Background Investigation Unit is staffed by part-time investigators and is comprised of a mix of modified duty officers and retired officers.	86.2	The SFPD should ensure that there is diversity within the investigators that comprise the Background Investigation Unit.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	04/12/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	A/Lt. Lloyd Martin
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	87	The Background Investigation Unit lacks valid performance measures to evaluate background investigators.	87.1	The Background Investigation Unit should continue the process of developing and implementing performance measures to evaluate the unit's investigators in terms of outcomes such as length of investigations, timeliness of investigations, numbers of contacts with the applicant, consistency of investigative approach, and hiring recommendations.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	04/09/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep & A/Lt. Lloyd Martin
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	87	The Background Investigation Unit lacks valid performance measures to evaluate background investigators.	87.2	The SFPD should evaluate the overall background investigation process including the demographics of candidates interviewed and progressed for hiring decisions.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	04/09/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	A/Lt. Lloyd Martin & Celeste Berg
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	88	Gender, racial, and ethnic minority recruits were terminated at a higher rate from recruit training than White male recruits. Gender, racial, and minority candidates accounted for 68.1 percent of all recruit terminations.	88.1	The SFPD should conduct ongoing review and analysis of release rates and their impact on diversity and identify mitigation measures to support the success of diverse candidates.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/11/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Michael Nevin
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Training	88	Gender, racial, and ethnic minority recruits were terminated at a higher rate from recruit training than White male recruits. Gender, racial, and minority candidates accounted for 68.1 percent of all recruit terminations.	88.2	The SFPD should evaluate why recruits are failing and develop additional training mechanisms to assist recruits in successfully completing California POST requirements.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	03/15/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Michael Nevin & Lt. Mark Im
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Training	88	Gender, racial, and ethnic minority recruits were terminated at a higher rate from recruit training than White male recruits. Gender, racial, and minority candidates accounted for 68.1 percent of all recruit terminations.	88.3	The SFPD should evaluate whether orientation for recruits has positively impacted disproportionate termination rates related to Emergency Vehicle Operations Training failure. If not, the SFPD should identify other strategies to assist recruits.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	01/11/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Michael Nevin
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	88	Gender, racial, and ethnic minority recruits were terminated at a higher rate from recruit training than White male recruits. Gender, racial, and minority candidates accounted for 68.1 percent of all recruit terminations.	88.4	The SFPD should continually audit and review each phase of the hiring process to ensure there are no unintended consequences that limit the advancement of its diversity goals.	Immediate	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Christina Serrano



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	89	The SFPD lacks a strategic plan for diversity including recruitment, retention, and advancement. The SFPD is to be commended for its diversity in overall staffing.	89.1	As part of the Strategic Plan (recommendation 39.1), the SFPD should develop a comprehensive diversity strategic plan that articulates the department's vision and commitment to organization-wide diversity initiatives including recruiting, hiring, and retaining a diverse and high-performing workforce. For this recommendation, the diversity strategic plan should <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · identify specific diversity recruiting priorities that are informed by empirical data that identify areas of underrepresentation; · identify specific recruiting activities and targets for diversity recruiting emphasis; · establish specific responsibilities for implementing and supporting action items for diversity program staff; · establish performance measures to track progress, solidify commitment, and ensure accountability across the organization for diversity in all ranks and units. 	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/10/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Cmdr. Steve Ford
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	90	The SFPD does not have representative diversity within all its ranks in the organization, especially in the supervisory and leadership ranks. Through visible commitment to diversity at all ranks of the department, the SFPD can establish itself as a welcoming organization for all communities.	90.1	The SFPD should regularly and systematically capture and report the demographic composition of its supervisory, management, and senior leadership ranks to establish an ongoing mechanism to conduct comparative analyses against the overall workforce composition.	Low	Substantial Compliance	01/11/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Nicole Jones
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Leadership/ Management Culture	90	The SFPD does not have representative diversity within all its ranks in the organization, especially in the supervisory and leadership ranks. Through visible commitment to diversity at all ranks of the department, the SFPD can establish itself as a welcoming organization for all communities.	90.2	The SFPD should commit to ensuring transparency and diversity in key assignments predicated on advancing and developing a talented and diverse pool of leaders.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	09/10/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Leadership/ Management Culture	91	The promotion process is not transparent. The lack of transparency has created a level of distrust of the process in segments of the department.	91.1	The SFPD should increase the level of transparency of the promotion process and should clearly outline the qualifications required to advance for promotion.	Low	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	91	The promotion process is not transparent. The lack of transparency has created a level of distrust of the process in segments of the department.	91.2	The SFPD should consider providing feedback to unsuccessful candidates for promotion as a means of advancing institutional knowledge and performance improvement.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Community Policing	91	The promotion process is not transparent. The lack of transparency has created a level of distrust of the process in segments of the department.	91.3	The SFPD should ensure that there is diversity on the panel that oversees promotions and should consider adding community members or outside observers (or both) to the panel.	Medium	Substantial Compliance	08/05/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Leadership/ Management Culture	92	The SFPD does not require the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing as required reading for the promotional exam.	92.1	The SFPD should require the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing as reading for all promotions.	High	Substantial Compliance	07/10/20	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Leadership/ Management Culture	92	The SFPD does not require the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing as required reading for the promotional exam.	92.2	The SFPD needs to require this assessment report as reading for all promotions.	High	Substantial Compliance	05/18/20	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Capt. Paul Yep
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	Doctrine/ Policy Development	93	The SFPD's Police Employee Groups (PEG) have a perception that their input and contributions to the department are not seriously considered.	93.1	The SFPD and the Police Employee Groups should look for ways to better institutionalize and incorporate their input into department operations where appropriate. Opportunities may include using members of the PEGs to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · serve on department panels and committees; · help address issues of bias as part of the department's ongoing training by bringing forth their experience and perspective; · work as community ambassadors for community members or as recruiters for hiring; · address areas of institutional practices that could be considered biased. 	Low	Substantial Compliance	08/12/21	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Sgt. Cristina Franco



**2016 COLLABORATIVE REFORM INITIATIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING MATRIX
Status as of 3/10/23**

Objective Number & Title	Concept	Finding #	Findings	Rec #	Recommendations	Priority	Status	Substantial Compliance Date	Bureau	Findings Manager	Project Manager
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	94	The SFPD does not maintain, analyze, or use data to support and forecast human resource needs, including diversity staffing, succession, or basic demographics. The SFPD cannot readily identify basic demographic data on its employees or readily access training records, separation records, and other human resource data for analysis and development in the department.	94.1	The SFPD should identify its data needs for personnel and human resource analysis, including organizational diversity, succession and forecasting, training records, and separation data. The collection of data should allow the agency to conduct a barrier analysis.	Low	Substantial Compliance	05/28/20	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Nicole Jones & Celeste Berg
5 - Recruitment, Hiring, and Personnel Practices	IT/Data Business Processes	94	The SFPD does not maintain, analyze, or use data to support and forecast human resource needs, including diversity staffing, succession, or basic demographics. The SFPD cannot readily identify basic demographic data on its employees or readily access training records, separation records, and other human resource data for analysis and development in the department.	94.2	The SFPD should prioritize the personnel and human resource data to better inform and support management decisions and practices.	High	Substantial Compliance	05/28/20	Administration	Sgt. Gabe Rivera	Lt. Nicole Jones & Celeste Berg

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Fw: Woke and go broke
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 4:25:00 PM

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

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

From: Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS) <stephanie.cabrera@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:40 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Fw: Woke and go broke

From: barryminkin@earthlink.net <barryminkin@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 5:46 PM
To: letters sf chron <letters@sfchronicle.com>; Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS) <stephanie.cabrera@sfgov.org>; President <president@whitehouse.gov>; President@ucop.edu; President SJS <sjsupres@sjsu.edu>
Subject: FWD: Fw: Woke and go broke

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

Sent from EarthLink Mobile mail

On 3/14/23, 2:42 PM, Barry Minkin <barryminkin@earthlink.net> wrote:

-----Forwarded Message-----

From: <barryminkin@earthlink.net>

Sent: Mar 14, 2023 2:37 PM

To: Gavin Newsom <gavin@gavinnewsom.com>, sf gov <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, sf cron <letter@sfchronicle.com>, Rep. Zoe Lofgren <Zoe.LofgrenCA19@mail.house.gov>, <CA18AEima@mail.house.gov>, DNC Headquarters <democraticparty@democrats.org>, dem liars <info@alert.keepthehouseemails.com>, moveon <help@list.moveon.org>, MSNBC <letters@msnbc.com>, letters CNN <ireport@cnn.com>, LA times <kim.murphy@latimes.com>, SJ Mercury <letters@mercurynews.com>, Joe Simitian <supervisor.simitian@bos.sccgov.org>, AP <support@apnews.com>, upi pressreleases <pressreleases@upi.com>, sen cortese <SenatorDaveCortese@davecortese.com>, low <Assemblymember.Low@assembly.ca.gov>, let atlantic <letters@atlantic.com>, letters washpo <letters@washpost.com>, times <letters@nytimes.com>, Justice <AskDOJ@usdoj.gov>

Subject: Woke and go broke

These same failed woke dumbshit assholes support the idiotic reparations congame by the victimization and divisivity scumbag parasites.

PRIORITIES: SVB's moronic asshole executives have been criticized for supporting a string of left-leaning causes... [*Head of risk assessment at Silicon Valley Bank invested in LGBTQ programs in months leading up to shutdown .Sexual deviation,sex and color over meritocracy has dredged up the worst ,dumbest, executives in American history in business,media and government ! Read Brainwashed! America's Cultural Revolution for how this happened.*](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: END the Housing Eviction moratorium NOW! Unethical and wrong
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 9:11:00 AM

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

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

From: PHAEDRA FISHER <phaedrafisher@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 4:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: END the Housing Eviction moratorium NOW! Unethical and wrong

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

Hello SF Board of Supervisors

I have been a homeowner/resident of SF District 8 (Eureka Valley/Castro) since July 2007. As I live in my own house, I am neither a tenant nor a landlord, so I am approaching the question about the Eviction moratorium as a third party.

I believe we all need to do our part to fight for a society that is just and based on equal application of laws to all – regardless of race, religion, gender identity, etc. I would also say that equal application of laws also is in regards to other attributes, like one's profession or pretty much any other attribute you can think of. All people need to be treated as equals under the law. There should never be an exception of application of law to one group. This creates a divisive society where one group is

lobbying for advantage over another group. That is the opposite of a just and fair society where everyone is treated equally under the law.

The Eviction moratorium has resulted in San Francisco Tenants not making payments to their landlords for the housing they occupy. When the tenant signed the rental agreement for the property, they agreed to a contractual commitment to make regular payments to the landlord in exchange for the housing they occupy. Now the tenants are receiving this housing, but the landlords are not receiving the payments. The tenants are receiving the housing for free.

There are only two ways that an individual can acquire something for free:

1. A gift – Person A gives the good or service to Person B with no expectation of anything in return.
2. Theft – Person A has a good or service which they are ready to offer at a price to Person B, but Person B takes the good without making the payment.

The tenants signed rental agreements. Clearly the landlord was expecting to provide housing in exchange for payment. This payment has not happened. The tenants have stolen services from the landlords.

In normal circumstances, when the provider of a good or service experiences theft, they can turn to law enforcement to report the crime and expect that the law enforcement will attempt to identify the criminals and hold them accountable.

In the case of the Eviction moratorium, the landlords are experiencing theft. Yet they cannot turn to law enforcement for assistance, as the city is the one who is permitting this theft – AND is actively preventing the landlords from collecting the money due to them.

There are two types of Theft:

1. State is actively opposing Theft - The person who has experienced theft can turn to law enforcement to report the crime and expect that there will be an attempt to identify the criminals and hold them accountable.
2. State is actively SUPPORTING Theft - The person who has experienced theft has no recourse to hold the criminals accountable, because the theft is state sponsored. In fact the state is taking the side of the criminals who have stolen the goods or services.

State supported theft of services is also known as SLAVERY. If an individual is forced against their will to provide goods or services with no expectation of payment and no ability to change their employer, then this is SLAVERY.

The Housing Eviction Moratorium is effectively enslavement of the landlords to the tenants. They cannot expect payment, They cannot change their employer. They are required to provide services. This is unethical and wrong.

The San Francisco that I believe in would oppose all types of slavery in all its forms. And the San

Francisco I believe in would apply all laws equally regardless of any characteristics of the parties involved.

End the Housing Eviction Moratorium NOW!

Regards,

Phaedra Fisher

18th Street

San Francisco, CA 94114

From: [Hub Stackhouse](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please END all anti-homeowner/ anti-housing pandemic era eviction restrictions bankrupting homeowners
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 8:28:22 AM

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

As your constituents, my family and I are urging you to follow the example of Alameda County and the state and nation and immediately END all pandemic era anti-homeowner laws such as eviction moratoria today. Countless homeowners are being pushed into bankruptcy, foreclosure, and displacement by these extreme laws. These laws make our housing shortage infinitely worse. Please help us.

Sincerely,
Herbert
San Francisco

From: [Lisa Tsang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: End the EM
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 12:53:03 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

Please understand Mom & Pop landlords also need help! Our money did not fall from sky we work hard for it! Can you not get pay from work! We did not ask you to stay in our side but simply want help also and Justice! Thanks
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Item 29 on Adoption Without Reference to Committee Calendar: File No. 230278
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 4:46:14 PM
Attachments: [Open Space Comment - March 13 2023 CCDC AZ Signed.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached communication regarding Item No. 29 on tomorrow's Board agenda.

Item 29 - File No. 230278 - Urging the Recreation and Parks Department to Adopt Immediate Changes to its Acquisition Strategies to Serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill Neighborhoods

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh

Executive Assistant

Office of the Clerk of the Board

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Amy Zhou <amy.zhou@chinatowncdc.org>

Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 4:04 PM

To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>

Cc: bos-legislativeaides@sfgov.org; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Alisa.Somerra@sfgov.org; Rosa Chen <rosa.chen@chinatowncdc.org>; myeung@chinatowncdc.org; Matthias Mormino <matthias.mormino@chinatowncdc.org>; Soha Abdou <soha.agina@chinatowncdc.org>; Lily Li <lily.li@chinatowncdc.org>; Diana Pang <diana.pang@chinatowncdc.org>

Subject: Re: Item 29 on Adoption Without Reference to Committee Calendar: File No. 230278

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

Please find attached CCDC's public comment for the Item 29 on Adoption Without Reference to Committee Calendar: File No. 230278.

Best,

Amy

Amy Zhou (*she/they*) | **Senior Planner**

Community Planning Team

Chinatown Community Development Center

Tel: 415-984-2732

669 Clay Street | San Francisco, CA | 94111

Effective January 9, 2023, Chinatown CDC have relocated our administrative offices. Our new office is located at 615 Grant Ave, San Francisco CA 94108 (cross street California). Please update your records.



1525 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
TEL 415.984.1450
FAX 415.362.7992
TTY 415.984.9910
www.chinatowncdc.org

March 13, 2023

Board of Supervisors
C/O Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Suite #244
SF, CA 94102

Re: Item 29 on Adoption Without Reference to Committee Calendar: File No. 230278 –
Urging the Recreation and Parks Department to Adopt Immediate Changes to its Acquisition
Strategies to Serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and the Lower Nob Hill Neighborhoods

To the Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC), I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisors and the Recreation and Parks Department and its Commission to adopt flexible criteria for its acquisition of potential open space and green recreation, parklet and pocket park sites in the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill, including the prioritization of smaller parcels between 2,000 and 5,000 square feet. IF parcels must be smaller, the Board, Recreation and Parks Department, and the Commission should also ensure that they are thinking about a holistic approach that maximizes more parcels. CCDC also urges that considerable and progress be made by the end of the calendar year on the voter-mandated equity priorities in the Open Space Acquisition Plan.

CCDC is a place-based community development organization serving the Chinatown and North Beach neighborhoods but also the Tenderloin. We serve many roles: neighborhood advocates, organizer and planners, and crucially, developers and managers of affordable housing. Importantly, CCDC is proud to manage Tenderloin Family Housing (TFH) at 201 Turk St, a diverse community of 175 family apartments with over 500 residents. TFH includes people from all backgrounds: refugees, immigrants, Middle Eastern, Eastern European, Vietnamese, Chinese, Latinx, etc. **The adoption of this item reflects the overwhelming sentiment of many of our TFH residents: parks in the Tenderloin are the only consistently safe, clean, vibrant and family friendly open spaces in the neighborhood.**

Residents enjoy opportunities to engage with nature, but find it difficult to go to big parks in other parts of SF for various reasons, such as transportation difficulties, childcare needs, cost, or language barriers. Identifying small parcels in the Tenderloin and surrounding Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill are even more important to raise the quality of life and address equity in our densest areas. The criteria as it currently stands needs to be more flexible and incorporate more metrics that are inclusive of the many of the working class, senior and family residents living in the included areas. Current metrics as they stand do not accurately represent the urgent need for open space in the community.

When the 2017 Controller Performance Audit on the voter-mandated Prop B charter amendment created the “equity metrics” requirement for the property tax-set aside for Open Space Acquisition, it found that the department’s use of a single equity zone for all metrics completely obscured differences in access to resources between low-income and disadvantaged neighborhoods. While



1525 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
TEL 415.984.1450
FAX 415.362.7992
TTY 415.984.9910
www.chinatowncdc.org

Recreation and Parks uses several equity metrics for the zone as whole, different areas in the zone like Chinatown and the Mission have different levels of need. They do not distinguish between important criteria, like the density of low income seniors vs. transient workers or tourists. Consider that Chinatown Community Development Center has residents, many of whom are seniors, in the Larkin Pine Senior Building located at 1303 Larkin Street and 1370 California, and are not able to walk all the way up to Huntington Park, nor go to Sgt. Macaulay or Hyde/Turk Mini Park because those parks are targeted for kids instead of seniors. The COVID-19 pandemic also highlighted the immense need for neutral open space for convening safely with other community members, and emphasizes just how much these spaces are needed.

The Recreation and Parks Commission needs to implement metrics that take into account the needs and circumstances of the community on a granular level, including neighborhoods with zero parks. Consider that the Broker Contract actually does not allow the City to look at sites less than 10,000 square feet, which removes the ability to invest in many of the potential smaller pocket parks and community gardens crucial for our communities, like the Tenderloin National Forest in Cohen Alley.

In closing, CCDC urges the Board of Supervisors and the Recreation and Parks Department and its Commission to adopt flexible criteria for its acquisition of potential open space and green recreation, parklet and pocket park sites in the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill, including the prioritization of smaller parcels between 2,000 and 5,000 square feet in addition to thinking more strategically about the parcels if they must be smaller by design, and to make measurable and considerable progress on voter-mandated equity priorities in its Open Space Acquisition plan.

Yours Sincerely,

Amy Zhou

Amy Zhou
Senior Planner, Chinatown Community Development Center

CC: bos-legislativeaides@sfgov.org
Cc: Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org and Alisa.Somerra@sfgov.org

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS Legislation (BOS); Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: FW: Letter in Support of BOS Resolution for Acquisition of Open Space in the TL, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill Neighborhoods ***COMMITTEE FOR BETTER PARKS AND RECREATION IN CHINATOWN***
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:38:00 AM

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

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

From: Tan Chow <tandchow@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 7:39 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Allan Low <ALow@perkinscoie.com>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; myeung@chinatowncdc.org; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter in Support of BOS Resolution for Acquisition of Open Space in the TL, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill Neighborhoods ***COMMITTEE FOR BETTER PARKS AND RECREATION IN CHINATOWN***

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

華埠公園康樂會

Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown

VIA EMAIL

March 13, 2023

President Aaron Peskin
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
City Hall
San Francisco, California 94102

Re: Letter in Support of Board of Supervisors Resolution for Acquisition of Open Space in the Tenderloin, Lower Polk, and Lower Nob Hill Neighborhoods

Dear President Peskin,

The **Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown (CBPRC)** supports the Board of Supervisors Resolution “Urging the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to Adopt Immediate Changes to its Acquisition Strategies to Serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk, and Lower Nob Hill neighborhoods.”

Founded in 1969, Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown (CBPRC) has advocated for open space and recreation areas in Chinatown. Because of Chinatown’s high density, open space and parks are an especially important and a limited resource to our community. Our committee members have a long history of being engaged and active in the community processes in Chinatown including the renovation of many San Francisco Recreation and Park facilities and open spaces. Our members include volunteer architects, district council staff, community youth organizations, community childcare providers, and community members,

as well as staff from neighborhood service providers like Chinatown Community Development Center, Community Youth Center, and Self-Help for the Elderly.

CBPRC believes every resident in San Francisco should have access to parks and space and that access should be within a 15-minute walk from where they live. Guided by Recreation and Park's Equity Metrics and Analysis, the Tenderloin, Lower Polk, and Lower Nob neighborhoods are Equity Zones. These neighborhoods are some of the densest neighborhoods in San Francisco where open space is very limited creating one of the areas in San Francisco with the fewest parks per person. These neighborhoods are also one of the high need areas with residents of limited financial resources and priority should be given to the Tenderloin, Lower Polk, and Lower Nob Hill neighborhoods for equitable access to open space areas.

160328533.2

Letter in Support of
Board of Supervisors Resolution No. t
March 13, 2023
Page 2

CBPRC supports access to open space and playgrounds for all San Franciscans and asks the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to adopt immediate changes to its acquisition strategies to serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk, and Lower Nob Hill neighborhoods, specifically securing as many or more parcels as the larger RPD acquisitions invested in wealthier neighborhoods, even if it means acquiring small pocket park parcels.

CBPRC strongly requests the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to adopt the Resolution "Urging the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department to Adopt Immediate Changes to its Acquisition Strategies to Serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk, and Lower Nob Hill neighborhoods".

Sincerely,



Allan Low
on behalf of **Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown**

About CBPRC:

Founded in 1969, CBPRC is a community and volunteer based parks, recreational and community development advocacy group. Our mission is to protect, preserve and create open space, recreational programs and facilities for Chinatown. Our value is based in social and environmental justice and empowerment of our grassroots residents and community in shaping our open space needs and agenda. In the last decade, we have led the community effort and partner with the city and designers in rebuilding the Betty Ann Ong Chinese Rec Center, a new

restroom at Portsmouth Square, a new park at St Mary's Square, a new plaza park at the new Chinatown central subway station, rebuilding of the Willie Woo Wong Playground as well as advocating for CBPRC member organizations to operate and programming at Woh Hei Yuen, Willie Woo Wong Chinese Playground and Portsmouth Square clubhouses. The current Portsmouth Square redesign and visioning is the last piece yet most ambitious of our decade old Chinatown parks and recreation master plan.

160328533.2

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Implement A Place for All; fund affordable shelter and housing in the 2023-24 budget
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 9:04:00 AM

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

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

From: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:54 PM
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: <board@doloresheights.org> <board@doloresheights.org>; RescueSF <info@rescuesf.org>
Subject: Implement A Place for All; fund affordable shelter and housing in the 2023-24 budget

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



To the Board of Supervisors and Mayor London Breed:

Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC), a neighborhood organization, supported the passage of A PLACE FOR ALL (File # 220281). We now urge you to support a practical and affordable plan to implement the shelter and housing needed to enable unhoused people to exit the streets. This is not an end to homelessness. However, it's a much-needed first step on a path out of homelessness.

Everyday, we witness the tragedy of street sleeping with its often-related drug use. The winter rains and cold have only deepened the suffering on our streets. Our efforts at the neighborhood level have not been enough. We need you, our elected officials, to provide the 2023-24 budget funds for the shelter and housing placements needed to get people off the streets. This can be done more quickly and more affordably than the \$1.4 billion HSH plan.

We will be following the Committee of the Whole hearing on March 21 and watching for your support on this. We need shelter using affordable cost models and rapid methods.

Thank you

Carolyn Kenady
Chair, Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC)

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
<http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady>

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Operations](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: POTENTIAL COMPROMISE for BOS Agenda Item #11 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees] File #221008
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:33:00 AM

Regarding File No. 221008.

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

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

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 6, 2023 2:01 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; Thornhill, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.thornhill@sfgov.org>; Bell, Tita (BOS) <Tita.Bell@sfgov.org>; madison.tam@sfgov.org; Timony, Simon (BOS) <Simon.Timony@sfgov.org>; Charles Head <charlesnhead@hotmail.com>
Subject: FW: POTENTIAL COMPROMISE for BOS Agenda Item #11 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees] File #221008

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

TO: Board of Supervisors members

The proposed text of this legislation cites cost and length of meetings.

Verbal comments at the Rules Committee on February 6, 2023 by the sponsor of the proposed legislation cited JFK Drive and the Redistricting Task Force meetings as examples of overly long meetings.

More recently, the sponsor of the proposed legislation has cited public comment by non-residents.

There is a potential compromise.

As I stated during public comment at the Rules Committee on February 6, 2023, the BOS could issue public comment call-in cards.

These cards would function in a manner similar to library cards.

The person would file an application for a BOS public comment call-in card.

That application would include a proof of residency e.g. a driver's license or a PG&E bill.

That application would be verified for accuracy.

Once verified, a public comment call-in card would be issued with a unique id.

When entering in public comment call-in queue, the commenter would also provide their unique id number.

Eileen Boken,
State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: aebooken <aebooken@gmail.com>

Date: 3/3/23 7:24 PM (GMT-08:00)

To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>, BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>

Subject: FW: Strongly OPPOSING BOS Agenda Item #11 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote

Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees] File #221008

TO: Board of Supervisors members

Repeating strong opposition to this legislation.

Eileen Boken

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: aebooken <aebooken@gmail.com>

Date: 2/26/23 9:35 PM (GMT-08:00)

To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>, BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>

Subject: Strongly OPPOSING Rules Committee Agenda Item #5 and BOS Agenda Item #30 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees] File #221008

TO: Board of Supervisors Rules Committee and members

In strong opposition to this legislation.

On Tuesday February 21, 2023, the winds at Ocean Beach were clocked between 68 and 73 miles per hour.

The next day there was heavy rain, hail and thunder.

One would think that the City would be more interested in protecting the public from the extreme weather events caused by human-induced climate change, not less, by continuing remote public comment.

This legislation cites costs and length of meetings but fails to quantify them.

At the February 6, 2023 meeting of the Rules Committee, the sponsor verbally cited JFK Drive and redistricting as additional reasons for this legislation.

Powerful and well connected special interests turned out to support the permanent closure of JFK Drive although most did not state their affiliation.

The redistricting process was highly controversial with allegations of gerrymandering.

The entire rationale for this legislation is questionable if not disingenuous.

Eileen Boken

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: LOR Tracey Mixon File No. 230154
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 12:29:00 PM
Attachments: [LOR_TraceyMixon.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached regarding Tracey Mixon for seats 5, 6, and 7 for the Homelessness Oversight Commission.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184 | (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@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: Kate Robinson <kate@tlcbd.org>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 11:11 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: LOR Tracey Mixon

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

Hello Supervisors.

Please see the attached Letter of Support for Tracey Mixon.
Thank you,

Kate Robinson | Executive Director

Pronouns: She | Her | Hers | [why pronouns matter](#)

Tenderloin Community Benefit District

512 Ellis St. | 415.292.4812 | tlcbd.org

....A Vibrant Community For All

March 10, 2023


Dear Supervisors,

I have personally and professionally gained so much strength from working with Tracey Mixon; she is a true leader in the communities she serves. Tracey embodies servant leadership, dedication, and collaboration, and she uses her lived experiences to both represent and improve the lives of unhoused individuals in San Francisco. For these reasons and many more, I highly recommend Tracey for the Homelessness Oversight Commission.

Tracey worked for several years as a TLCBD Safe Passage Corner Captain when I was the program director. She is an advocate through and through - always modeling for others that lifting others up improves your own life in addition to the ones you serve. Tracey works tirelessly for families experiencing homelessness, as she experienced it firsthand. She brings true empathy and intelligence to her work and is a critical voice to represent her community.

Please consider me a reference if you have any questions regarding Tracey's experience and character. You will be inspired.

Thank you for your consideration,



Kate Robinson

Executive Director of TLCBD

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: JFK
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 11:56:00 AM

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

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

From: christine chiang <christine.chiang.497635970@p2a.co>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 10:17 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: JFK

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

A compromise for John F. Kennedy Drive was reached in 2007 that allowed all users of Golden Gate Park to share the roads. It is time to reopen JFK Drive back to the way it was before COVID. The select few that are the most vocal are doing us all a disservice that want a reasonable compromise.

Please reopen JFK Drive like it was before COVID!

Regards,
christine chiang
Moraga, CA 94556

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: LPCBD Support Resolution 230278 (Parks-Peskin) Adoption w/o Committee Reference
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:23:59 PM
Attachments: [LPCBD Parks Letter BOS Peskin Res.pdf](#)

From: Chris Schulman <cschulman@lowerpolkcbd.org>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 5:28 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>
Subject: LPCBD Support Resolution 230278 (Parks-Peskin) Adoption w/o Committee Reference

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

Clerk Calvillo and Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter of support from the Lower Polk Community Benefit District in support of Resolution 230238 [Urging the Recreation and Parks Department to Adopt Immediate Changes to its Acquisition Strategies to Serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill Neighborhoods.]

Regards,

Chris Schulman
Executive Director
Lower Polk Community Benefit District
www.lowerpolkcbd.org
415-827-0650 cell



March 13, 2023

Board of Supervisors
C/O Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Suite #244
SF, CA 94102

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

The Lower Polk Community Benefit District is writing to express our strong support for Resolution 230278 [Urging the Recreation and Parks Department to Adopt Immediate Changes to its Acquisition Strategies to Serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill Neighborhoods.]

The Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill areas are densely populated neighborhoods that lack adequate open space and green recreation areas. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of outdoor spaces for mental and physical health, and the lack of such spaces in these neighborhoods has become even more pressing.

These neighborhoods are populated with low income residents, seniors, persons with disabilities and others who will benefit mentally and physical from parks and open space nearby. At the same time, many of these individuals are unable to travel distances to parks in neighboring areas and nearby parks and open space are a necessity, not a luxury.

The resolution calls for the Recreation and Parks Department and its Commission to adopt flexible criteria for the acquisition of potential open space and green recreation areas in these neighborhoods. Specifically, the resolution prioritizes smaller parcels of 2,000 square feet to 5,000 square feet that would not require years of demolition and construction. This approach would allow for a more strategic and holistic approach to open space acquisition that maximizes the number of parcels available, even if they must be necessarily smaller by design. The community supports this approach.

Furthermore, the resolution urges the Recreation and Parks Department to make considerable progress by the end of this calendar year on the voter-mandated equity priorities in its Open Space Acquisition plan. This is an important step towards ensuring that these neighborhoods receive the necessary resources to create more equitable and accessible open spaces.

We strongly believe that adopting these flexible criteria and prioritizing smaller parcels is



a critical step towards addressing the lack of open space in these neighborhoods. We urge you to vote YES on this on this resolution as soon as possible to urge to the department to make considerable progress towards the voter-mandated plan.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Chris Schulman
Executive Director



From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:51:00 AM

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

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

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Victoria via San Francisco Baykeeper
Sent: Sunday, March 12, 2023 7:40 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills

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

To: Mayor London Breed
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

This summer, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal." It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Victoria Pletsch
San Jose, CA

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Na, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please keep/reinstate mask mandates in public settings
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 9:17:00 AM

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

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Michelle Fiesta <michellefiesta@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:59 AM
Subject: Please keep/reinstate mask mandates in public settings

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

Hello,

I am emailing because I am growing increasingly concerned about the lack of mask mandates in public settings, like public transportation, hospitals, grocery stores, etc. My partner and I are immunocompromised, and the decrease of these important accommodations are severely limiting our ability to live full lives.

Research shows that one-way masking—even with N95s—is not effective when others nearby inside are unmasked. Masks work best when everyone wears them. (For more information, please see this 2/15/22 Slate article titled “Why One-Way Masking Isn’t a Very Good Public Health Solution” <[https://url.avanan.click/v2/https://slate.com/technology/2022/02/one-way-masking-coronavirus-protection-vulnerable.html?__YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzozZjkwYjJjNjM2ZGY3Mzc2ZjU5ZWFmN2M0OTJkZmZkNzo2OjV1YjM6NWMyNmIYzUwMDA3YTQyNTgweOGlzMWRzITk0NjgkMzBiNjkwNjFjNjI4YWFhZmZlYjM3NDY3MGI4NDg1ZTpoOIQ>](https://url.avanan.click/v2/https://slate.com/technology/2022/02/one-way-masking-coronavirus-protection-vulnerable.html?__YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzozZjkwYjJjNjM2ZGY3Mzc2ZjU5ZWFmN2M0OTJkZmZkNzo2OjV1YjM6NWMyNmIYzUwMDA3YTQyNTgweOGlzMWRzITk0NjgkMzBiNjkwNjFjNjI4YWFhZmZlYjM3NDY3MGI4NDg1ZTpoOIQ>”>

We don't want to risk getting long COVID, which can affect anyone—it affects about 5–30% of people who contract the virus, including many fully vaccinated and boosted people. For a summary of a study that suggests that even fully vaccinated people who get COVID are at significant risk of getting long COVID, please see the 6/1/22 Salon article titled, “Vaccines reduce risk of long Covid by just 15 percent, study finds” <[https://url.avanan.click/v2/https://www.salon.com/2022/06/01/vaccines-reduce-risk-of-long-by-just-15-percent-study-finds/?__YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzozZjkwYjJjNjM2ZGY3Mzc2ZjU5ZWFmN2M0OTJkZmZkNzo2OjV1YjM6NWMyNmIYzUwMDA3YTQyNTgweOGlzMWRzITk0NjgkMzBiNjkwNjFjNjI4YWFhZmZlYjM3NDY3MGI4NDg1ZTpoOIQ>](https://url.avanan.click/v2/https://www.salon.com/2022/06/01/vaccines-reduce-risk-of-long-by-just-15-percent-study-finds/?__YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzozZjkwYjJjNjM2ZGY3Mzc2ZjU5ZWFmN2M0OTJkZmZkNzo2OjV1YjM6NWMyNmIYzUwMDA3YTQyNTgweOGlzMWRzITk0NjgkMzBiNjkwNjFjNjI4YWFhZmZlYjM3NDY3MGI4NDg1ZTpoOIQ>”>

Masks are a simple, effective way to protect our community from COVID spread, and is the best way to accommodate immunocompromised community members. Literally nothing else the ADA requires matters to us if we can't exist in our community without risking long-term illness and disability.

Please keep/reinstate mask mandates in public settings. We are worried about doing even basic, important things, like getting a physical checkup or going to the dentist. THIS SHOULD NOT BE HOW SAN FRANCISCO TACKLES THIS ONGOING PANDEMIC.

Thank you,

Michelle Fiesta (zip code 94114)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Take Action to Address Unintended Impacts, re: expiration of the PHE
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:07:00 PM

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

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

From: Criage Lynnette Althage <cl-althage@neiu.edu>
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:41 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Take Action to Address Unintended Impacts, re: expiration of the PHE

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

Supervisors ,

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Mayor London Breed,

We write to urge you to take immediate action to address the numerous and significant impacts that the expiration of the Public Health Emergency (PHE) will have on San Franciscans and the greater Bay Area at a time when our most vulnerable community members continue to struggle. These impacts will exacerbate existing regional challenges and jeopardize tenuous progress on core issues of public interest such as public safety, access to medical services, displacement and homelessness, food insecurity, and wealth

inequality, while hamstringing progress on disability, environmental, and racial justice.

Although we understand that our collective actions, bolstered by your leadership and the very-best science, have brought us to a “new normal”, allowing for some restrictions to be lifted as the threat from SARS-CoV-2, the novel coronavirus behind the COVID-19 pandemic improves, certain protections must remain in place to prevent a devastating surge in evictions, limitations in medical services, and increased risk for infections, especially for the most vulnerable members of our community. This letter is also an invitation to join with us to work together to protect our Beloved City and Bay Area Community.

Without your intervention, the effects of an abrupt end to the public health emergency and its embedded protections, will fall particularly on vulnerable populations who have already been disproportionately impacted by the pandemic – including people with disabilities, older adults, low-income households, people of color, people facing housing insecurity and food insecurity, artists, working families, LGBTQIA+ folks, people with chronic illness, immigrants, children, and our essential workers. We urge the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Mayor London Breed to take the immediate following actions:

Support ongoing monitoring and reporting of Bay Area SARS-Cov-2 presence in wastewater, cases, hospitalizations and deaths;

Extend eviction protections one final time, through January 31, 2024, while developing and implementing an equity-charged “Recover and Prosper without Displacement” off-ramp strategy to prevent a mass surge in homelessness;

Continue universally masked access in healthcare settings, and promote universally masked access to indoor or crowded public spaces and schools to protect and shield medically vulnerable individuals, who will still require increased public health protection to prevent serious illness or death, thus protecting their inherent right to accessible spaces and not undermining progress made through groundbreaking laws like the ADA;

Work with us to develop a “Public Space, Public Air, Personal Choice” sunshine ordinance that requires and supports upgrades to measure and disclose CO2 levels in public spaces. Just as radar speed signs calm traffic and reduce harm this public disclosure will safeguard access to public spaces while providing transparent unfettered public access to data to facilitate personal liberties in decision-making;

Commit funds to support a public education effort to inform people of their rights while also helping at-risk community clients to access local nonprofits that support families on their way to recovery from pandemic-related setbacks;

Create, in advance, transparent criteria to recognize, monitor and communicate to the public the presence of any new variants of concern or of any possible surges in infection with specific thresholds for reinstating recommended public health protections, first voluntarily, then on a mandatory basis;

Bolster and fund established and emergent community leaders and multi-stakeholder efforts to address homelessness, displacement, and other forms of inequity in San Francisco. Multi-stakeholder platforms have the power to amplify communications from the

frontline to provide ongoing and critical information and avert distress; and
Commit to meeting with us and make it possible to hold a public summit with our “San Francisco United in Equity for a Just Recovery” coalition to discuss these and other concerns and lay the groundwork for a truly inspired collaboration that will meet the challenges of the moment.

Already over 1.12 million people in the United States died from SARS-CoV-2 representing nearly 20% of total global deaths, despite the US being only 4% of the global population. Our disproportionate burden exposed flaws in society jeopardizing the very promise of the American Dream. California was the bright spot in the USA’s pandemic response: following the science early on and creating a data-informed response that took into account not just the virus but also social determinants of health and systems that harm we’re all working to dismantle. That shining spot of our response was made possible by the 7 counties coming together to act quickly, decisively, and in concert with one another in the face of an imminent threat. Despite differences, we acted as one. No doubt their actions saved us from the realities of refrigerator trucks, mass graves, and paupers’ cemeteries overflowing with the dead that we saw in places like New York City and El Paso, Texas.

As we worked together to lead the nation in a strategy to address the virus, this is an invitation to work together to lead the nation in a strategy that ensures a more equitable and just response to the challenges of recovery. Now that the public health emergency is officially ending, we must focus on maintaining crucial and effective policy shields, such as the continuation of masking in healthcare settings, and pandemic-related moratoria, to name just two, in order to build on the hard work and strong foundation of knowledge our city has acquired since March 2020.

The people and reputation of San Francisco – as a shining example of equity, justice, community, and as a leader of innovation in a changing world – is in our hands.

Thank you.

Criage Lynnette Althage
cl-althage@neiu.edu
6554 S. Bishop St.
Chicago , Illinois 60636

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: FW: San Francisco Parklets
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:13:00 PM
Attachments: [Image001.png](#)

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

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

From: Richard Skaff <richardskaff1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:47 AM
To: Richard Skaff <richardskaff1@gmail.com>
Cc: District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>; California Department of Justice <PIU.PIU@doj.ca.gov>
Subject: San Francisco Parklets

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

How many more years will San Francisco permit inaccessible Parklets? And, not only is the Parklets in the following photo inaccessible to those who use wheelchairs, the City has allowed this particular Parklets to remain on the sidewalk, blocking almost all of the sidewalk!



And, given the overwhelming proliferation of Parklets throughout California, many of which remain inaccessible to people with disabilities, I wonder if and when the State Architect will develop California Building Code, Title 24 standards that will assure all Parklets are fully accessible?

A copy of this email is also being sent to the San Francisco District Attorney's Office. I wonder if DA Brooke Jenkins will do anything about this flagrant violation of both state and federal disability rights requirements.

https://sfstandard.com/arts-culture/despite-nasty-weather-and-fees-most-restaurants-plan-to-keep-their-parklets/?utm_source=The+San+Francisco+Standard&utm_campaign=696dbfd615-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2022_06_21_02_54_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_f81e82e2a3-696dbfd615-528156085

Richard Skaff, Executive Director
Designing Accessible Communities
Email: richardskaff1@gmail.com
Cell: 707-755-1681

"Get in good trouble, necessary trouble, and redeem the soul of America"

A statement made by civil rights leader, John Lewis.

"Fighting Hate,

Teaching Tolerance,

Seeking Justice" | The

Southern Poverty Law Center

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Nick Berg on Twitter: "The biggest lie in SF is that the folks we see on the streets are low income earning San Franciscans that couldn't keep up with rent increases. I have friends that got priced out of SF. They moved to Vallejo & Concord. N...
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:16:00 AM
Attachments: [PDF document.pdf](#)

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

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

From: k miller <kevmill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:11 PM
To: Bolen, Jennifer M.(BOS) <jennifer.m.bolen@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Nick Berg on Twitter: "The biggest lie in SF is that the folks we see on the streets are low income earning San Franciscans that couldn't keep up with rent increases. I have friends that got priced out of SF. They moved to Vallejo & Concord. N..."

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

Hi.

Please checkout this Twitter site . I'm not on it but it appears many citizens are contributing and are offering comments . The number of citizens opposed to the city governments ideas and failed plans

is growing . People are increasingly concerned and disappointed.

They are ready for a change and not buying the propaganda from City Hall .

Voting is favoring a change of those who are currently elected who took an oath and are not answering to the calls of their constituents.

Please be open to the truth and please act to change the failures .

The PowerPoints, meetings and promises are not effective .

The drug addiction and sales is the number one cause for homeless on the streets in San Francisco .

It is not due to cost of housing or jobs .

Sincerely , KMiller

Begin forwarded message:

From: k miller <kevmill@yahoo.com>

Date: March 14, 2023 at 9:58:57 PM CDT

To: realistic one <menging.tang@gmail.com>

Subject: Nick Berg on Twitter: "The biggest lie in SF is that the folks we see on the streets are low income earning San Franciscans that couldn't keep up with rent increases. I have friends that got priced out of SF. They moved to Vallejo & Concord. NONE downsized to a tent on the sidewalk in the Loin.

[https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://t.co/qlw82Xy80d"___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzowMmUwY2U5NGMxMzJkMGQ1YTRmNjNjMwVhMjdkZWQ4MDo2OjJmMDg6MzQxOTc0NWZODIwODgzZjI5YjM3MjQyMTgzZjVmYTVmYzI1ZjNiNThlOTIhMGViNjJmMjFIMTBmODZkNGUzYzYp0OIQ](https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://t.co/qlw82Xy80d); / Twitter

https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://twitter.com/NickBergSF/status/1633688654198751232___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzowMmUwY2U5NGMxMzJkMGQ1YTRmNjNjMwVhMjdkZWQ4MDo2OmNjNGE6N2E2NzY2MDU4MzNkMGQ5OWQ1NDJlYmUwYzY2M4NjIhYTc3ZGRiYjY0YWVhMDUwZGY0MTA3OWQyOGRiNWVlZmMwOTp0OIQ



Q Search Twitter



Log in

Use app



Sharkyl @Sharkyl · Mar 9

Replying to @NickBergSF

Part of the issue seems to be you hear the word “homeless” and you think of the people in the biggest picture. In SF is that the folks we see on the streets are low income earning San Franciscoans that people who keep hoping with rent increases the people in your picture.



Nick Berg @NickBergSF · Mar 9

Replying to @Sharkyl

And some of the people who look like the people in your picture actually have homes. Friends that got priced out of SF. They moved to Vallejo & Concord. NONE of them lived in a tent on the sidewalk in the LoIn.

100% agree. Henceforth, I will be referring to folks like those pictured as “public campers”, not as “homeless people”.

9 71 4,633

Show replies



SoMa Artist SF @SomaArtistsSF · Mar 9

Replying to @NickBergSF

I am one of the SF “street folk” you speak of.


- I lived in the bay area for many years, SF for 1+ year.
- I do not have a drug habit.
- I lost my job in Biotech in early Feb '23 and became unhoused shortly after.

I do not deserve MORE respect than other “street folk”.

10:38 PM

202 Retv






Nick Berg  @NickBergSF · Mar 9

Replying to @SomaArtistSF

It's not that you deserve more respect. But, surely you can understand that it's hard enough for San Francisco to provide a social safety net for its own residents. It is economically infeasible for us to house folks from around the nation.



[Show replies](#)



CR @NamkuzuNiggina · Mar 9

Replying to @NickBergSF

Open question to debate:

Would legalization of production, distribution and consumption of all recreational drugs, making them legal tax paying economical activities, help us deal with the drug crisis?

I think it would. Please feel free to chime in



From: [Bullock, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding Community Based Ambassador Program
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:38:00 PM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding Community Based Ambassador Program.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 Letters Regarding Community Based Ambassador Program.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Info CBD](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Letter of Support for Community-based Ambassador programs
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:20:58 PM
Attachments: [CC Ambassador letter March 8.pdf](#)

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

Dear Supervisors:

Community-based Ambassador programs are essential to public safety in Civic Center and throughout the downtown core.

Our private, non-profit organization currently operates a privately-funded, public safety Ambassador program. To meet current demands for service we contract with two organizations for personnel: StreetPlus and Urban Alchemy.

Civic Center itself is home to thousands of local residents, educational institutions and businesses; it is also home to numerous City, State and Federal office buildings which serve residents from all over San Francisco, the Bay Area and Northern California.

The District is also part of the City's vital downtown core currently battling unprecedented challenges post-pandemic such as: the loss of positive pedestrian foot traffic, vacant storefronts, drug dealing, open air drug use, property crime and illegal vending.

The nationwide shortage of law enforcement personnel - felt acutely in San Francisco - has left the Civic Center community and its seat of government at great risk of becoming increasingly more unsafe, unwelcoming, and unable to model the level of public safety required in the dense downtown core and beyond.

Until such time as our City's law enforcement staffing is replenished, more responsibility will fall on community-based programs to provide what support they can. While Ambassadors are not a substitute for law enforcement, their presence does serve to deter anti-social behaviors and provide a crucial resource for communities.

Please do everything in your power to ensure community Ambassador programs remain; and that they remain adequately supported by City services, namely our Police and Fire Departments, Public Works and the Department of Public Health.

Respectfully,
The Civic Center Community Benefit District



March 8, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Pl #244,
San Francisco, CA 94102
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors:

Community-based Ambassador programs are essential for public safety in Civic Center and throughout the downtown core.

Our private, non-profit organization currently operates a privately-funded, public safety Ambassador program. To meet the current demand for service we contract with two organizations for personnel: StreetPlus and Urban Alchemy.

Civic Center itself is home to thousands of local residents, educational institutions and businesses; it is also home to numerous City, State and Federal office buildings which serve residents from all over San Francisco, the Bay Area and Northern California.

The District is also part of the City's vital downtown core currently battling unprecedented challenges post-pandemic such as: the loss of positive pedestrian foot traffic, vacant storefronts, drug dealing, open air drug use, property crime and illegal vending.

The nationwide shortage of law enforcement personnel - felt acutely in San Francisco - has left the Civic Center community and its seat of government at great risk of becoming increasingly more unsafe, unwelcoming, and unable to model the level of public safety required in the dense downtown core and beyond.

Until such time as our City's law enforcement staffing is replenished, more responsibility will fall on community-based programs to provide what support they can. While Ambassadors are not a substitute for law enforcement, their presence does serve to deter anti-social behaviors and provide a crucial resource for communities.

Please do everything in your power to ensure community Ambassador programs remain; and that they remain adequately supported by City services, namely our Police and Fire Departments, Public Works and the Department of Public Health.

Respectfully,
The Civic Center Community Benefit District

From: [Info Info](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SUPPORT FOR DOWNTOWN AMBASSADOR PROGRAMS
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:08:51 PM
Attachments: [MMCBD Ambassador letter March 8.pdf](#)

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

Hello and thank you very much for distributing this to the individual Board members.



Mid Market Community Benefit District is a privately-funded 501c3 not-for-profit organization that works in tandem with City agencies to enhance the Mid Market public realm.

March 5, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Pl #244,
San Francisco, CA 94102

Via email: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors:

We write this letter in support of additional funding for community ambassador programs in Mid Market and throughout downtown San Francisco.

Mid Market CBD's privately-funded ambassador program has operated since 2007, and over the years we have welcomed and worked alongside new ambassador groups such as the City's OCEIA ambassadors, the Mid Market Foundation's Urban Alchemy personnel, and SF Travel's Downtown Welcome Ambassadors. The addition of so many ambassador programs in recent years is evidence of the need and their effectiveness.

While many neighborhoods throughout San Francisco are experiencing challenges related to crime, homelessness and drug abuse - none suffer more than the Mid Market/Tenderloin area.

Public realm problems downtown which existed pre-pandemic are now exponentially worse due to:

- Fentanyl production, distribution, and consumption;
- Property crime and illegal street vending (often to afford drugs);
- Loss of pedestrian foot traffic, resulting in the availability of public space for illegal activity;
- Loss of active retail storefronts, also providing space for vandalism, loitering and illegal activity;
- Drug dealers and users pushed from the Tenderloin into Mid Market during the Emergency Declaration;
- Insufficient shelter space for the homeless;
- Insufficient mental health treatment options;
- Insufficient drug addiction treatment options;
- Insufficient compulsory care for the mentally ill and drug addicted;
- Insufficient law enforcement personnel;
- Insufficient enforcement of laws.

While community ambassadors are no replacement for authorized law enforcement personnel – and in fact can not intervene with illegal activity - they are more important than ever for making pedestrians feel as safe and comfortable as possible.

We must also make sure the ambassadors themselves are as safe and comfortable as possible in their difficult and often dangerous work environment. Without sufficient back-up from City agencies, namely SFPD, ambassadors must increasingly rely on one another to ensure their own safety.

Please support downtown ambassador programs now; and work expeditiously to restore law enforcement capacity so we may once again have safe and civil streets in our downtown core and throughout San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Mid Market Community Benefit District

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 3 Letters From Monica D Regarding Various Subjects
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:45:00 PM
Attachments: [3 Letters From Monica D Regarding Various Subjects.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 3 Letters From Monica D Regarding Various Subjects.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

From: Monica D
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); StefanStaff (BOS); Deskin_Aaron (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); Preston_Dean (BOS); DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Ronen_Hillary; Walton_Shamann (BOS); Safai_Absha (BOS); Bried_Mayor London (MYR); SFPD_Chief (POL); District Attorney (DAT)
Subject: Re: Public Safety
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:10:57 AM

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

Another one of your criminals! Bring back the mugshots! And this better be charged with enhancement of "Asian hate crime!"
~infuriated & fed-up Asian SF taxpayer

00:03 




Instagram 



Henry K. Lee 
@henrykleeKTVU

12yo boy arrested on suspicion of attempted murder in unprovoked stabbing of 15yo boy on @SFMTA_Muni bus near Stockton & Sutter, per @SFPD @SFPDCentral, adding suspect also booked for unrelated robbery & stabbing. Bus victim recovering from life-threatening injury





Liked by jackfroot and 368 others

sfstreets415 12 yr old Black kid tries to murder 15 yr old Asian teen on a Muni bus in San Francisco that was going from Chinatown to Union Square. Stay safe Asian community in San Francisco Bay Area! The Asian community is targeted every day by thugs and thugettes.

Local media reporters are asking us if they can speak to the victim but he is currently recovering and needs his rest. We are glad he's alive and that another Asian family didn't have to mourn their son.

sfstreets415 will continue to look for his health



3:22



twitter.com — Private

← Tweet

Open app

Replying to @GavinNewsom

You. Are. Not. Pro. Life
You're killing CA.
And we keep having to fight to not get killed or
murdered in CA.
~angry fed-up SF taxpayer



cbsnews.com

San Francisco Muni riders concerned about their
safety

From: [Monica D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#)
Subject: Re: Graffiti
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 4:39:13 PM
Attachments: [hLRJ1GG_y0J.ico](#)

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

To City Hall,

Have you driven around SF? Because it looks like a third-world country with all the graffiti, especially Hillary Ronen's district. DEPRESSING and UNINVITING!

How do you sleep at night when penalizing hard-working business owners while protecting and coddling YOUR criminals? I thought Stefani proposed that businesses are no longer responsible for your criminals' graffiti?

UNBELIEVABLE! Mark my word, there will be a civil war, if not a class action lawsuit by business and property taxpayers against the City Hall, and you will be the talk of the nation, and the world!

Graffiti taggers are attacking SF Chi... -
Leanna Louie
[facebook.com](#)



Infuriated SF taxpayer

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SF Artist Attacked
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:59:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Monica D regarding an artist who was attacked.


Sincerely,

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

From: Monica D <mdsf94107@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:58 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; SFPD, Chief (POL) <sfpdchief@sfgov.org>; District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: SF Artist Attacked

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

An unhoused artist named Jaz whom I used to pass by everyday on my way to work downtown from where I live in South Beach was attacked on his head by YOUR criminals (by now we know who amongst the BoS are against public safety)! Not only did he lose his teeth, but this is also his second traumatic brain injury! It is maddening what is happening in our city! This is a person who never bothered anyone nor asked anyone for money, and who just tried to make a living through his ART! Why is he NOT housed, and why are the disruptive ones who shoot up drugs all day while using the system to have taxpayers money fund their habits are housed??? Why are the 140 non-profits squandering our money??? WE, TAXPAYERS, NEED ANSWERS!





[Help the SF Artist & Musician Attacked on 2nd St.](#)
[organized by Shelley Costantini](#)
gofundme.com

Angry and fed-up SF taxpayer

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 3 Letters From Wynship Hillier
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:46:00 PM
Attachments: [3 Letters From Wynship Hillier.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 3 Letters From Wynship Hillier.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

From: [Wynship Hillier](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kunins, Hillary \(DPH\)](#); [DPH-San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission](#); [SOTF, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Communication
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:39:09 PM
Attachments: [BHC Meeting Locations II.pdf](#)

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

Dear Madam, Mx., or Sir:

Please forward this message to all Supervisors and add the attached letter to the communications packet for the next meeting of the Board.

Very truly yours,
Wynship Hillier

Wynship W. Hillier, M.S.
3562 20th Street, Apartment 22
San Francisco, California 94110
(415) 505-3856
wynship@hotmail.com

March 15, 2023

Aaron Peskin, Chair
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, California 94102

Sent via email to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

RE: THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SERVICES MUST ACT SWIFTLY IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT NO FURTHER REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION OR ITS COMMITTEES ARE HELD ILLEGALLY OR CANCELLED DUE TO NOTICING DEADLINES AND OTHER LEGAL REQUIREMENTS.

Honorable Chair Peskin:

Contrary to what I said in my previous letter on this subject dated Mar. 13, the Behavioral Health Commission has appx. one week to act. I had neglected to take into account the eighth sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.6(f), which requires 15 days' notice for a special meeting to be held at a different address than that at which regular meetings of the policy body are held. Regular meetings of the Commission and its Executive Committee had been held at 1380 Howard St. immediately prior to the state of emergency, though without a motion setting the place for regular meetings of either of these bodies at this location having been passed pursuant to *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a). The next regular meeting of the Executive Committee is set for April 11. It must be noticed by April 7. By that afternoon, then, the location for it must have been decided by motion and vote at a special meeting of the Commission or, acting on behalf of the Commission, a special meeting of its Executive Committee. 15 days prior to April 7 is Mar. 23, appx. one week away, by which time the special meeting must be noticed, including its physical location. If the special meeting is to be held somewhere at 1380 Howard St., then the meeting may be noticed as late as Apr. 4, at a time of day no later than that at which the special meeting is to be held three days later, at the latest.

The notice for the special meeting must contain all or a reasonable selection of possible physical locations for regular meetings of the Commission and each of its standing or advisory committees as it directs or has directed to meet regularly (as well as any advisory committees that are policy bodies that it directs to meet regularly, through *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5). (My formulation of this rule in my previous letter was also incorrect.) *Id.* § 67.7(a) (second sentence) (“Agendas shall specify, for each item of business, the proposed action or a statement [that] the item is for discussion only.”) That the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force does not abide by this rule in its own agendas is of no account. The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force appears to have set themselves up as a super-legislature over the Board of Supervisors and written this sentence out of the law through their own practice. Not even their explicit decisions are binding upon boards, commissions, or agencies in San Francisco, and their omission does not in any way affect the validity of this law. The Behavioral Health Commission must abide by it, and each physical location must appear on the agenda with each security setup available at each location. Behavioral Health Services must not exclude any location or level of security from the list as inadequate. They may appear at the hearing and argue against any location-security combination(s) on the list that they wish. (Any committees for which a time for regular meetings has not been set may also have their time for regular meetings set by this method, or meetings for which times for regular meetings have been set may have them changed with the requisite 2/3 majority vote.)

Because members of the Behavioral Health Commission are not adept at using parliamentary procedure, it is highly likely that a single member at the special meeting would be able to determine the choice by moving one of the options on the agenda. It might be an alternative that only this member wants. If that alternative is voted down, then there will be no physical meeting space for regular meetings of the body(ies) in question, and thus no regular meetings thereof, though that might have been no one’s intention. A vote cannot be taken twice, and the item may not be “re-voted” if it is lost, until it is won, not may members be bullied into changing their votes. To prevent these occurrences, the method of “filling in blanks” should be used to select the location. RONR (12th ed.) 12:92-113. The way that filling in blanks works is that, after none of the members wish to speak further on the subject (or, at a special meeting of the Commission, all of the members who wish to speak have exhausted their right to speak), a vote is first taken on the alternative with which to fill the blank in the motion to set the place for regular meetings of whatever body. Thus, instead of voting “aye” or “nay” on the motion itself, each member, during the roll-call vote, states the location and security set-up (and, if necessary, regular meeting time) with which they most prefer to fill in the blank in the motion, “*Resolved*, That the [name of body to meet regularly] meet regularly at _____ [on _____[time and date]].” This is how it should appear on the agenda, with only the name of the body or bodies filled in, and the alternatives for filling in the blank(s) listed below the motion. Anything less will violate the Sunshine Ordinance.

(Another error in my previous letter was the statement that the Behavioral Health Commission was running up tort liability for the City and County with their lawless behavior. They are

running up mere legal liability, rather, because both the Sunshine Ordinance and the Brown Act allow any interested person to sue the Commission for civil violations of either law, and the City and County will be due to pay their reasonable attorney's fees in bringing the suit if they succeed. *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.35(b). *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54960.5.)

The clerk must repeat the vote of each member immediately after it is given in order to ensure that there are no errors. To speed up the process, I suggest that the clerk make up a list of the members of the body meeting specially before the meeting, in alphabetical order by last name, except that the chair must be listed last. The order in which the members are listed and called must be stable through repeated votes on filling the blank in order that members will more clearly be able to perceive changes between other members' successive votes and better prepare their vote for when their name is called, depending on the votes that come before theirs. Then, across the top of the ordered list of members, list each of the security-location (or security-location-time) alternatives as a separate column. Multiple copies of this sheet should be made because the vote may have to be repeatedly retaken. Each member must vote on a particular security-location combination with which to fill the blank. There will be an opportunity for members to register their rejection of all of the alternatives, if they wish, during the second phase of the vote. When each member votes on a security-location alternative, the clerk should keep a running total of each of them by marking the first vote for the column with a "1", the next vote for that security-location combination (if any) with a "2", etc. If the number just recorded in any column equals a majority of the members present, the blank(s) is/are decided and voting may cease at that point. If, at any time during the vote, the number of remaining members to vote would not be enough to register a majority for any of the alternatives listed, voting should continue, because it would indicate what combinations are popular, how strong is their support, and who supports them, which will be helpful information with which for members to change their votes in subsequent rounds of voting. Thus, at the end of the voting during this phase or as soon as possible during it, it is determined which of the location and security setup combinations have the support of a majority of the members present. If none have the support of a majority of the members present, then the vote is retaken as many times as necessary until one of location-security alternatives attains a majority.

Once one location-security combination has majority support, the blank is filled with this location-security combination and the second phase of voting commences. The question is put whether the body or bodies in question shall meet regularly at this location with this security setup, and the vote is taken in the usual manner. Only this motion and second vote need be recorded in the minutes (but both must be recorded, because the agenda will not show which alternative was proposed). *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54953(c)(2) (each action taken must be reported). This gives the body meeting specially the opportunity to express that none of the location-security combinations are adequate (of that a committee not meet regularly) by voting down the motion once the blank has been filled in. This must all be one item on the agenda for each body (or set of bodies to be voted together) to meet regularly, with one opportunity for the public to address the body meeting specially during the debate (i.e., before the first phase of voting),

Chair Peskin
March 15, 2023
Page 4

including Behavioral Health Services, on each item listed on the agenda. Members of Behavioral Health Services must be given the same amount of time due to other members of the public. This is the method that will adduce the alternative with the greatest support among the members in a fair and efficient manner, in compliance with all applicable laws.

Behavioral Health Commission and Behavioral Health Services should act speedily in order to prepare a reasonable number of alternatives for regular meetings of the Commission and its committees that it wishes to meet regularly in advance of noticing this special meeting, to find an adequate time and place to hold this special meeting, and to notice it in accordance with all applicable laws.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Wynship Hillier

cc: Hillary Kunins, Director of Behavioral Health Services and Mental Health S.F.
Behavioral Health Commission
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

From: [Wynship Hillier](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kunins, Hillary \(DPH\)](#); [DPH-San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission](#); [SOTF, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Communication
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:45:02 AM
Attachments: [BHC Meeting Locations.pdf](#)

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

Dear Madam, Mx., or Sir:

Please distribute the attached to all Supervisors, and add to the Communications packet for the next available meeting thereof.

Very truly yours,
Wynship Hillier

Wynship W. Hillier, M.S.
3562 20th Street, Apartment 22
San Francisco, California 94110
(415) 505-3856
wynship@hotmail.com

March 13, 2023

Aaron Peskin, Chair
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, California 94102

Sent via email to bos@sfgov.org

RE: BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SERVICES IS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY DENYING THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION A PHYSICAL MEETING PLACE AND THREATENS TO UNREASONABLY IMPAIR PUBLIC ACCESS TO THEIR MEETINGS.

Honorable Chair Peskin:

The Behavioral Health Commission (“the Commission”) was unable to meet this month due to the unavailability of a meeting space that met unknown requirements imposed by the Behavioral Health Service (“BHS” or “the administration”). While I assume that BHS will find a room that meets BHS’s needs before the next regular meetings of the Commission are scheduled to occur, the Commission needs to meet specially in the meantime, which they cannot currently do because of these requirements. Thus, BHS has infringed and is infringing the Commission’s Constitutional right to assembly without a compelling government purpose. Furthermore, BHS’s requirements will permanently impair the public’s right to access to meetings of the Commission without even a substantial justification. An highly exaggerated need for safety is driving BHS’s policy, and both the Brown Act and a fundamental principle of American law require that the Commission decide what level of security it needs, not BHS, at a special meeting that must be noticed in the next three weeks.

BHS perceived tort liability is based on confused and extravagant claims. Amber Gray, staff for the Commission for about a year, said at a meeting of the Compliance and Amendments Committee of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force on Aug. 23, 2022, that she feared for her safety because of comments I made at remote meetings of the Behavioral Health Commission. She specifically said that she feared going back to in-person meetings because of what I might do. These claims appear to have gained traction with the administration, and the inability to find

an acceptable meeting space for the Commission is probably an inability to find a meetings space with armed guards and a “free-speech area” for the public, cordoned off from the Commission and with a separate entrance, served by microphones and a public address system. The Commission is too large to permanently meet in any of the hearing rooms in City Hall or even 101 Grove St., though it used to meet in Room 420 in City Hall.

The Commission is a 17-member advisory body created alongside Behavioral Health Services by the Board of Supervisors on April 10, 1958. Ord. No. 193-58. One member of the Board of Supervisors is to serve on it. *Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code* § 5604(a)(2)(A), *S.F. Admin. Code* § 15.12(b). In my five years of attending meetings of the Commission, three different Supervisors have been elected to it. None of them attended a single meeting during this time, and the seated Supervisor seat has now been vacant for appx. one year. To fail to elect a Supervisor to fill this seat is a misdemeanor, *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 1222 (failure to carry out a duty enjoined by law), and official misconduct, *S.F. Charter* § 15.105(e) (same). For an elected Supervisor to fail to attend meetings is cause for removal. *S.F. Admin. Code* § 15.13(d). However, being elected and attending meetings could lead to misdemeanors for violating of the Brown Act, *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54959, and/or failing to carry out the duties of the Commission, *id.* § 1222, as well as official misconduct on both counts, *S.F. Charter* § 15.105(e).

My specific comments to the Commission at their remote meetings over the past three years do not at all warrant the level of security demanded by Behavioral Health Services. Specifically, I accused the Director of BHS, Dr. Hilary Kunins, of being an enemy of the Constitution at a meeting of the Commission about a year ago. This was repeatedly interpreted by Co-Chair Stephen Banuelos as an accusation of “terrorism”. I have made the same claim about the Board of Supervisors, some of you will recall, beginning in fall of 2017 and for about a year afterwards, but you *do* have an area for the public, cordoned off from the Board, with a separate entrance, served by microphones and a public address system and watched by armed guards.

At the meeting on Aug. 23, 2022, Ms. Gray accused me of “uncivil behavior” and making “threats” at meetings of the Behavioral Health Commission. I have never made any threats at meetings of the Commission, and I will remark that the hearings before the Compliance and Amendments Committee were characterized by a lot of lying on the side of the Behavioral Health Commission. In this case, Ms. Gray exposed her own lie by stating that the supposed “threats” and “uncivil behavior” were actually threats of “court action”, but even this is not true. I have prosecuted a number of court cases *in propria persona* and they have involved a staggering amount of work, very difficult for me to pursue with my disability and without any formal legal training. I take court action very seriously and would not make such a threat unless I intended to follow it through. Even so, it would hardly be the sort of “threat” justifying the presence of armed guards, etc. Someone should inform Clerk Gray that the purpose of courts of law is to prevent violence, not to instigate it! The purpose of courts is to preserve civility, not destroy it! Perhaps Clerk Gray should review some history, specifically the reign of Henry II of England, who first brought courts to that nation from which we inherit our legal tradition, to

better appreciate why courts were created and what life was like without them. My constant references to law and infrequent references to court process ought to suggest that I am unwilling to resort to self-help, not the contrary!

What Ms. Gray was referring to in my supposed threats of court action was the fact that, at meetings of the Behavioral Health Commission, I have been in the habit, during the State of Emergency, of picking out Sunshine Ordinance and Brown Act violations at almost every meeting and voicing them during public comment, as well as via email. When Brown Act violations rise to a certain level, they are misdemeanors under *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54959 committed by the individual members of the Commission present at the meeting, and I do not hesitate to tell them this. I have also accused them of willful refusal to take any action to execute their fourth power and duty, a misdemeanor under *Cal. Gov't Code* § 1222. At my worst, I have called the members of the Commission criminals at meetings and over email because, during a lengthy period, they refrained from committing violations of the Brown Act only when criminal penalties were involved. These were not “fighting words.” They were neither intended, nor, had they been made in person, would they have been likely, to incite imminent lawless action. No one has even accused me of disturbing meetings of the Commission thereby. These are the nature of my alleged “threats”: They were Constitutionally-protected speech and warnings of the Commission’s liability to specifically *lawful* action. BHS’s tort liability, while great, is due entirely to the lawless activity of the Commission, not the public, about which the furnishings of a physical meeting space can and will do absolutely nothing!

Meanwhile, such provisions to promise to seriously impair public access at meetings of the Commission and its committees. The Commission is too big, and its available meeting spaces too small, to allow for all of the protections they probably desire without making it impossible for the public to see all of the Commissioners at once, nor for them to see the member of the public who is speaking during public address. I have been to public meetings of a body as large as the Commission in Sacramento, and they required large conference rooms or even ballrooms at local hotels in order for everyone to be able to see everyone else, and these still did not meet the requirements that BHS probably wants: a cordoned area for the public, armed guards, or a separate entrance. In the past, crowded sightlines in cramped spaces have not been a problem, because the public had freedom of movement and could get up close to the Commissioners, both things that BHS’s likely enhancements are aimed to remove. Not being able to see Commissioners’ faces, nor those of the public, will seriously detract from the quality of public access to these “face-to-face” meetings, a quality upon which the Brown Act puts an high value, as evidenced by the very heavy burdens it places on teleconferenced meetings.

BHS’s new and unreasonable requirements might have other and unscrupulous motives. They might, of course, want to impair public access to meetings of the Commission. They might wish to impair or make impossible my previous YouTube close-up videos of the Director of BHS lying in public, or my planned ones of Commissioners committing misdemeanor violations of the Brown Act. There is simply no way to know, because Behavioral Health Services conducts their

deliberations in secret, and this is ultimately the problem: the Commission, and not the administration, should be making these decisions, and they should be doing so at meetings that are open to the public.

The Commission has a right to assemble under *U.S. Const.* Amend. I. Their Constitutional right may not be infringed absent a compelling government purpose. Furthermore, even granted such a purpose, the allowance should be narrowly tailored such that the right is infringed as little as possible. From the looks of it, Behavioral Health Services is infringing upon this right as much as possible through their unilateral imposition of “logistical requirements” on possible meetings spaces for the Commission, apparently giving lexicographic preference to mitigating a wholly fatuous tort liability over all other concerns. This offends a fundamental tenet of American law, that no man can be a fair judge of his own case.

Who would be this judge? There is not enough time for court involvement in the Constitutional issue, which will likely become moot in a week or two. We would rather draw attention to the concern about what Commission meetings are to look like over the long term. With respect to this concern, the interested parties are the administration and the public. Though not wholly a disinterested party, the Commission is probably qualified to sit in judgment thereof.

The Brown Act shows a legislative intent that the Commission play this role. *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a) requires that the Commission pass a motion establishing the time and place of the regular meetings of itself, any ad hoc committees with decisionmaking power that are legislative bodies, and those of its standing committees or advisory committees that are legislative bodies and it directs to meet regularly (and, through *S.F. Admin. Code* §§ 67.5 and 67.6(a), policy bodies under the Sunshine Ordinance that are either committees with decisionmaking power or advisory committees that are to meet regularly). If only one option is feasible, then this vote amounts to a decision as to whether the offered quarters are adequate or not (and whether the Commission forfeits its Constitutional right to assemble). However, Behavioral Health Services should not be allowed to impose requirements that constrain the choice set at all. If the administration has security concerns, let them present them to the Commission at an hearing held for the purpose, with equal time for the public to state their case. Necessarily, alternative locations will imply different levels of security at them, including, as was the case prior to the state of emergency, no security. The Commission may then decide what level of “logistical requirements” strike the appropriate balance between security and public access at the same time as they make the locational decision. The Executive Committee of the Commission may decide this on behalf of the Commission, with ratification by the Commission at its next meeting, or the Commission may itself hear the matter. Their Executive Committee has the advantage that it is small enough to meet in one of the hearing rooms at City Hall, in order to make this decision at an open and public meeting with all of the security provisions that the administration thinks are necessary. Whatever body takes on this task, it must do so at a special meeting, because the Commission and its committees were out of compliance with *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a) before the state of emergency, and neither the Commission nor any of its committees may meet

Chair Peskin
March 13, 2023
Page 5

regularly in person until it or its Executive Committee passes this motion and brings the Commission and its committees into compliance for regular meetings. Whatever body must notice a special meeting within the next three weeks in order not to either violate *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a) or cancel any further regular meetings, regardless of whether requirements imposed by the administration are met or not.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Wynship Hillier

cc: Hillary Kunins, Director of Behavioral Health Services and Mental Health S.F.
Behavioral Health Commission

From: [Wynship Hillier](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kunins, Hillary \(DPH\)](#); [DPH-San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission](#); [SOTF, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Communication
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 12:05:04 PM

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

Correction! If the special meeting is held at City Hall, or anyplace other than 1380 Howard St., then it must be noticed no later than Mar. 23 a.m., i.e., next Thursday. *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.6(f) (eighth sentence). -WH

From: Wynship Hillier
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hillary.Kunins@sfdph.org <hillary.kunins@sfdph.org>; DPH-San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission <sfbhc@sfdph.org>; SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>
Subject: Communication

Dear Madam, Mx., or Sir:

Please distribute the attached to all Supervisors, and add to the Communications packet for the next available meeting thereof.

Very truly yours,
Wynship Hillier

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 7 Letters Regarding Cats & Dogs in Seoul
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:48:00 PM
Attachments: [7 Letters Regarding Cats & Dogs in Seoul.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 7 Letters Regarding Cats & Dogs in Seoul.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

From: [Laura Zainotto](#)
Subject: Sister City Campaign – Seoul, South Korea – San Francisco, California
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:04:01 AM

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

Dear Sirs,

I BEG YOU PLEASE to do whatever is in your power to put an end to all those terrible dog farms and slaughterhouses and to punish whoever keeps all those poor SENTIENT ANIMALS in such horrible cages and subject to everyday torture, hunger and unbearable suffering and fear only waiting to be killed in the worst of ways.

They are not just objects for consumption! They suffer and feel pain and misery like all living beings. They are kept in horrifying conditions and are subject to torture and unimaginable suffering and terror, every day of their poor and desperate life, until the moment they are killed with electrocution or hit violently with hammers.

I can't even watch the images and videos of those tortures and the ways these poor dogs and cats are kept and killed. So, how can men do such terrible things? And is that really necessary to hurt so much? Can one be so heartless??

Please! I do trust you have the power and the will to put an end to all this violence, horror and suffering.

I thank you in advance for whatever you will be able to do to save them from their terrible conditions and destiny – they all have the right to live their lives in the best possible way, like any other living being.

Your sincerely,

Laura Zainotto

ITALY

From: [Diane Kent](#)
To: [Breed_Mayor_London \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin_Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen_Hillary](#); [Safai_Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani_Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston_Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Walton_Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [kanglaw83@hanmail.net](#); [sjkang2005@hanmail.net](#); [k-gimoon@hanmail.net](#); [hiseocho@naver.com](#); [aromaeffort@hanmail.net](#); [sml-ling@naver.com](#); [muse201@hotmail.com](#); [khhbb0331@daum.net](#); [leejs8341@naver.com](#); [kkd3344@hanmail.net](#); [spoman88@naver.com](#); [dwk5gangnam@gmail.com](#); [visionbosco@naver.com](#); [oki1422@naver.com](#); [kimyc5975@naver.com](#); [yongk0525@hanmail.net](#); [pukasun011@hanmail.net](#); [kyj22222@naver.com](#); [kim22wt@naver.com](#); [ij7857@gmail.com](#); [k80209454@hanmail.net](#); [220601winner@naver.com](#); [suijihoo@hanmail.net](#); [gare1@hanmail.net](#); [Kts8104@hanmail.net](#); [hyeon4123@hanmail.net](#); [kign0071@naver.com](#); [khyseoul7@daum.net](#); [bombam111@naver.com](#); [jnd0522@hanmail.net](#); [mydoh@chol.com](#); [nayuri89@naver.com](#); [Mbj1440@naver.com](#); [ksp9725@naver.com](#); [shp2022@naver.com](#); [parksuk7@hanmail.net](#); [syanie@naver.com](#); [101gangbuk@gmail.com](#); [sjpark5272@hanmail.net](#); [maum7412@naver.com](#); [csp2000@naver.com](#); [seven7star77@hanmail.net](#); [h2p0521@naver.com](#); [gox9778@nate.com](#); [yeol1977@naver.com](#); [ricehope@hanmail.net](#); [sho3120@hanmail.net](#); [zxy100@naver.com](#); [mountain8511@naver.com](#); [skt007@naver.com](#); [songdoh088@hanmail.net](#); [ecopolis2050@hanmail.net](#); [flutelove2001@hanmail.net](#); [bj618@hanmail.net](#); [meiqing7@nate.com](#); [kantry1@hanmail.net](#); [oje1015@hanmail.net](#); [joinus7942@daum.net](#); [kfmpd@naver.com](#); [yumanhee@hanmail.net](#); [yjh8144@naver.com](#); [dorimchun@hanmail.net](#); [ds1msm@hanmail.net](#); [city02@hanmail.net](#); [anemily@naver.com](#); [lks7459@naver.com](#); [min12343@naver.com](#); [2min5gl@naver.com](#); [lover9474@naver.com](#); [kee61k@empas.com](#); [bjkmc@naver.com](#)
Subject: San Francisco Mayor London Breed: Tell Sister City Seoul, South Korea, you oppose the torture and consumption of dogs and cats.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 1:06:18 PM

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

Dear Mayor London Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors members:

As mayor and representatives of San Francisco, I ask you to reconsider your "friendship" with Seoul, a city that permits dogs and cats to be brutally tortured for food.

While graphic, these undercover videos depicting South Korea's dog meat industry are important to watch:

Part 1 of 2: https://youtu.be/_ZVQjgGb4RO

Part 2 of 2: <https://vimeo.com/754160791>

<https://koreandogs.org/jtbc-news-electric-tortured-in-cages/>

Touted as a so-called cosmopolitan city, Seoul [consumes the most dog meat of any city in South Korea](#). There are countless dog farms and dog slaughterhouses in the vicinity of Seoul. Korean web searches of Seoul turn up hundreds of [dog meat restaurants](#) and so-called "[Health Centers](#)" that commonly serve soup made of dog meat as phony elixirs (also known as dog soju).

Dogs suffer their entire lives in filthy, feces-encrusted wire cages in dire misery only to be slaughtered in the most horrific of ways — tortured by electrocution, hammer strikes to their head, hanging, being beaten to death, having their throats slit, being burned alive with a blowtorch or thrown into a vat of boiling water while still alive. In many places in Seoul, dogs are killed in full view of other caged dogs who tremble with terror. In addition, beloved pets are often stolen and sold to these slaughterhouses, where they meet the same horrific fate. Puppies who die of disease are tossed away like trash, often left in front of cages to rot while their mothers watch and cry out in despair.

Mayor Christopher Chung of Palisades Park, NJ, knew that no relationship or economic incentive was worth complicity in torturing humankind's most loyal companion. As reported in [the Korea Times](#), he recently rejected a visit from exchange students from the friendship city Incheon Ganghwa County due to their dog meat trade. In California, [the Los Angeles City Council](#) unanimously passed a resolution supporting legislation or administrative action that would request the governments of South Korea, China, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Cambodia ban the sale of dog meat and enforce their animal protection laws.

On behalf of companion animal-loving Americans and people worldwide, we ask that you follow these bold leads by not remaining silent in the face of such abhorrent cruelty. Please urge Seoul Mayor Oh Se-Hoon to shut down all Seoul-supplying dog farms, slaughterhouses, markets, dog meat restaurants, and trucks transporting dogs to their inevitable fates. An online petition calling for your support in ending such horrors perpetrated in Seoul is in progress: <https://chnq.it/5Ty85rRc>.

Thank you for your serious consideration. We eagerly await your reply.

Sincerely,

Diane Kent

Scottsdale, AZ

From: [Jane Burgess](#)
To: [Breed_Mayor_London \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [777byung@naver.com](#); [kimbyongwook0415@gmail.com](#); [kimbyungjoo62@gmail.com](#); [kshdg11@gmail.com](#); [shk@assembly.go.kr](#); [7882576kj@hanmail.net](#); [kimsq5358@naver.com](#); [kimsw910@naver.com](#); [ksjwithjj@naver.com](#); [kimnowongu@gmail.com](#); [iksan832@naver.com](#); [snk651006@gmail.com](#); [kiminnotank@naver.com](#); [swkimsuwon@gmail.com](#); [yb7841521@gmail.com](#); [yeungshik20@naver.com](#); [kimyoungjoo2018@gmail.com](#); [youngjink840@naver.com](#); [kim-youngho@naver.com](#); [yeajjjoy@gmail.com](#); [fopeopler76@gmail.com](#); [jebek8969@gmail.com](#); [songpawoong@naver.com](#); [kimwoni923@gmail.com](#); [ydkim22@naver.com](#); [kek9580@gmail.com](#); [lawji@naver.com](#); [kimjungho3359@daum.net](#); [withmin413@gmail.com](#); [gimpolovekjy@gmail.com](#); [kcm8764@naver.com](#); [ktn0320@daum.net](#); [taehoshgh@naver.com](#); [ansung24@naver.com](#); [hanqkim74@gmail.com](#); [7840498@naver.com](#); [khyungdong@naver.com](#); [2020kimhonggul@gmail.com](#); [khj539@naver.com](#); [caesar1217@assembly.go.kr](#); [heekuk1020@naver.com](#); [nisoona@na.go.kr](#); [ryh4711@naver.com](#); [wraenoh1@gmail.com](#); [djhpoem@assembly.go.kr](#); [7847142@naver.com](#); [help@ryuhojeong.com](#); [minjoomsk@naver.com](#); [indobangrang@hanmail.net](#); [jmoon123@naver.com](#); [anyangmin@gmail.com](#); [mhb1961@naver.com](#); [sotong533@gmail.com](#); [dcparkjj@assembly.go.kr](#); [parkdukhyum@naver.com](#); [pbs2100@gmail.com](#); [gimpo_park@naver.com](#); [smpark3340@naver.com](#); [pksoffice@naver.com](#); [sjpark101@hanmail.net](#)
Subject: San Francisco Mayor London Breed: Tell Sister City Seoul, South Korea, you oppose the torture and consumption of dogs and cats.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 7:52:02 AM

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

Dear Mayor London Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors members:

As mayor and representatives of San Francisco, we ask you to reconsider your “friendship” with Seoul, a city that permits dogs and cats to be brutally tortured for food.

While graphic, these undercover videos depicting South Korea’s dog meat industry are important to watch:

Part 1 of 2: https://youtu.be/_ZVQjgGb4RQ

Part 2 of 2: <https://vimeo.com/754160791>

<https://koreandogs.org/jtbc-news-electric-tortured-in-cages/>

Touted as a so-called cosmopolitan city, Seoul [consumes the most dog meat of any city in South Korea](#). There are countless dog farms and dog slaughterhouses in the vicinity of Seoul. Korean web searches of Seoul turn up hundreds of [dog meat restaurants](#) and so-called “[Health Centers](#)” that commonly serve soup made of dog meat as phony elixirs (also known as dog soju).

Dogs suffer their entire lives in filthy, feces-encrusted wire cages in dire misery only to be slaughtered in the most horrific of ways— tortured by electrocution, hammer strikes to their head, hanging, being beaten to death, having their throats slit, being burned alive with a blowtorch or thrown into a vat of boiling water while still alive. In many places in Seoul, dogs are killed in full view of other caged dogs who tremble with terror. In addition, beloved pets are often stolen and sold to these slaughterhouses, where they meet the same horrific fate. Puppies who die of disease are tossed away like trash, often left in front of cages to rot while

their mothers watch and cry out in despair.

Mayor Christopher Chung of Palisades Park, NJ, knew that no relationship or economic incentive was worth complicity in torturing humankind's most loyal companion. As reported in [the Korea Times](#), he recently rejected a visit from exchange students from the friendship city Incheon Ganghwa County due to their dog meat trade.

In California, [the Los Angeles City Council](#) unanimously passed a resolution supporting legislation or administrative action that would request the governments of South Korea, China, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Cambodia ban the sale of dog meat and enforce their animal protection laws.

On behalf of companion animal-loving Americans and people worldwide, we ask that you follow these bold leads by not remaining silent in the face of such abhorrent cruelty. **Please urge Seoul Mayor Oh Se-Hoon to shut down all Seoul-supplying dog farms, slaughterhouses, markets, dog meat restaurants, and truckers transporting dogs to their inevitable fates.** An online petition calling for your support in ending such horrors perpetrated in Seoul is in progress: <https://chng.it/5Ty85rRc>.

Thank you for your time and consideration to this matter.

Kind regards

Jane Burgess
Duncan Caddick

United Kingdom

From: [Maria Zimmer](#)
To: [Breed_Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [kanglaw83@hanmail.net](#); [sjkang2005@hanmail.net](#); [k-gimoon@hanmail.net](#); [hiseocho@naver.com](#); [aromaeffort@hanmail.net](#); [smil-ing@naver.com](#); [muse201@hotmail.com](#); [kkhbb0331@daum.net](#); [leejs8341@naver.com](#); [kkd3344@hanmail.net](#); [spoman88@naver.com](#); [dwk5gangnam@gmail.com](#); [visionbosco@naver.com](#); [oki1422@naver.com](#); [kimyc5975@naver.com](#); [yongk0525@hanmail.net](#); [pukasun011@hanmail.net](#); [kwj22222@naver.com](#); [kim22wt@naver.com](#); [jj7857@gmail.com](#); [k80209454@hanmail.net](#); [220601winner@naver.com](#); [sujihoo@hanmail.net](#); [gare1@hanmail.net](#); [Kts8104@hanmail.net](#); [hyeon4123@hanmail.net](#); [kign0071@naver.com](#); [khyseoul7@daum.net](#); [bombam111@naver.com](#); [jnd0522@hanmail.net](#); [mydoh@chol.com](#); [nayuri89@naver.com](#); [Mbj1440@naver.com](#); [ksp9725@naver.com](#); [shp2022@naver.com](#); [parksuk7@hanmail.net](#); [syannie@naver.com](#); [101gangbuk@gmail.com](#); [sjpark5272@hanmail.net](#); [maum7412@naver.com](#); [csp2000@naver.com](#); [seven7star77@hanmail.net](#); [h2p0521@naver.com](#); [gox9778@nate.com](#); [yeol1977@naver.com](#); [ricehope@hanmail.net](#); [sho3120@hanmail.net](#); [zxy100@naver.com](#); [mountain8511@naver.com](#); [skt007@naver.com](#); [songdoho88@hanmail.net](#); [ecopolis2050@hanmail.net](#); [flutelove2001@hanmail.net](#); [bj618@hanmail.net](#); [meiqing7@nate.com](#); [kantry1@hanmail.net](#); [oje1015@hanmail.net](#); [joinus7942@daum.net](#); [kfmpd@naver.com](#); [yumanhee@hanmail.net](#); [yjhm8144@naver.com](#); [dorimchun@hanmail.net](#); [ds1msm@hanmail.net](#); [etty02@hanmail.net](#); [anemiy@naver.com](#); [lks7459@naver.com](#); [min12343@naver.com](#); [2min5gi@naver.com](#); [lover9474@naver.com](#); [kee61k@empas.com](#); [bjkmc@naver.com](#); [seoul7635@gmail.com](#); [teamleesanghoon@naver.com](#); [zzy1895@naver.com](#); [113lee@naver.com](#); [sora94seoul@gmail.com](#); [sjl0894@hanmail.net](#); [sm6244@naver.com](#); [marinespyi@naver.com](#); [dndsil@hanmail.net](#); [st2020@hanmail.net](#); [yiw2898@naver.com](#); [eunlim@ewhain.net](#); [jongbae1252@daum.net](#); [smilemen@hanmail.net](#); [ljh5612@hanmail.net](#); [seoul.lhw@gmail.com](#); [summithansol@naver.com](#); [kcnljw@hanmail.net](#); [sangchoo1900@hanmail.net](#); [eparty@paran.com](#); [cnseo566@naver.com](#); [samueladams@naver.com](#); [bjjeon918@hanmail.net](#); [lehgoa@gmail.com](#); [jw9976@naver.com](#); [mapogood@naver.com](#); [amyanything@naver.com](#); [gichan6907@hanmail.net](#); [minkyu0307@naver.com](#); [choi_767@naver.com](#); [inpraxis@naver.com](#); [0816jy@naver.com](#); [fng9129@hanmail.net](#); [han-shin@naver.com](#); [yangcheongo@naver.com](#); [cp1055@naver.com](#); [lovejane26@hanmail.net](#); [hck01@hanmail.net](#); [ENGLISH@assembly.go.kr](#); [ggotop@naver.com](#); [kds21341@naver.com](#); [mainsail440@daum.net](#); [strongwind01@naver.com](#); [kmj2020edu@gmail.com](#); [kangbw89@gmail.com](#); [gangseo.kap@gmail.com](#); [em7086@gmail.com](#); [jhkang315@gmail.com](#); [gohoonsik@gmail.com](#); [kominjung21@gmail.com](#); [koyoungin312@gmail.com](#); [gogoyongjin@naver.com](#); [can929292@naver.com](#); [kmh330575@naver.com](#); [ksdd22@naver.com](#); [yskys2020@naver.com](#); [kwoneunhee0215@gmail.com](#); [iskwon317@naver.com](#); [anotherk7@gmail.com](#); [gidongmin@naver.com](#)
Subject: Tell Sister City Seoul, South Korea, you oppose the torture and consumption of dogs and cats.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 4:47:17 AM

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

San Francisco Mayor London Breed: Tell Sister City Seoul, South Korea, you oppose the torture and consumption of dogs and cats.

Dear Mayor London Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors members:

As mayor and representatives of San Francisco, we ask you to reconsider your “friendship” with Seoul, a city that permits dogs and cats to be brutally tortured for food.

While graphic, these undercover videos depicting South Korea’s dog meat industry are important to watch:

Part 1 of 2: https://youtu.be/_ZVQjG4RO

Part 2 of 2: <https://vimeo.com/754160791>

<https://koreandogs.org/jtbc-news-electric-tortured-in-cages/>

Touted as a so-called cosmopolitan city, Seoul [consumes the most dog meat of any city in South Korea](#). There are countless dog farms and dog slaughterhouses in the vicinity of Seoul. Korean web searches of Seoul turn up hundreds of [dog meat restaurants](#) and so-called “[Health Centers](#)” that commonly serve soup made of dog meat as phony elixirs (also known as dog soju).

Dogs suffer their entire lives in filthy, feces-encrusted wire cages in dire misery only to be slaughtered in the most horrific of ways—tortured by electrocution, hammer strikes to their head, hanging, being beaten to death, having their throats slit, being burned alive with a blowtorch or thrown into a vat of boiling water while still alive. In many places in Seoul, dogs are killed in full

view of other caged dogs who tremble with terror. In addition, beloved pets are often stolen and sold to these slaughterhouses, where they meet the same horrific fate. Puppies who die of disease are tossed away like trash, often left in front of cages to rot while their mothers watch and cry out in despair.

Mayor Christopher Chung of Palisades Park, NJ, knew that no relationship or economic incentive was worth complicity in torturing humankind's most loyal companion. As reported in [the Korea Times](#), he recently rejected a visit from exchange students from the friendship city Incheon Ganghwa County due to their dog meat trade. In California, [the Los Angeles City Council](#) unanimously passed a resolution supporting legislation or administrative action that would request the governments of South Korea, China, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Cambodia ban the sale of dog meat and enforce their animal protection laws.

On behalf of companion animal-loving Americans and people worldwide, we ask that you follow these bold leads by not remaining silent in the face of such abhorrent cruelty. Please urge Seoul Mayor Oh Se-Hoon to shut down all Seoul-supplying dog farms, slaughterhouses, markets, dog meat restaurants, and truckers transporting dogs to their inevitable fates. An online petition calling for your support in ending such horrors perpetrated in Seoul is in progress: <https://chnng.it/5Ty85rRc>.

Thank you for your serious consideration. We eagerly await your reply.

Sincerely,

Maria Zimmer
Annagasse 4
AT - 7361 Kroatisch Geresdorf

From: Nickie.Duong@infineon.com
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Your Urgent Action Required -- SF should NOT associate with Dog Meat Trade!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 12:08:07 PM
Importance: High

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

Dear Mayor London Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors members:

As mayor and representatives of San Francisco, we ask you to reconsider your “friendship” with Seoul, a city that permits dogs and cats to be brutally tortured for food.

While graphic, these undercover videos depicting South Korea’s dog meat industry are important to watch:

Part 1 of 2: <https://youtu.be/ZVQjgGb4RO>

Part 2 of 2: <https://vimeo.com/754160791>

<https://koreandogs.org/jtbc-news-electric-tortured-in-cages/>

Touted as a so-called cosmopolitan city, Seoul [consumes the most dog meat of any city in South Korea](#). There are countless dog farms and dog slaughterhouses in the vicinity of Seoul. Korean web searches of Seoul turn up hundreds of [dog meat restaurants](#) and so-called “[Health Centers](#)” that commonly serve soup made of dog meat as phony elixirs (also known as dog soju).

Dogs suffer their entire lives in filthy, feces-encrusted wire cages in dire misery only to be slaughtered in the most horrific of ways— tortured by electrocution, hammer strikes to their head, hanging, being beaten to death, having their throats slit, being burned alive with a blowtorch or thrown into a vat of boiling water while still alive. In many places in Seoul, dogs are killed in full view of other caged dogs who tremble with terror. In addition, beloved pets are often stolen and sold to these slaughterhouses, where they meet the same horrific fate. Puppies who die of disease are tossed away like trash, often left in front of cages to rot while their mothers watch and cry out in despair.

Mayor Christopher Chung of Palisades Park, NJ, knew that no relationship or economic incentive was worth complicity in torturing humankind’s most loyal companion. As reported in [the Korea Times](#), he recently rejected a visit from exchange students from the friendship city Incheon Ganghwa County due to their dog meat trade. In California, [the Los Angeles City Council](#) unanimously passed a resolution supporting legislation or administrative action that would request the governments of South Korea, China, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Cambodia ban the sale of dog meat and enforce their animal protection laws.

On behalf of companion animal-loving Americans and people worldwide, we ask that you follow these bold leads by not remaining silent in the face of such abhorrent cruelty. **Please urge Seoul Mayor Oh Se-Hoon to shut down all Seoul-supplying dog farms, slaughterhouses, markets, dog meat restaurants, and truckers transporting dogs to their inevitable fates.**

An online petition calling for your support in ending such horrors perpetrated in Seoul is in

progress: <https://chng.it/5Ty85rRc>.

Thank you for your serious consideration. We eagerly await your reply.

Sincerely,

Dr. Nicolas Duonn
San Francisco, CA

From: [Catherine Hensley](#)

To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)

Cc: [kanglaw83@hanmail.net](#); [sjkang2005@hanmail.net](#); [k-gimoon@hanmail.net](#); [hiseocho@naver.com](#); [aromaeffort@hanmail.net](#); [smil-ing@naver.com](#); [muse201@hotmail.com](#); [kkhbb0331@daum.net](#); [leejs8341@naver.com](#); [kkd3344@hanmail.net](#); [spoman88@naver.com](#); [dwk5gangnam@gmail.com](#); [visionbosco@naver.com](#); [oki1422@naver.com](#); [kimyc5975@naver.com](#); [yongk0525@hanmail.net](#); [pukasun011@hanmail.net](#); [kwj22222@naver.com](#); [kim22wt@naver.com](#); [ij7857@gmail.com](#); [k80209454@hanmail.net](#); [220601winner@naver.com](#); [sujihoo@hanmail.net](#); [gare1@hanmail.net](#); [Kts8104@hanmail.net](#); [hyeon4123@hanmail.net](#); [kign0071@naver.com](#); [khyseoul7@daum.net](#); [bombam111@naver.com](#); [jnd0522@hanmail.net](#); [mydoh@chol.com](#); [nayuri89@naver.com](#); [Mbj1440@naver.com](#); [ksp9725@naver.com](#); [shp2022@naver.com](#); [parksuk7@hanmail.net](#); [syannie@naver.com](#); [101gangbuk@gmail.com](#); [sjpark5272@hanmail.net](#); [maum7412@naver.com](#); [csp2000@naver.com](#); [seven7star77@hanmail.net](#); [h2p0521@naver.com](#); [gox9778@nate.com](#); [yeol1977@naver.com](#); [ricehope@hanmail.net](#); [sho3120@hanmail.net](#); [zxy100@naver.com](#); [mountain8511@naver.com](#); [skt007@naver.com](#); [songdoho88@hanmail.net](#); [ecopolis2050@hanmail.net](#); [flutelove2001@hanmail.net](#); [bj618@hanmail.net](#); [meiqing7@nate.com](#); [kantry1@hanmail.net](#); [oje1015@hanmail.net](#); [joinus7942@daum.net](#); [kfmpd@naver.com](#); [yumanhee@hanmail.net](#); [yjhm8144@naver.com](#); [dorimchun@hanmail.net](#); [ds1msm@hanmail.net](#); [etty02@hanmail.net](#); [anemiy@naver.com](#); [lks7459@naver.com](#); [min12343@naver.com](#); [2min5gj@naver.com](#); [lover9474@naver.com](#); [kee61k@empas.com](#); [bjkmc@naver.com](#); [seoul7635@gmail.com](#); [teamleesanghoon@naver.com](#); [zzy1895@naver.com](#); [113lee@naver.com](#); [sora94seoul@gmail.com](#); [sjl0894@hanmail.net](#); [sm6244@naver.com](#); [marinespy@naver.com](#); [dndsil@hanmail.net](#); [st2020@hanmail.net](#); [yiwh2898@naver.com](#); [eunlim@ewhain.net](#); [jongbae1252@daum.net](#); [smilemen@hanmail.net](#); [ljh5612@hanmail.net](#); [seoul.lhw@gmail.com](#); [summithansol@naver.com](#); [kcnljw@hanmail.net](#); [sangchoo1900@hanmail.net](#); [eparty@paran.com](#); [cnseo566@naver.com](#); [samueladams@naver.com](#); [bjeon918@hanmail.net](#); [lehgoa@gmail.com](#); [jw9976@naver.com](#); [mapogood@naver.com](#); [amyanything@naver.com](#); [gichan6907@hanmail.net](#); [minkyu0307@naver.com](#); [choi_767@naver.com](#); [inpraxis@naver.com](#); [0816jy@naver.com](#); [fng9129@hanmail.net](#); [han-shin@naver.com](#); [yangcheongo@naver.com](#); [cp1055@naver.com](#); [lovejane26@hanmail.net](#); [hck01@hanmail.net](#); [ENGLISH@assembly.go.kr](#); [ggotop@naver.com](#); [kds21341@naver.com](#); [mainsail440@daum.net](#); [strongwind01@naver.com](#); [kmj2020edu@gmail.com](#); [kangbw89@gmail.com](#); [gangseo.kap@gmail.com](#); [em7088@gmail.com](#); [jhkang315@gmail.com](#); [gohoonsik@gmail.com](#); [kominjung21@gmail.com](#); [koyoungin312@gmail.com](#); [gogoyongjin@naver.com](#); [can929292@naver.com](#); [kmh330575@naver.com](#); [ksdd22@naver.com](#); [yskys2020@naver.com](#); [kwoneunhee0215@gmail.com](#); [jskwon317@naver.com](#); [anotherk7@gmail.com](#); [gidongmin@naver.com](#); [2020kkman@gmail.com](#); [ggh000@naver.com](#); [kimkh4u@naver.com](#); [together_eut@gmail.com](#); [lawmaker0415@daum.net](#); [ldek3525@naver.com](#); [okdkkorea@gmail.com](#); [015miae@naver.com](#); [kimminki@assembly.go.kr](#); [newkms2030@gmail.com](#); [mckim6812@naver.com](#); [the.kim.weapon@gmail.com](#); [777byung@naver.com](#); [kimbyongwook0415@gmail.com](#); [kimbyungjoo62@gmail.com](#); [kshdg11@gmail.com](#); [shk@assembly.go.kr](#); [7882576kj@hanmail.net](#); [kimsq5358@naver.com](#); [kimsq910@naver.com](#); [ksjwithjj@naver.com](#); [kimnowongu@gmail.com](#); [iksan832@naver.com](#); [snk651006@gmail.com](#); [kiminnotank@naver.com](#); [swkimsuwon@gmail.com](#); [yb7841521@gmail.com](#); [yeungshik20@naver.com](#); [kimyoungjoo2018@gmail.com](#); [youngjiink840@naver.com](#); [kim-youngho@naver.com](#); [yeajijoy@gmail.com](#); [fopeopler76@gmail.com](#); [jebek8969@gmail.com](#); [songpawoong@naver.com](#); [kimwoni923@gmail.com](#); [ydkim22@naver.com](#); [kek9580@gmail.com](#); [lawjj@naver.com](#); [kimjungho3359@daum.net](#); [within413@gmail.com](#); [gimpolovekij@gmail.com](#); [kcm8764@naver.com](#); [ktn0320@daum.net](#); [taehoshgh@naver.com](#); [ansung24@naver.com](#); [hanqkim74@gmail.com](#); [7840498@naver.com](#); [khyungdong@naver.com](#); [2020kimhonggul@gmail.com](#); [khj539@naver.com](#); [caesar1217@assembly.go.kr](#); [heekuk1020@naver.com](#); [nisoona@na.go.kr](#); [ryh4711@naver.com](#); [wraenoh1@gmail.com](#); [djhpoem@assembly.go.kr](#); [7847142@naver.com](#); [help@ryuhojeong.com](#); [minjoomsk@naver.com](#); [indobangrang@hanmail.net](#); [jmoon123@naver.com](#); [anyangmin@gmail.com](#); [mhb1961@naver.com](#); [sotong533@gmail.com](#); [dcparkjj@assembly.go.kr](#); [parkdukhyum@naver.com](#); [pbs2100@gmail.com](#); [gimpo_park@naver.com](#); [smpark3340@naver.com](#); [pksjoffice@naver.com](#); [sjpark101@hanmail.net](#); [psyfor2020@naver.com](#); [pys6427@naver.com](#); [lasco21@hanmail.net](#); [gangbuk24@gmail.com](#); [2016pjh@gmail.com](#); [pjkorea21c@naver.com](#); [newwonju643@naver.com](#); [joomincenter@gmail.com](#); [dolphin1956@naver.com](#); [parkcd0214@gmail.com](#); [7844165@naver.com](#); [maumgil88@gmail.com](#); [bjg517@naver.com](#); [bjh438@naver.com](#); [bhrassembly0217@gmail.com](#); [bji@assembly.go.kr](#); [dyongseo@naver.com](#); [sbsulju@daum.net](#); [suhbs8680@naver.com](#); [3s0011@naver.com](#); [youngkyos@naver.com](#); [guseng@hanmail.net](#); [sjkorea@gmail.com](#); [suhjs708@naver.com](#); [sulhoon21@naver.com](#); [sij5140@naver.com](#); [sbcpr21@gmail.com](#); [sotong848@daum.net](#); [kssong800518@daum.net](#); [peacesong1@naver.com](#); [734ssj@gmail.com](#); [songok4740@naver.com](#); [songjeju2020@gmail.com](#); [sdkwin16@gmail.com](#); [0415gunsan@gmail.com](#); [syd@assembly.go.kr](#); [wonteam20@naver.com](#); [21shy740@gmail.com](#); [713sim@naver.com](#); [intoan429@gmail.com](#); [amsams0606@gmail.com](#); [anbg02@naver.com](#); [csahn435@gmail.com](#); [ahnho065@gmail.com](#); [kyungsook_0906@naver.com](#); [ygoldh8999@naver.com](#); [8746195@gmail.com](#); [yangyi.assembly@gmail.com](#); [jsyang7735@gmail.com](#); [bestwest1967@gmail.com](#); [kiyku@naver.com](#); [2040jd@gmail.com](#); [okhyung628@naver.com](#); [119heartsaver@naver.com](#); [hello@yonghyein.kr](#); [wsh2016v@gmail.com](#); [reform1-1@hanmail.net](#); [wishjeju@hanmail.net](#); [y0890@assembly.go.kr](#); [yookihong1001@gmail.com](#); [newds61@naver.com](#); [sbyoo64@naver.com](#); [ptopen730@naver.com](#); [junshine905@naver.com](#); [youunky926@gmail.com](#); [winneryks@naver.com](#); [gyeongsan.love@gmail.com](#); [mhyang530@naver.com](#); [shyoon@na.go.kr](#); [yyd0415v@naver.com](#); [hangomy@assembly.go.kr](#); [yyc8361@naver.com](#); [yoonjg542@naver.com](#); [7882579@naver.com](#); [bela0524@naver.com](#); [yjb870053@naver.com](#); [yunch5270@gmail.com](#); [hjun9292@naver.com](#); [yoons609@hanmail.net](#); [7880291@naver.com](#); [ldg200020@naver.com](#); [fairness933@gmail.com](#); [yc20002@naver.com](#);

mslee3@assembly.go.kr; lbh0318@hanmail.net; smlee@assembly.go.kr; leesh_2018@naver.com;
giant_smlee@gmail.com; hello@imsoyoung.kr; sujinkleehope@gmail.com; leesj545@hanmail.net;
2yangs6288@naver.com; yonglee0623@naver.com; gwangsan.lyb@gmail.com; yslee9282@naver.com;
minjoolee2020@gmail.com; 614lyh@naver.com; ewon33@gmail.com; we1taeg@daum.net;
515.lee.ej@gmail.com; insoon0502@naver.com; liy1964@empal.com; ljm631000@assembly.go.kr;
leejlaw@gmail.com; ljm935@na.go.kr; victoryljb@naver.com; 217jongseong@naver.com;
leejoohwan3@naver.com; lci8572@naver.com; leetanhi1@gmail.com; leetk918@gmail.com;
youngcamp1@gmail.com; ilovebusanjin@hanmail.net; hslee2020bk@gmail.com; jigalso@daum.net; jungnam-
bhlm@naver.com; lok0415@hanmail.net; lj11@hanmail.net; 5321tempia@hanmail.net;
limhoseon2020@naver.com; letskt2020@gmail.com; dh337dh@naver.com; assembly0607@naver.com;
jcm5440@gmail.com; contact@janghyeyeong.com; jbm102100@na.go.kr; braveplane@gmail.com;
613jjs@gmail.com; jhjoy827@naver.com; sangrokgab@naver.com; jhsook7612@gmail.com;
dongmanjeong432@gmail.com; jsh35351@naver.com; 706gbs@gmail.com; chung10park@naver.com;
jsjeong0403@naver.com; jsemail@naver.com; jungchanmin@naver.com; ssaribi0415@naver.com;
hopejung@na.go.kr; jth5073@gmail.com; pmjung537@gmail.com; heeyong4you@naver.com;
yeskt@hanmail.net; 843mhjo@gmail.com; assembly2020@naver.com; yuseong0413@daum.net; hana-
king@hanmail.net; gracecho1@naver.com; chopros312@gmail.com; 7842760@naver.com;
chojunghun544@naver.com; chohaejin0804@naver.com; jassembly536@gmail.com; 7842055@naver.com;
mokbal2006@naver.com; smjingogo@gmail.com; hotjjoon@gmail.com; juno3355@gmail.com;
assembly420@gmail.com; choiwakeup@gmail.com; joynet4321@gmail.com; cysook915@naver.com;
hee709ho@gmail.com; 332incho@gmail.com; choejh0902@gmail.com; cjiyiw@naver.com;
cschoi415@naver.com; happyhappo@naver.com; choihy647@gmail.com; khchoo@assembly.go.kr;
onekorea2025@gmail.com; hayoungje635@naver.com; radiohaha@naver.com; hanmk2021@naver.com;
1bddoit@gmail.com; jeoung@gmail.com; juno.news2020@gmail.com; successshuh@gmail.com;
jongsy@naver.com; flyhong21@naver.com; mphonglove@hanmail.net; 0634assembly@naver.com;
sejonghsk@gmail.com; youngvote@hanmail.net; peace@peacehong.net; waytohong@naver.com;
0415hbsh@naver.com; unhah0301@gmail.com; hwanghee6728@gmail.com

Subject: San Francisco Mayor Breed: Tell your Sister City Seoul, South Korea, that you oppose the torture and consumption of dogs and cats!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:53:50 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors members:

As mayor and representatives of San Francisco, we ask you to reconsider your “friendship” with Seoul, a city that permits dogs and cats to be brutally tortured for food.

While graphic, these undercover videos depicting South Korea’s dog meat industry are important to watch:

Part 1 of 2: <https://youtu.be/ZVQjgGb4RO>

Part 2 of 2: <https://vimeo.com/754160791>

<https://koreandogs.org/jtbc-news-electric-tortured-in-cages/>

Touted as a so-called cosmopolitan city, Seoul [consumes the most dog meat of any city in South Korea](#). There are countless dog farms and dog slaughterhouses in the vicinity of Seoul. Korean web searches of Seoul turn up hundreds of [dog meat restaurants](#) and so-called “[Health Centers](#)” that commonly serve soup made of dog meat as phony elixirs (also known as dog soju).

Dogs suffer their entire lives in filthy, feces-encrusted wire cages in dire misery only to be slaughtered in the most horrific of ways—tortured by electrocution, hammer strikes to their head, hanging, being beaten to death, having their throats slit, being burned alive with a blowtorch or thrown into a vat of boiling water while still alive. In many places in Seoul, dogs are killed in full view of other caged dogs who tremble with terror. In addition, beloved pets are often stolen and sold to these slaughterhouses, where they meet the same horrific fate. Puppies who die of disease are tossed away like trash, often left in front of cages to rot while their mothers watch and cry out in despair.

Mayor Christopher Chung of Palisades Park, NJ, knew that no relationship or economic incentive was worth complicity in torturing humankind's most loyal companion. As reported in [the Korea Times](#), he recently rejected a visit from exchange students from the friendship city Incheon Ganghwa County due to their dog meat trade. In California, [the Los Angeles City Council](#) unanimously passed a resolution supporting legislation or administrative action that would request the governments of South Korea, China, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Cambodia ban the sale of dog meat and enforce their animal protection laws.

On behalf of companion animal-loving Americans and people worldwide, we ask that you follow these bold leads by not remaining silent in the face of such abhorrent cruelty. Please urge Seoul Mayor Oh Se-Hoon to shut down all Seoul-supplying dog farms, slaughterhouses, markets, dog meat restaurants, and truckers transporting dogs to their inevitable fates. An online petition calling for your support in ending such horrors perpetrated in Seoul is in progress: <https://chnng.it/5Ty85rRc>.

Thank you for your serious consideration. We eagerly await your reply.

Sincerely,

Catherine Beauchamp, USA

From: [Maria Zimmer](#)
To: [Breed_Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [okhyung628@naver.com](#); [119heart saver@naver.com](#); [hello@yonghyein.kr](#); [wsh2016v@gmail.com](#); [reform1-1@hanmail.net](#); [wishjeju@hanmail.net](#); [y0890@assembly.go.kr](#); [yookihong1001@gmail.com](#); [newds61@naver.com](#); [sbyoo64@naver.com](#); [ptopen730@naver.com](#); [junshine905@naver.com](#); [younky926@gmail.com](#); [winneryks@naver.com](#); [gyeongsan.love@gmail.com](#); [mhyang530@naver.com](#); [shyoon@na.go.kr](#); [yyd0415v@naver.com](#); [hangomy@assembly.go.kr](#); [yyc8361@naver.com](#); [yoonjg542@naver.com](#); [7882579@naver.com](#); [bela0524@naver.com](#); [yjb870053@naver.com](#); [yunch5270@gmail.com](#); [hjun9292@naver.com](#); [yoons609@hanmail.net](#); [7880291@naver.com](#); [ldg200020@naver.com](#); [fairness933@gmail.com](#); [yc20002@naver.com](#); [mslee3@assembly.go.kr](#); [lbh0318@hanmail.net](#); [smlee@assembly.go.kr](#); [leesh_2018@naver.com](#); [giant.smlee@gmail.com](#); [hello@imsoyoung.kr](#); [sujinleehope@gmail.com](#); [leesj545@hanmail.net](#); [2yangs6288@naver.com](#); [yonglee0623@naver.com](#); [gwangsan.lyb@gmail.com](#); [yslee9282@naver.com](#); [minjoollee2020@gmail.com](#); [614lyh@naver.com](#); [ewon33@gmail.com](#); [we1taeg@daum.net](#); [515.lee.ej@gmail.com](#); [inseon0502@naver.com](#); [liy1964@empal.com](#); [ljm631000@assembly.go.kr](#); [leejjlaw@gmail.com](#); [ljm935@na.go.kr](#); [victoryljb@naver.com](#); [217jongseong@naver.com](#); [leejoohwan3@naver.com](#); [lci8572@naver.com](#); [leetanh1@gmail.com](#); [leetk918@gmail.com](#); [youngcamp1@gmail.com](#); [ilovebusanjin@hanmail.net](#); [hslee2020bk@gmail.com](#); [ijgalso@daum.net](#); [jungnam-bhlim@naver.com](#); [lok0415@hanmail.net](#); [llj11@hanmail.net](#); [5321tempia@hanmail.net](#); [limhoseon2020@naver.com](#); [letskt2020@gmail.com](#); [dh337dh@naver.com](#); [assembly0607@naver.com](#); [jcm5440@gmail.com](#); [contact@janghyeyeong.com](#); [jbm102100@na.go.kr](#); [braveplane@gmail.com](#); [613jjs@gmail.com](#); [jhjoy827@naver.com](#); [sangrokgab@naver.com](#); [jhsook7612@gmail.com](#); [dongmanjeong432@gmail.com](#); [jsh35351@naver.com](#); [706gbs@gmail.com](#); [chung10park@naver.com](#); [jsjeong0403@naver.com](#); [jsemail@naver.com](#); [jungchanmin@naver.com](#); [ssaribi0415@naver.com](#); [hopejung@na.go.kr](#); [jth5073@gmail.com](#); [pmjung537@gmail.com](#); [heeyong4you@naver.com](#); [yeskt@hanmail.net](#); [843mhjo@gmail.com](#); [assembly2020@naver.com](#); [yuseong0413@daum.net](#); [hana-king@hanmail.net](#); [gracecho1@naver.com](#); [chopros312@gmail.com](#); [7842760@naver.com](#); [chojunghun544@naver.com](#); [chohaejin0804@naver.com](#); [jassembly536@gmail.com](#); [7842055@naver.com](#); [mokbal2006@naver.com](#); [smjingogo@gmail.com](#); [hotjjoon@gmail.com](#); [juno3355@gmail.com](#); [assembly420@gmail.com](#); [choiwakeup@gmail.com](#); [joynt4321@gmail.com](#); [cysook915@naver.com](#); [hee709ho@gmail.com](#); [332incho@gmail.com](#); [choejh0902@gmail.com](#); [cjyjiw@naver.com](#); [cschoi415@naver.com](#); [happyhappo@naver.com](#); [choihy647@gmail.com](#); [khchoo@assembly.go.kr](#); [onekorea2025@gmail.com](#); [hayoungje635@naver.com](#); [radiohaha@naver.com](#); [hanmk2021@naver.com](#); [1bdtoit@gmail.com](#); [jeoung@gmail.com](#); [juno.news2020@gmail.com](#); [successshuh@gmail.com](#); [jongsy@naver.com](#); [flyhong21@naver.com](#); [mphonglove@hanmail.net](#); [0634assembly@naver.com](#); [sejonghsk@gmail.com](#); [youngvote@hanmail.net](#); [peace@peacehong.net](#); [waytohong@naver.com](#); [0415hbsh@naver.com](#); [unhah0301@gmail.com](#); [hwanghee6728@gmail.com](#)
Subject: Tell Sister City Seoul, South Korea, you oppose the torture and consumption of dogs and cats.
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 8:49:03 AM

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

San Francisco Mayor London Breed: Tell Sister City Seoul, South Korea, you oppose the torture and consumption of dogs and cats.

Dear Mayor London Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors members:

As mayor and representatives of San Francisco, we ask you to reconsider your “friendship” with Seoul, a city that permits dogs and cats to be brutally tortured for food.

While graphic, these undercover videos depicting South Korea’s dog meat industry are important to watch:

Part 1 of 2: https://youtu.be/_ZVQjG64RO

Part 2 of 2: <https://vimeo.com/754160791>

<https://koreandogs.org/jtbc-news-electric-tortured-in-cages/>

Touted as a so-called cosmopolitan city, Seoul [consumes the most dog meat of any city in South Korea](#). There are countless dog farms and dog slaughterhouses in the vicinity of Seoul. Korean web searches of Seoul turn up hundreds of [dog meat restaurants](#) and so-called “[Health Centers](#)” that commonly serve soup made of dog meat as phony elixirs (also known as dog soju).

Dogs suffer their entire lives in filthy, feces-encrusted wire cages in dire misery only to be slaughtered in the most horrific of ways—tortured by electrocution, hammer strikes to their head, hanging, being beaten to death, having their throats slit, being burned alive with a blowtorch or

thrown into a vat of boiling water while still alive. In many places in Seoul, dogs are killed in full view of other caged dogs who tremble with terror. In addition, beloved pets are often stolen and sold to these slaughterhouses, where they meet the same horrific fate. Puppies who die of disease are tossed away like trash, often left in front of cages to rot while their mothers watch and cry out in despair.

Mayor Christopher Chung of Palisades Park, NJ, knew that no relationship or economic incentive was worth complicity in torturing humankind's most loyal companion. As reported in [the Korea Times](#), he recently rejected a visit from exchange students from the friendship city Incheon Ganghwa County due to their dog meat trade. In California, [the Los Angeles City Council](#) unanimously passed a resolution supporting legislation or administrative action that would request the governments of South Korea, China, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Cambodia ban the sale of dog meat and enforce their animal protection laws.

On behalf of companion animal-loving Americans and people worldwide, we ask that you follow these bold leads by not remaining silent in the face of such abhorrent cruelty. Please urge Seoul Mayor Oh Se-Hoon to shut down all Seoul-supplying dog farms, slaughterhouses, markets, dog meat restaurants, and truckers transporting dogs to their inevitable fates. An online petition calling for your support in ending such horrors perpetrated in Seoul is in progress: <https://chnng.it/5Ty85rRc>.

Thank you for your serious consideration. We eagerly await your reply.

Sincerely,

Maria Zimmer
Annagasse 4
AT - 7361 Kroatisch Geresdorf

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 32 Letters Regarding the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:49:00 PM
Attachments: [32 Letters Regarding the Valencia Placemaking Pilot.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 32 Letters Regarding the Valencia Placemaking Pilot.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

From: [Tom Fenwick](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 3:08:56 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

The bike lanes down the middle of Valencia street is a misguided attempt to make Valencia safer. I would honestly feel safer biking in the car lane than in a bike lane down the center of the street. But I would much prefer this place making pilot over the status quo and the bike lane in the middle of Valencia

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Tom Fenwick
tsfenwick@gmail.com
1362 la playa street
San Francisco, California

From: [Marcia Bana Tonetto](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 3:36:16 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Marcia Bana Tonetto
mbanatonetto@gmail.com
321 Prospect Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Jonathan Weisman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: URGENT - so important to support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 4:23:07 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Jonathan Weisman
jonathan.r.weisman@gmail.com
128 Linda St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [John McDonell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 4:25:26 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

John McDonell
johnmcdonell@gmail.com
1777 15th St.
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Joe Klinker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 4:25:27 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Joe Klinker
jklink3r@gmail.com
159 Tiffany Ave, Apt 5
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Kat Langille](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 4:56:00 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Kat Langille
katlangille1@gmail.com
1785 OFarrell St
, California

From: [Michael Gallagher](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 4:59:18 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Michael Gallagher
mjgallag@gmail.com
1550 Mission St Apt 3011
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Guilhem Lacaze](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 5:03:43 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Guilhem Lacaze
guilhem.lacaze@gmail.com
1650 Florida st
San Francisco, California

From: [Elizabeth Rajasingh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 6:49:56 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Elizabeth Rajasingh
elizabeth.rajasingh@gmail.com
626 Guerrero Street, Unit A
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Andrew Metcalf](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Valencia Placemaking Pilot!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 7:48:52 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot. The Slow Streets program has been amazing for our neighborhood. Sanchez St has become a community hub instead of a car throughfare. I'd love to see commercial streets like Valencia follow that path and be more friendly to people than to cars. Please vote in support of the pilot!

Andrew Metcalf
agmetcalf@gmail.com
3935 25th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Nelson Santry](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 7:54:07 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Nelson Santry
nelson.d.santry@gmail.com
626a Guerrero Street, Unit A
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Jessamyn Conell-Price](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 7:57:46 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Jessamyn Conell-Price
jessamyncp@gmail.com
48 Douglass St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Pavan Yedavalli](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:02:07 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Pavan Yedavalli
pavyedav@gmail.com
126 Noe St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Jonathan Rauch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:05:20 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, local residents, and all people. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to make the pilot a reality as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Jonathan Rauch
08.scour-chaff@icloud.com
101 Waller St, #452
San Francisco, California

From: [Matt Biggar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:40:21 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024 (hopefully much earlier)?

We need these spaces in San Francisco for improving the quality of life and the local economy.

Thank you.

Matt Biggar
mbiggar@connectedtoplace.com
668 Castro St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Michael Ottum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 10:06:36 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Michael Ottum
mike.ottum@gmail.com
3530 18th Street
, California

From: [j.robinson](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#); MTABoard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 2:53:48 PM

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

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot — led by Livable City — and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia an even better, more thriving community space and destination for merchants, locals, and travelers. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approval and funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City, the associated advocates, and SFMTA to approve the Pilot so it can start as soon as possible and no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a community space and destination for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better community space and destination. But that can only happen if the pilot is approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

From: [Lukas Bergstrom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 3:11:05 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Lukas Bergstrom
lukasb@gmail.com
233 Dorland Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Patrick Linehan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:46:56 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Patrick Linehan
plinehan@plinehan.com
251 Foerster St
San Francisco, California

From: [Andrew Fister](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:14:14 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Andrew Fister
temposs@gmail.com
1338 17th Ave
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94122

From: [ANDREW M Casteel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 7:43:03 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

ANDREW M Casteel
casteel@gmail.com
571 Valley St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Tyler Brandon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 2:26:37 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Tyler Brandon
tyler.a.brandon@gmail.com
138 Saturn Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Jake Price](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 2:40:16 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Jake Price
j.m.price55@gmail.com
1437 Hayes Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Kenta Nagamine](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 4:24:33 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Kenta Nagamine
kngmnaa1e@gmail.com
2802 21st
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Charles Whitfield](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 7:03:08 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Charles Whitfield
whitfield.cw@gmail.com
66 Cleary Court Apt 710
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Linh Hoang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:38:45 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Linh Hoang
linhphoang@gmail.com
665 Ashbury St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Dan Johnson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:56:07 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible. This pilot will make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved. I live up in the Lower Haight and have a six-year old daughter; creating a space like this will make it much more likely that we will head down that way together. Other world-class cities (Barcelona, Berlin) are creating spaces like this right now. It's time for San Francisco to join them.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Dan Johnson
dapperdan@gmail.com
571 Waller Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Kieran Farr](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 9:56:21 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Kieran Farr
kieran.farr@gmail.com
320 ALABAMA ST
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [J.P. Lavallee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 10:53:16 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

J.P. Lavallee
jplavalamp@yahoo.com
85 6th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Nathanael Aff](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:03:07 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Nathanael Aff
nathanaelaff@gmail.com
1523 24th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Mark Mac Manus](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 9:30:29 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Mark Mac Manus
mmacmanu@gmail.com
358 Dolores St.
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Sven Eberlein](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support and approve the Valencia Placemaking Pilot
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 10:30:09 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to support the Valencia Placemaking Pilot led by Livable City and urge you to support and approve the pilot of a "better block" as soon as possible to make Valencia a better destination for people and more thriving community space for merchants, local residents, and visitors. Please voice your support for the Pilot, vote in favor of any pilot approvals/funding (e.g. Board of Supervisors, SFCTA Board, SFMTA Board), and work with Livable City and the associated advocates to start the pilot no later than May 1st, 2024.

Valencia Street is a destination and community space for thousands of people and a critical merchant corridor for the Mission and our city. Approving a 3+ month pilot starting no later than May 1st, 2024 will allow residents and merchants to take part in the process of making Valencia an even better destination and community space. But that can only happen if the pilot is officially proposed and approved.

Will you publicly support the pilot and vote to approve a 3+ month pilot — ideally with funding — starting no later than May 1st, 2024?

Sven Eberlein
bikingtheclimate@gmail.com
1241A Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 48 Letters Regarding File No. 230161
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:56:00 PM
Attachments: [48 Letters Regarding File No. 230161.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 48 Letters Regarding **File No. 230161:**

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to permit law enforcement officials to respond to a federal immigration officer's request for voluntary notification that a person will be released from local custody, for adults who have been convicted of a felony for the sale, possession for sale, or transport for sale, of Fentanyl, and been held to answer for a felony for the sale, possession for sale, or transport for sale, of Fentanyl.

Regards,

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

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

From: [Marina D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 11:58:00 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

From your constituent Marina D
Email Jazmin1557@aol.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Stephanie Jeong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stop Fentanyl Undocumented Dealers
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 12:16:49 PM

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

Why do you not support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's idea to turn in undocumented drug dealers, who are dealing in Fentanyl, over to the police or to ICE? Selling an illegal substance is already breaking the law.

I await your reply. Thank you.

Stephanie

From: [Frederick Bullock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 5:33:43 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Frederick Bullock
Email fred.bullock@outlook.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals who prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [L Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 9:21:37 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

From your constituent L Wong
Email renonv87@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Justin Truong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 11:29:09 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

From your constituent Justin Truong
Email justintruong56@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Elizabeth Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:54:09 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

From your constituent Elizabeth Clark

Email swimeclark@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [K.R. Schwartz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 7:38:37 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

From your constituent K.R. Schwartz
Email kielygomes@yahoo.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Susan Abbott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:39:45 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

From your constituent Susan Abbott
Email suzy.abbott.sf@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Seema Gokhale](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 5:15:18 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

From your constituent Seema Gokhale
Email seema.v.gokhale@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Debbie Symanovich](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 9:49:38 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Debbie Symanovich
Email debbiesymanovich@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Meina Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:39:59 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

From your constituent Meina Young

Email meinayoung1@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [David Uyeda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 8:27:06 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

From your constituent David Uyeda
Email dkuyeda@hotmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Kenneth Camp](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:15:26 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

From your constituent Kenneth Camp
Email kennycamp@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [roz_Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:40:32 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent roz Smith
Email slowstreetroz@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Leslie Koelsch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:03:11 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

From your constituent Leslie Koelsch
Email koelsch1886@comcast.net

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Gary Decad](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:10:33 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Gary Decad
Email gmdecad@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Lou Ann Bassan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:24 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

From your constituent Lou Ann Bassan
Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Lou Ann Bassan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:25 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

From your constituent Lou Ann Bassan
Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [David Lehr](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:35:17 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

From your constituent David Lehr
Email lehr.david@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Susan McDonough](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:40:18 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

From your constituent Susan McDonough
Email sdrcrm@hotmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Mark Staton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:12:59 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

From your constituent Mark Staton
Email msstaton@sbcglobal.net

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Rob Higginbotham](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:20:30 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

From your constituent Rob Higginbotham
Email jch1965@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

Please okay this Amendment!!

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you,
Rob Higginbotham

From: [Yedi Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:10:29 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Yedi Wong
Email wongye@yahoo.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Gail Rutherford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:25:16 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

From your constituent Gail Rutherford
Email gail_rutherford@yahoo.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Emily Martin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:30:24 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

From your constituent Emily Martin
Email emilymartin@me.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Iris Vaughan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:24:06 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

From your constituent Iris Vaughan
Email iris.l.vaughan@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Mark Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:50:19 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

From your constituent Mark Clark
Email mpclark704@icloud.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Richard ash](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:55:30 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

From your constituent Richard ash
Email richardwesleyash@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Dorsey's efforts to amend San Francisco's administrative code and end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers. It is time to ensure that our Sanctuary Ordinance serves its intended purpose of protecting law-abiding residents and not criminals who prey upon innocent victims and those struggling with addiction.

As you may know, the misuse of the Sanctuary Ordinance has been a contentious issue in San Francisco. The ordinance was enacted in 1989 to protect undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crimes. However, over the years, many exemptions have been added to the law, including for murderers and rapists. Former District Attorney Chesa Boudin's use of the ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers was the last straw for many San Franciscans, leading to his recall.

It is crucial that we take action to ensure that our Sanctuary Ordinance serves its intended purpose. I urge you to support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance and add deadly drug dealers to the list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco. We must ensure that our city remains a safe place for all residents, and that includes taking

action against those who engage in drug trafficking and other criminal activities.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Dorsey's efforts to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers in San Francisco.

From: [Greg Batista](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:20:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Greg Batista
Email gbatista@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Margaret de Clercq](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:20:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Margaret de Clercq
Email ninadeclercq@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Paul Norris](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 2:10:34 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Paul Norris
Email paul.norrisii@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Joseph McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:30:17 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

From your constituent Joseph McFadden
Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Peter Fortune](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:15:19 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

From your constituent Peter Fortune
Email pt4tune@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Maurice Rivers](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:25:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Maurice Rivers
Email jumpstreet1983@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Barbara Dwyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:45:33 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Barbara Dwyer
Email montereydivingwoman@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Jane Day](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 7:45:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Jane Day
Email janeday@earthlink.net

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I wholeheartedly support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Garret Tom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:03:31 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Garret Tom
Email Gntom@bu.edu

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Robin McMillan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 10:00:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Robin McMillan
Email rkmcmillan@viselect.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Grant Ingram](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 12:07:47 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

From your constituent Grant Ingram

Email grant.ingram@yahoo.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Anthony Fox](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 1:38:57 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

From your constituent Anthony Fox
Email sftonyfox@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Anthony Fox](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 1:40:27 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Anthony Fox
Email sftonyfox@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Alexander McNees](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 2:08:50 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

From your constituent Alexander McNees
Email amcnees@hotmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Sylvia Terpstra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 7:05:32 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Sylvia Terpstra
Email skterp@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Marshall Terpstra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:32:30 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

From your constituent Marshall Terpstra
Email mjterps@yahoo.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Cynthia Kwan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 10:32:57 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

From your constituent Cynthia Kwan
Email cynthia.kwan@gmail.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Kate English](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:45:27 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

From your constituent Kate English
Email kenglish1775@comcast.net

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Kate English](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:45:28 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

From your constituent Kate English
Email kenglish1775@comcast.net

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Josephine Zhao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:58:25 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Josephine Zhao
Email josephine_zhao@yahoo.com

I support Supervisor Dorsey's effort to end sanctuary for deadly drug dealers!

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's ordinance amending San Francisco's administrative code so our Sanctuary Ordinance will protect law-abiding residents as intended and not the criminals that prey upon innocent victims and those incapacitated by substance addiction.

The last straw for many San Franciscans was watching former SF District Attorney Chesa Boudin describe how he used our Sanctuary Ordinance to protect Honduran drug dealers. A historic recall election soon followed and Boudin was resoundingly recalled.

Misuse of our Sanctuary Ordinance must stop. Enacted in 1989 to shield undocumented immigrants from being turned over to ICE by local law enforcement after reporting crime, many exemptions have been added to the law over the years including for murderers and rapists. It's now time to add deadly drug dealers to that list of those who are exempt from sanctuary protection in San Francisco.

Thank you.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 50 Letters Regarding the City Budget
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:56:00 PM
Attachments: [50 Letters Regarding the City Budget.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 50 Letters Regarding the City Budget.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

From: [Marina D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 12:00:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Marina D
Email Jazmin1557@aol.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [RICHARD MANSO](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 1:31:14 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

From your constituent RICHARD MANSO

Email rmanso2016@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Frederick Bullock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 5:35:31 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Frederick Bullock
Email fred.bullock@outlook.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I'm a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

Everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the degrading state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [L Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 9:25:19 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

From your constituent L Wong
Email renonv87@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Justin Truong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 11:30:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Justin Truong
Email justintruong56@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Elizabeth Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:55:25 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

From your constituent Elizabeth Clark
Email swimeclark@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [K. R. Schwartz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 7:40:22 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

From your constituent K. R. Schwartz
Email kielygomes@yahoo.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Susan Abbott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:41:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Susan Abbott
Email suzy.abbott.sf@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Seema Gokhale](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 5:16:38 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Seema Gokhale
Email seema.v.gokhale@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Debbie Symanovich](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 9:55:19 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

From your constituent Debbie Symanovich
Email debbiesymanovich@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Meina Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:45:21 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Meina Young

Email meinayoung1@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [David Uyeda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 8:30:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent David Uyeda
Email dkuyeda@hotmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Leslie Boin Podell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:10:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Leslie Boin Podell

Email leslie@podell.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Kenneth Camp](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:15:17 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

From your constituent Kenneth Camp
Email kennycamp@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Roz Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:39:45 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Roz Smith
Email slowstreetroz@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Natasha Dolby](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:45:17 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

From your constituent Natasha Dolby
Email nddolby@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Leslie Koelsch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:05:27 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

From your constituent Leslie Koelsch
Email koelsch1886@comcast.net

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Gary Decad](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:10:45 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Gary Decad
Email gmdecad@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and taxpayer and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process. WE DEMAND TRANSPARENCY AND WILL PUT AN END TO CORRUPTION IN CITY HALL . WE ARE FED UP!

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Lou Ann Bassan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:24 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

From your constituent Lou Ann Bassan
Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Alison Fong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:24 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

From your constituent Alison Fong
Email ayfong1@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [David Lehr](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:30:26 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

From your constituent David Lehr
Email lehr.david@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Susan McDonough](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:40:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Susan McDonough
Email sdrcrm@hotmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Art Lamb](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:50:17 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

From your constituent Art Lamb
Email sale_item@mindspring.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Mark Staton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:15:26 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

From your constituent Mark Staton
Email msstaton@sbcglobal.net

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Yedi Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:05:24 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

From your constituent Yedi Wong
Email wongye@yahoo.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Meredith Dunn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:25:24 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

From your constituent Meredith Dunn
Email meredithcdunn@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you,
Meredith Dunn

From: [Gail Rutherford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:25:25 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

From your constituent Gail Rutherford
Email gail_rutherford@yahoo.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [John Simpson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:30:35 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

From your constituent John Simpson
Email jsimpson1226@yahoo.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Iris Vaughan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:25:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Iris Vaughan
Email iris.l.vaughan@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Mark Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:46:02 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

From your constituent Mark Clark
Email mpclark704@icloud.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Margaret de Clercq](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:20:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Margaret de Clercq
Email ninadeclercq@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Mariana Prutton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:57:17 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

From your constituent Mariana Prutton
Email marprutton@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Paul Norris](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 2:10:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Paul Norris
Email paul.norrisii@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Bev Lipson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:20:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Bev Lipson
Email buzbev@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Ken Lipson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:25:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Ken Lipson
Email klios007@aol.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Joseph McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:30:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Joseph McFadden
Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Erika Kim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:59:52 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

From your constituent Erika Kim
Email e_kimch@yahoo.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.
Erika Kim

From: [Peter Fortune](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:15:21 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Peter Fortune

Email pt4tune@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Maurice Rivers](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:25:15 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

From your constituent Maurice Rivers
Email jumpstreet1983@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Barbara Dwyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:46:17 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

From your constituent Barbara Dwyer
Email montereydivingwoman@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Ronald Albucher](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 7:30:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Ronald Albucher
Email ronalbucher@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Garret Tom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:05:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Garret Tom
Email Gntom@bu.edu

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Robin McMillan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:54:17 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

From your constituent Robin McMillan
Email rkmcmillan@viselect.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Grant Ingram](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 12:08:03 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

From your constituent Grant Ingram

Email grant.ingram@yahoo.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Anthony Fox](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 1:35:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Anthony Fox
Email sftonyfox@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Alexander McNees](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 2:10:18 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

From your constituent Alexander McNees

Email amcnees@hotmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Sylvia Terpstra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 7:10:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Sylvia Terpstra
Email skterp@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Marshall Terpstra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:33:52 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

From your constituent Marshall Terpstra
Email mjterps@yahoo.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Kate English](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:42:02 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

From your constituent Kate English
Email kenglish1775@comcast.net

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Olga Graham](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:29:56 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

From your constituent Olga Graham
Email olga.graham2353@gmail.com

As a resident of San Francisco, I insist on an effectively run city government that is transparent about ALL spending.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco voter and I am concerned about San Francisco's \$14B budget and the city budget process.

You should know that everyday San Franciscans are paying attention to the City budget, especially in light of the declining state of our streets, education, public safety, transportation and all services. Given the seemingly endless news of corruption and wasted funds, including funds to non-existent non-profits, we want transparency and accountability.

At the very least, I expect that NO organization contracting with the City should receive funds without clear expectations and demonstrable metrics of success. All non-profit contractors should be in good standing and in compliance with the requirements of the State of California, or should lose their funding.

San Franciscans deserve to see real, on-the-ground results for \$14B of spending, and I insist that our government provide the public with a transparent and accountable budget process.

Thank you.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 52 Letters Regarding File No. 230157
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 1:00:00 PM
Attachments: [52 Letters Regarding File No. 230157.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 52 Letters Regarding **File No. 230157:**

Ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023; this Ordinance requires a two-thirds approval vote of all members of the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter, Section 9.113(c).

Regards,

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

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

From: [David Nolley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 2:37:41 PM

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

General email Board Of Suervisors,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

David Nolley
danolley@aol.com
1754 Great Highway
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Karen Breslin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 3:16:15 PM

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

General email Board Of Suervisors,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Karen Breslin
kbsmail@sbcglobal.net
839 Foerster St
SF, California 94127

From: [Frederick Bullock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 5:32:51 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Frederick Bullock
Email fred.bullock@outlook.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [L Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 9:20:34 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent L Wong
Email renonv87@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Justin Truong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 11:28:58 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

From your constituent Justin Truong
Email justintruong56@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Elizabeth Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:53:36 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

From your constituent Elizabeth Clark

Email swimeclark@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [K.R. Schwartz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 7:38:07 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

From your constituent K.R. Schwartz
Email kielygomes@yahoo.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Susan Abbott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:38:11 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

From your constituent Susan Abbott
Email suzy.abbott.sf@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.


Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [National League Of Cities \(NLC\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Celebrating Two Years of the American Rescue Plan Act
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 4:16:35 AM

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



The Weekly

[celebrating two years of the american rescue plan act](#)



Hello NLC Friends and Colleagues,

Today, we celebrate an incredible accomplishment for our nation's cities, towns and villages – two full years of the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). Exactly two years ago, President Biden signed into law legislation that would be game-changing for all of our communities in our recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond.

Thanks to ARPA, \$65.1 billion was put directly in the hands of local leaders to spend in ways we knew were best for our communities. And since then, city leaders have used their ARPA funds to not just address the immediate crisis of the pandemic but truly transform their cities – setting up shelters to address homelessness, putting stakes in the ground on broadband expansion projects, funding afterschool programming for our communities' kids, and so much more. Local leaders are building their cities back stronger with these funds, changing the lives of their residents along the way.

Although a lot has changed in the last two years, today the work continues. In this edition of the Weekly, we're resharing some of our top ARPA resources so that you can continue to allocate your funds in the most effective ways possible, prepare for reporting requirements and tell the stories of how these investments are changing your communities. So please, join us in celebrating by taking advantage of the resources below and sharing your ARPA stories! [Download our toolkit](#) for prompts to share your stories on social media, pitch to local press, and examples on how to

demonstrate that residents in your community benefitted from these critical funds. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,



Clarence E. Anthony

CEO & Executive Director

National League of Cities

TOP CONTENT



**President Victoria Woodards:
Celebrating Two Years
of the American
Rescue Plan Act »**



**Fact Sheet: Local
Governments Using
ARPA Local Recovery
Funds to Combat
Impacts of Inflation »**



**Upcoming SLFRF
Reporting Deadline:
Five Tips for Small
Governments »**

INDUSTRY NEWS

- [Federal COVID aid OK'd to pay for roads, natural disasters](#) - *Associated Press* (January 10, 2023)
- [As cities and counties commit more American Rescue Plan funds, regional priorities are emerging](#) - *Brookings* (February 14, 2023)
- [It's been two years since ARPA was signed into law and almost 70% of cities have committed their allotments](#) - *American City & County* (February 23, 2023)
- [ARPA fund spending shows regional differences in local government priorities, researchers say](#) - *Smart Cities Dive* (February 23, 2023)
- [Treasury brings back popular help line for Rescue Plan funds](#) - *StateScoop* (February 27, 2023)
- [How Cities and Counties Are Spending Their ARPA Funds](#) - *Route Fifty* (February 28, 2023)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Treasury Reopens Help Line Ahead of April SLFRF Filing

Deadline: In February, the U.S. Department of Treasury re-opened the contact center many small and rural cities, towns and villages rely on for guidance. [Read more »](#)

What You Need to Know About ARPA and the Single

Audit Alternative: Understand the regulation and program requirements for SLFRF recipients and give an overview of relief provided recently by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).


[Read more »](#)

As Cities and Counties Commit More ARPA Funds, Regional Priorities Are Emerging: New data from the Department of the Treasury has provided the fullest picture to date of how local, state, and tribal governments are investing the act's \$350 billion in State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF). [Read more »](#)

Congress Gives Cities More Flexibility for Recovery Funds: Passed by Congress in December 2022, the ARPA Flex provision provides additional flexibility for States, Tribes, and units of local government to spend their allocations of the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds. [Read more »](#)

The Municipal Workforce Through the Pandemic: Where Are We Now? A detailed analysis of municipal labor data and insights on how communities are investing ARPA funds to bolster their local governments' staff. [Read more »](#)

Public Safety Workforce in the Post-COVID Era: Learn how communities are investing ARPA funds to bolster their communities' public safety staff. [Read more »](#)



jennifer adams



Read our blog, [*Women's History Month: Spotlighting Women in Local Government*](#) »

JOB OPENINGS

[See Who's Hiring Right Now](#) »

- [Planning Services Manager - Town of Abilene, TX](#)

- [Director of Pooled Programs - City of Roseville, CA](#)
- [City Manager - City of New Hope, MN](#)

Join the Team at NLC »

- [Business Events Logistics Coordinator](#)
- [Senior Program Specialist, Urban Innovation](#)
- [Program Manager, Research](#)

Helpful NLC Links:

[News & Insight](#)

[Upcoming Events](#)

[Resources & Training](#)

[Advocacy](#)

[COVID-19 Relief Resources](#)



If this message is not displaying properly, please view in [browser](#).

This message was intended for: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org. You may update your communication [preferences](#) from NLC at any time here.

NLC

660 North Capitol Street NW, Suite 450 Washington DC, DC, 20001, United States
[Privacy Policy](#) | © 2022 NLC, All Rights Reserved

From: [Debbie Symanovich](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 9:49:00 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

From your constituent Debbie Symanovich
Email debbiesymanovich@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Meina Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:39:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Meina Young

Email meinayoung1@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [David Uyeda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 8:25:31 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent David Uyeda
Email dkuyeda@hotmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Leslie Boin Podell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:06:53 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

From your constituent Leslie Boin Podell

Email leslie@podell.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Kenneth Camp](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:15:17 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

From your constituent Kenneth Camp

Email kennycamp@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Roz Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:39:05 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

From your constituent Roz Smith
Email slowstreetrox@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Natasha Dolby](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:45:20 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

From your constituent Natasha Dolby
Email nddolby@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Leslie Koelsch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:05:26 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

From your constituent Leslie Koelsch
Email koelsch1886@comcast.net

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Gary Decad](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:10:22 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

From your constituent Gary Decad
Email gmdecad@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Alison Fong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:22 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

From your constituent Alison Fong
Email ayfong1@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Lou Ann Bassan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Lou Ann Bassan
Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Lou Ann Bassan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:25 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

From your constituent Lou Ann Bassan
Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Alison Fong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:26 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

From your constituent Alison Fong
Email ayfong1@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [David Lehr](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:30:24 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

From your constituent David Lehr
Email lehr.david@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Art Lamb](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:50:28 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

From your constituent Art Lamb
Email sale_item@mindspring.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Rob Higginbotham](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:20:18 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

From your constituent Rob Higginbotham
Email jch1965@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

Please approve this ordinance!!

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you,
Rob Higginbotham

From: [Laurance Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:40:03 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

From your constituent Laurance Lee

Email laulemlee@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Melissa Ippolito](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:45:18 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

From your constituent Melissa Ippolito
Email melissaippo@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

SAVE OUR CITY. IT IS AN EMBARRASSMENT AND A DISASTER. Your job is to represent the people and the people want to be safe. Do your job and fund the DA so they can prosecute. SF is lawless and without an aggressive change, it will be to the point of no return. Longtime residents will leave.

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of

Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Yedi Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:04:16 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

From your constituent Yedi Wong
Email wongye@yahoo.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Gail Rutherford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:20:24 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

From your constituent Gail Rutherford
Email gail_rutherford@yahoo.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Meredith Dunn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:30:17 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

From your constituent Meredith Dunn
Email meredithcdunn@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you,
Meredith Dunn

From: [Iris Vaughan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:22:50 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

From your constituent Iris Vaughan
Email iris.l.vaughan@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Mark Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:44:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Mark Clark
Email mpclark704@icloud.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Greg Batista](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:15:34 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Greg Batista
Email gbatista@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Margaret de Clercq](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:20:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Margaret de Clercq
Email ninadeclercq@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [JOSLYN GOLDBERG](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [HRC-dreamkeepersf](#)
Subject: Dream Keeper Initiative
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:22:08 PM

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

To: Mayor Breed and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Thank you for taking to time to review this letter of request.

My concern is that the funding for the Dream Keeper program will be cut. This program has served many many residents of San Francisco. The access to the help the program has provided to residents has improved their quality of life. It has raised their standard of living. This type of help has helped residents tremendously. Their self esteem, mental stability and quality of life have all been positively affected.

My concern is that if this program is dissolved it would cause many people in our most underserved communities would not be able to get the services and help that these communities so rightly deserve.

Thank you

Joslyn Goldberg
685 Orizaba Ave
San Francisco, CA 94132
415 335 5010

From: [Mariana Prutton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:57:05 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

From your constituent Mariana Prutton
Email marprutton@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Paul Norris](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 2:10:19 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

From your constituent Paul Norris
Email paul.norrisii@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Joseph McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:30:18 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

From your constituent Joseph McFadden
Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Erika Kim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:59:23 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Erika Kim
Email e_kimch@yahoo.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.
Erika Kim

From: [Peter Fortune](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:15:22 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

From your constituent Peter Fortune

Email pt4tune@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Maurice Rivers](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:20:31 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Maurice Rivers
Email jumpstreet1983@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Barbara Dwyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:46:53 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

From your constituent Barbara Dwyer
Email montereydivingwoman@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Steve Lawrence](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 6:10:26 PM

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

General email Board Of Suervisors,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Steve Lawrence
splawrence@sbcglobal.net
55 Montalvo Ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Jane Day](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 7:42:42 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

From your constituent Jane Day
Email janeday@earthlink.net

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Garret Tom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:02:49 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

From your constituent Garret Tom
Email Gntom@bu.edu

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Sem Lederman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:01:49 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

From your constituent Sem Lederman
Email llederman@hotmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Robin McMillan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:52:56 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

From your constituent Robin McMillan
Email rkmcmillan@viselect.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Alexander McNees](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 2:08:22 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

From your constituent Alexander McNees

Email amcnees@hotmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Sylvia Terpstra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 7:03:02 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

From your constituent Sylvia Terpstra
Email skterp@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Marshall Terpstra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:32:11 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

From your constituent Marshall Terpstra
Email mjterps@yahoo.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Kate English](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:41:34 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Kate English
Email kenglish1775@comcast.net

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Josephine Zhao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:57:58 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

From your constituent Josephine Zhao
Email josephine_zhao@yahoo.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 55 Letters Regarding File Nos. 230078 & 230109
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 1:12:00 PM
Attachments: [55 Letters Regarding File Nos. 230078 & 230109.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 55 Letters Regarding File Nos. 230078 & 230109.

File No. 230078: Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, September 19, 2023, at 3:00 p.m., to hold a public hearing on the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative updates; and requesting the Human Rights Commission, the African American Reparations Advisory Committee, and the Dream Keeper Initiative to present.

-
File No. 230109: Resolution accepting the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan of the African American Reparations Advisory Committee.

-
Regards,

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

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



Clerk_of_the_Board_Information_Request

Your Tracking Number is: 16544081

Thank you for your submission.
You will receive an email confirmation with a link to follow the progress of your submission.

If you have any additional requests or questions, you can call us 7 days a week, 24 hours a day at 311 (for calls outside of San Francisco please dial 415-701-2311).

Date: 03/15/2023

First Name: jesse
Last Name: tucker
Phone: 9297164339
Email: jessetuckerjr@urexposed.net

File No.:
Resolution No.:
Ordinance No.:
Motion No.:

Print
2023 MAR 15 AM 8:15
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
BY [Signature] BOS-11

Request from City Department
I want to see the file. (Files stored off site are ordered on Friday and delivered on Monday)
I will return to see the file on:

I want a copy of: (all copies will be double-sided)

- Resolution
- Ordinance
- Motion
- Audio Recording
- Entire File

Need certified copy? No
(Additional \$2.00 per document per Administrative Code, Section 8.37)

I will pick up the information on:

Mail information to: n/a

If less than 10 pages, fax information to: n/a

If available electronically, email information to: n/a

Subject/Brief Description/Additional Information *

Keep in mind that Joe Biden is a WHITE-white privilege person and must pay reparations for slavery.

Copies are 10 cents per page and CDs and audio tapes are \$1.00 each, plus postage. Make check payable to: City and County of San Francisco.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: March 14. 2023 Dream Keepers, Black Owned Business, Funding for Our Communities
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:17:00 AM

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

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

From: Lisa Ferdinand <lisa3848@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 12:55 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: March 14. 2023 Dream Keepers, Black Owned Business, Funding for Our Communities

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

You need you to keep your promises. We are tax payers who are struggling to keep our in home Childcares open to support black/brown children and low income families. Grants for education is needed for childcare providers to help educate ourselves, children and families we serve in our programs. This also helps with books, materials and supplies to help facultate, field trips and their/our education. Training and workshops need to continue so that we all can provide quality care and keep serving our communities. etc. Thank you, Lisa Ferdinand - Family Child Care Provider.

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Support SF Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 7:15:00 PM

From: Anna W Yohannes <annawyohannes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:07 PM
Subject: Support SF Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative

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

To the SF Board of Supervisors,

As a Black San Francisco resident, preschool teacher, and child care advocate, I write to you unequivocally support the San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative and ask you to fund them permanently.

As a member of the African American Early Childhood Education Policy Council which has received funding via the Dream Keeper Initiative's grant process, I can attest to the importance of this allocation directly to Black-serving education nonprofits. It is crucial that Black-serving and Black-led community-based organizations are able to access City resources. Almost a third of respondents surveyed by DKI indicated that this funding cycle was the first time they had secured City funds for their programming – that is a significant impact and should continue.

The Dream Keeper Initiative is enacting real and ongoing community accountability and authentic partnership across the City's diverse Black communities. This throughline of what easily falls into a 'For Us, By Us' model has been embraced by and large because it is **empowering and engaging Black San Franciscans in ways that have not been previously seen and supported.**

Thank you for taking the time to consider this matter. **I feel confident that you will do the right thing.**

Sincerely,
Anna Wolde-Yohannes
District 5

From: [Ena Ferdinand](#)
To: DRAMOSCBROWN@thirdbapist.org
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations Payment Proposal
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:05:16 AM

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

Good Day,

As a SF native and life member of the NAACP (purchased by my late grandfather Esau Ferdinand) I am very disappointed and ashamed of your recent email sent to the SF Board. This has nothing to do with the city itself as your letter clearly insinuates. This has more to do with an attempt to provide a small monetary compensation for a larger systemic problem that disproportionately robbed us of civil liberties, life sustainability. Took away billions from our communities and created generational problems . Your ideas are specific to the city's responsibility not in line with what this proposal is truly for.

You do not speak for me as a direct descendant of slavery. My grandfather was lucky to have had the stamina and mindset of owning and prospering against all odds which allowed him to purchase multiple properties in SF despite the redlining and racial inequities he faced. Imagine if he was able to freely dream and build based on HIS needs and wants instead of that of which is left.

He even had the mindset that purchasing his ENTIRE family NAACP memberships could (possibly / hopefully) ensure representation and leadership for his future generations.

I am ashamed of you. I am saddened by you. Jesus came and died so that we may have life and live it abundantly. You should ask members of the community near and far what THEY would prefer or want in the compensation strategies instead of retraumatizing and muddying the process with non relevant opposition options which have no direct benefit to the people that would stand to be included in the proposal. Take your political antics out of this and truly represent yourself as an ally!

Ena Ferdinand

510-480-6685

From: [steve marks](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:20:07 AM

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

You people are idiots.....

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Ena Ferdinand](#)
To: [HRC-Reparations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); dramoscbrown@thirdbaptist.org
Subject: Reparations Payment Proposal
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 11:59:26 AM

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

Good Day Rev. Dr. Amos Brown,

As a SF native and life member of the NAACP (purchased by my late grandfather Esau Ferdinand) I am very disappointed and ashamed of your recent email sent to the SF Board. This has nothing to do with the city itself as your letter clearly insinuates. This has more to do with an attempt to provide a small monetary compensation for a larger systemic problem that disproportionately robbed us of civil liberties, life sustainability. Took away billions from our communities and created generational problems . Your ideas are specific to the city's responsibility not in line with what this proposal is truly for.

You do not speak for me as a direct descendant of slavery. My grandfather was lucky to have had the stamina and mindset of owning and prospering against all odds which allowed him to purchase multiple properties in SF despite the redlining and racial inequities he faced. Imagine if he was able to freely dream and build based on HIS needs and wants instead of that of which is left.

He even had the mindset that purchasing his ENTIRE family NAACP memberships could (possibly / hopefully) ensure representation and leadership for his future generations.

I am ashamed of you. I am saddened by you. Jesus came and died so that we may have life and live it abundantly. You should ask members of the community near and far what THEY would prefer or want in the compensation strategies instead of retraumatizing and muddying the process with non relevant opposition options which have no direct benefit to the people that would stand to be included in the proposal. Take your political antics out of this and truly represent yourself as an ally!

Ena Ferdinand

510-480-6685

From: [Bernal Heights Democratic Club San Francisco](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\); Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: March 14 BOS agenda Item 14: Draft SF Reparations Plan
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 11:21:32 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

We, the Executive Committee of the Bernal Heights Democratic Club, write to you in support of the draft report and recommendations of the African American Reparations Advisory Committee.

We commend Supervisor Walton for his leadership in crafting the legislation to create the AARAC and you and former members of the Board for unanimously passing that legislation and appointing a stellar group of leaders to serve on the Committee.

The work the AARAC has produced is profound and thoughtfully responds to the many years of economic, geographic, and social discrimination against Black San Franciscans, which drove a devastating migration of valued members of our community to other destinations in search of jobs, affordable housing, healthcare, and services.

While the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency eviscerated Black communities in the Western Addition and Fillmore in the 1950s and 1960s under the vicious and false policies of "urban renewal," the City implemented policies that eliminated working class industries and promoted downtown to be the financial center of the West. That history created the circumstances to solidify the racial disparities that define our city today.

The list of recommended actions in the AARAC draft report is extensive and deserves deep and thoughtful consideration, new and innovative ideas for revenue where necessary, and a clear timeline for implementation.

This is an opportunity to make amends for past and present harms and to repair and move toward the promise of Dr. King's Beloved Community. We urge you to do the right thing and to direct the AARAC to continue their work to refine the draft plan, so that a Reparations Plan can be adopted from the AARAC final report due this summer.

With thanks.

Sincerely,

BERNAL HEIGHTS DEMOCRATIC CLUB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

From: [Joyce Nakamura](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for Draft SF Reparations Plan
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 6:17:48 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I support reparations for San Francisco African Americans to repair the harms of chattel slavery and repair to the legacy of harms to African American San Franciscans. As someone who fought redevelopment of the San Francisco Japantown community, I especially want to point out how urban renewal and redevelopment has wiped out middle class families in San Francisco and thousands of units of housing making it impossible for African Americans to live in San Francisco, also due to other discriminatory practices.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to accept the Draft Reparations Plan proposed by the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee and commit to making the recommendations in the Plan to be made law by Ordinance or Executive Order of the Mayor.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joyce Nakamura
District 3 resident

From: [Joyce Chartock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Black American Reparations Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:15:24 AM

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

Hello,

I read the article in the SF Chronicle about what the reparations to Black Americans might look like.

I wondered if anyone has proposed a plan to create a trust that would pay for any Black American student to go to college and have his/her college expenses paid? Of course there would be contingencies like maintaining a B average etc;. A Black American student coming out of college with no debt would be huge for the future of Black Americans. Those students will become doctors, teachers, start-up entrepreneurs, nurses, and open up businesses which will support their upward mobility in our society.

In my opinion, just giving some people money won't help the situation for all future Black Americans which I assume is the intent of this plan. Yes, offering Black Americans support in buying a home will help some. Yes, mental health services for Black Americans will help some. All of the proposed plans I read offer support for some Black Americans.

How about adding a plan that provides support for all future Black Americans?

Just my opinion.

Thank you.

Joyce Chartock

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Bailey Radian](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparatons
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 12:27:32 PM

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

Vote NO
Bailey Radian

From: [Sonya Brunswick](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Reparations Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 1:22:41 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-t5jkc5y1.png](#)
[Outlook-pq2mtfsc.png](#)
Importance: High

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

To All Our San Franciscan City Officials & Leaders,

We are grateful for your leadership and the progress being made to move San Francisco forward and lead in all areas of social justice and economic empowerment and prosperity for all.

I support the reparations for San Francisco African Americans. I ask the supervisors to accept the Draft Reparations Plan and commit to making the 111 recommendations in the Plan to be made law by Ordinance or Executive Order by the Mayor.

Sincerely,


FOURSQUARE CHAPLAINS
Reverend Sonya Brunswick, Senior Pastor
San Francisco Police Department Chaplain
Greater Life Foursquare Church
San Francisco, CA 94134
Brunswick@sbcglobal.net
www.greaterlife4u.org



“The purpose of life is not to be happy – but to matter, to be productive, to be useful, to have it make some difference that you have lived at all.”

Leo Rosten

From: [Tonya Strickling](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations 4 SF Blacks
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 1:40:29 PM

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

Hello, my name is Tonya and I was born and raised in San Francisco. I am here to demand your support for the recommendations in the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan.

The Board of Supervisors must take action NOW.

If you support these recommendations, then it is YOUR job to determine how you fund them. You don't ask the people you've hurt to do your homework and figure out how to pay for the damage you caused. It's on this body to provide redress for the very specific actions taken to cause harm to Black San Franciscans

We want student loan debt to be eliminated for Black students that suffered through the San Francisco school district that did not prepare us for jobs that could pay those loans back.

We want a school that focuses on Black-centered curriculum where Black students Pre-K through 12th grade can receive high-quality, culturally-affirming education.

Warm regards,
Tonya Strickling

Sent from my iPhone

From: [HARRY SHORT](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 5M\$ Black Person Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:03:12 PM

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

You people are simply fucking crazy. I don't believe you know what planet you live on. Liberal elitist assholes, all of you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Rhonda C~](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: AA Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:07:32 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

My name is Rhonda Collins. I grew up in San Francisco before my family relocated to Napa Valley. My parents chose to move because raising 5 children had become unsafe in Hunter's Point and The Bayview areas and they wanted us to have better education, resources and safety. My talking point is EDUCATION. As a child, I was bussed from the Bayview to the Excelsior District in the 4th grade. This became an extra expense and worry for my parents as NO BUSSES WERE PROVIDED and I had to take Muni. I was 9 at that time and my parents were unable to take me to school. No parent should have to worry about their children's safety, extensive travel before and after school or their receiving sub-par education which is why we were bussed. I write this letter on behalf of my brothers Tyrone Moore, Phillip Moore, Jermaine Moore, mother Dorothy Moore and myself.

Thank you

Rhonda Collins

From: [Rhonda C~](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: AA Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:10:32 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

My name is Bruce Collins. I both lived in San Francisco and was an instructor for the SF City College for more than 30 years, working on the main campus, Southeast Campus, Evans Campus, Mission Campus and Gough Street. My talking point is EDUCATION. I saw firsthand the disparity in educational opportunities and resources available to people of color, particularly at the Southeast Campus. I personally witnessed the dwindling resources in the Black community and lack of effort given to recruit Blacks to fill available courses. Many of the classes were removed and offered only at other campuses which were difficult to travel and enroll. Education must remain available and affordable for all.

Thank You

Bruce Collins

From: [Crista](#)
To: crista42@yahoo.com
Subject: San Francisco Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:17:17 PM

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

I support the reparations for San Francisco African Americans being presented at the Board of Supervisors special hearing today (3/14/23). I ask the supervisors to accept the Draft Reparations Plan and commit to making the 111 recommendations in the Plan law by Ordinance or Executive Order by the Mayor.

Thank you,
Crista Underwood

From: [Sarita Mason](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:21:29 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Sarita Mason and I along with my older sister and younger brother grew up in the San Francisco, Potrero Hill Public Housing Projects.

I am asking for the Board of Supervisors and/or Mayor to make Reparations for African Americans an executive order or an ordinance to make reparations a law in San Francisco.

We (the African American community & other supporters of reparations for African American descendants of forced labor practices, unequal social & racial practices resulting in the inequitable distribution of wealth, resources & opportunities) do not want this draft to sit and collect dust like the others, we need the Board of Supervisors to take ACTION since they unanimously voted that Black people in San Francisco deserve Reparations!

Respectfully,
Sarita M. Mason
Saritammason@gmail.com
5104792406

From: [alicia.st.andrews](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Accept draft reparations plan and commit to 111 recommendations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:21:55 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I support the reparations for San Francisco African Americans. I ask the supervisors to accept the Draft Reparations Plan and commit to making the 111 recommendations in the Plan to be made law by Ordinance or Executive Order by the Mayor.

Sincerely,

Alicia St. Andrews
SF City and County employee

--

Alicia St. Andrews
Pronouns: [she/her/hers](#) | Race: [white](#) | Land: [Ohlone](#)

From: [Sandra Hall](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support of Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:44:58 PM

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

I support the reparations for San Francisco African Americans. I ask the supervisors to accept the Draft Reparations Plan and commit to making the 111 recommendations in the Plan to be made law by Ordinance or Executive Order by the Mayor.

Thank you,

Sandra Hall
SF native

From: [Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Larry Ransom A Voice for Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:54:44 PM

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

From: Larry Ransom <Grace43sts@yahoo.com>
Date: March 14, 2023 at 5:37:21 AM PDT
To: boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org
Subject: Re: Reparations

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

On Monday, March 13, 2023, 11:55 PM, Larry Ransom <grace43sts@yahoo.com> wrote:

<boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

On Monday, March 13, 2023, 10:36 PM,

From:
grace43sts@yahoo.com

Subject:
Reparation
Date:
March
13,
2023
at
9:12:52
PM
PDT
To:
Larry
Ransom
<grace43sts@yahoo.com>
Cc:

Hello,
my
Larry
C.
Ransom,
I
am
native
that
was
born
and
raised
in
San Francisco
until
the
age
of
25.
I
moved
out
of
state
in
1979,
and
returned
in
1986.

The
struggle
to
reside
was
even
harder
economically.

I
was
unable
to
provide
a comfortable
living
environment
for
my
family
in
San Francisco.

I
am writing
to
demand
your
support
for
the recommendation
in
the
Draft
San Francisco
Plan.

The
Board
of Supervisors
must
take
action
now.

Telling the
Black
people
to
give

the
context
and balance
your
budget,
just
simply
adds
insult
to
injury.
Expecting
the communities
that have
been harmed
by
a
legacy
of
disinvestment
and
racially
biased
policy
is
unfair
and unprecedented.

Under
the
education,
part
of
the
reason
we
should
be compensated
is
due to
the
harm
of
the San Francisco
Education
system
had

brought
upon
us.
Yet,
from
the
1700's,
into
the
21st century
we
have
not ceased contributing
to
the
world
around
us,
through
Black African
American
innovators,
and
inventors
through science
and
social technology
making
life
easier,
safer,
and
more comfortable
individuals, communities
and
us
advancing
science
and technology.
We
want
a
school
that
will
focus
on
Black
centered curriculum
where

Black
students
pre-
K through
12th
grade
receive
a
high
quality
culturally affirming education.
Thank
you
in advance
for
your consideration.

Hotel hospitality
now
retired
Mr.
Larry
C.
Ransom

From: [john.smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: COMMENTS
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 3:03:27 PM

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

YOU RATS ARE JUST FUCKING MORONS, HOW THE FUCK DO YOU JUSTIFY GIVING \$\$\$ OUR \$\$\$ TO PEOPLE THAT WERE NEVER SLAVES FROM PEOPLE WHO NEVER OWNED SLAVES ??? YOU FUCKING IDIOTS ??? THIS CITY IS A FUCKING MESS. WHY NOT DEAL WITH THAT ??? HEY IDIOTS THE HOMELESS ARE FUCKING EVERYWHERE GIVE THEM A ROOM & A JOB ??? A TAX PAYER IS WAY MORE VALUABLE THAN A \$\$\$ TAKER YOU MORONIC FUCKS YOU ARE A ROOM OF IDIOTS !!! ALSO, YOU EVER THINK ABOUT BRINGING IN LE GUILLOTINE ??? IT WORKS REALLY WELL & VERY CHEAP TOO. WE CAN USE IT TO DEAL WITH THE YOU KNOW WHOS WHAT DO YOU THINK ???
VIVA LA LIBERTE !!!
**OH WELL YOU ALL
TAKE CARE
ALL THE BEST
BE WELL**

From: [Richard Tokeshi](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 3:09:26 PM

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

I fully support the Plan for Reparations for SF African-Americans. I ask that the Board of Supervisors adopt into law the 111 recommendations in the plan. Thank you.

Richard Tokeshi
San Francisco, CA

From: [Mrs. Nikcole Cunningham](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Pls accept the SF Reparations draft
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 3:40:09 PM

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

Hello Board of Supervisors,

My name is Nikcole Cunningham and I'm a native San Franciscan from "Filmoe" aka The Filmore. I am part of the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee seat 6 (someone who has been discriminated in the workplace) and I'm asking that you fully accept our San Francisco Reparations Draft from December 2022 and sign in all 111 recommendations into LAW. We need/want/desire to have the recommendations signed in as an executive order, ordinance or any means necessary to make these recommendations law. Please do **NOT** send any of these recommendations to the people of San Francisco to vote on as I am positive that most Americans in San Francisco and throughout this country do not want Black people to receive reparations of any kind. A vote from the people will fail and Black people will continue to be harmed.

We need all of you to sign these recommendations into law so that Black folks can receive our due, these are not gifts, they're debts owed for life long suffering.

Before you all say, "there's no money," I want to recommend some ideas and ways to find money:

Create taxes on anything and everything that people **MUST/WILL** use like:

PG&E tax

Internet tax

CRV tax (soda/water)

marijuana tax

bag tax

water bill tax

garbage bill tax

alcohol tax

cigarette tax

\$1 for every parking ticket in San Francisco

Gas tax is good, but would end in 2035 based on Gavin Gavin Newsom's electric cars only bill.

President Joe Biden didn't ask me to send BILLIONS of dollars to Ukraine, but he found the money to send it abroad to "others" when Black folks at home in the US are suffering daily.

Here's some of the things I'm passionate about and would like you to pay special attention to. All 111 recommendations are all equally important and necessary.

Economic

1) getting Black people to the median income for the next 250 years... currently, \$97K (annual income for white folks is \$130K, Black folks is \$35K)

- 2) debt forgiveness, payday loans, school loans, etc.
- 3) tax credits, home, payroll, business, no taxes at all for 250 years
- 4) BMRs are trash and not helpful. Allowing people with certificate of preference, low income, Section 8 folks to use/own those BMRs (Below Market Rate)

Education

- 1) early childhood education, early start in SFUSD
- 2) all schools have adequate funding
- 3) financial benefits to families negatively impacted by racial barriers in SFUSD
- 4) build a K-12 school for Black children with Black teachers and therapists who live in San Francisco
- 5) culturally competent school professionals and curriculum for all children in public schools and hospitals

Health

- 1) hospital or clinic that is geared to serve Black people, Black doctor's and other staff
- 2) compensation to the families who have been impacted by the pollution from the Navy shipyard
- 3) provide funding for schools, churches etc to increase culturally appropriate wellness for Black people
- 4) reduce the number of liquor stores, dispensaries, and fast food restaurants in Black communities, this is killing us. Clean up the Bayview Hunter's Point Shipyard and fund families injured and harmed by the toxins of the Shipyard.
- 5) Declare community violence as a public health crisis and fund resources for effective interventions.

Policy

- 1) reword current laws that negatively impact Black people to no longer negatively impact us. White people over 400 years ago implement laws that are currently negatively impacted Black people and we need to change that

Respectfully,
A Proud, Black Native San Franciscan ,
Member Nikcole Cunningham

Racist status: Not-Racist, You?

Preferred Pronouns: She/Her I support LGBTQA+

"You have to find the blessings within the hell you're in!" Nikcole

From: [Robert Sauls](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 3:54:58 PM

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

You people are a board of idiots! Bunch of lunatics and fanatics.

From: [Delia Fitzpatrick](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Dream Keeper Initiative and Reparations support
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 3:59:57 PM

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

There are two separate conversations:

1. We are demanding that they make the Reparations a statute by executive order. If this goes to vote, it will not pass. The publicity around \$5 million per person may not be the final number because it's more about providing African Americans access to resources that have been intentionally denied by the city through a just and transparent process.

2. We want to keep the DreamKeeper Dollars that were removed from the police to stay in the community. These dollars have been leveraged in so many different ways and it has benefited the resource lack area of Lakeview in District 11.

Ways dream keeper support that have been added to community: (just to name a few)

1. Opening of the Novation Lab, Community Computer Lab
2. Stipends for attending Early Educator Workshop classes
3. Science Workshops/Field Trips
4. Various community events/festivals for families (Stem Frenzy)
5. Expanded Resources
6. Job Readiness Training
7. Computer help
8. Pre-ELS Supports
10. Grants and Loans for Early Childhood Educators
11. Ask A Bookkeeper Series
12. Expanded Summer Programming/Stipends
13. Additionally Cultural books
14. Mental Health Supports
15. Supplies
16. Kindergartener Kits
17. Educational Pipelines

This has truly widen the door for conversations on how the city should do better and appreciate your time and listening

Delia Fitzpatrick

From: [Jesse W](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco reparations idea input
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 4:06:56 PM

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

I believe from what I read the San Francisco board of supervisors will be discussing giving each black person \$5 million dollars.

I think you would be fools. I grew up in northern California with all white kids, and at least half of them didn't graduate from high school because they thought black people and their hip hop/ partying culture was cool.

Black people might have once been slaves, but their influence in society over the last 30 years has destroyed a lot of lives of white people. I don't ever hear a black person say they don't like rap music and I can't believe the garbage that is in their songs. I don't know why you would want to give those kinds of people money. Most of them are bad influences on society.

From: [Christina Tai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Christina Tai](#)
Subject: Board of Supervisor"s Meeting - Tuesday, March 14, 2023 - Public Comment - Dream Keepers Initiative
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 4:16:25 PM

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

Topic: Dream Keepers Initiative
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023
Name: Christina Tai, Senior Salesforce Administrator/Business Anal
Organization: Code Tenderloin
Address: 55 Taylor Street, San Francisco, CA
Phone Number: 650-888-9015
Email: christina@codetenderloin.org

As a native-born San Franciscan and now working in DOWTOWN San Francisco, I want the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to continue supporting and have Dream Keepers Initiative. Dream Keepers Initiative helps improve the program participants' lives and the larger San Francisco community as a whole. I see firsthand from the stories participants and others tell me often.

From: [Ggumbold](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Five Million? Not enough!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 4:23:46 PM

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

Five million to blacks? You can do better, 1 Billion per black individual, if SF residences are so stupid to allow the board of supervisors to even joke about it then to hell with them all, they deserve the screwing they get.

From: [Erin McAuliff](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for Draft SF Reparations Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 4:49:28 PM

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

President Peskin and Board of Supervisors:

I am a San Francisco resident of Bernal Heights and employee of the City and County of San Francisco, writing in support of the draft SF Reparations Plan presented today. I urge you to accept the draft through the resolution before you. This resolution is just one step in towards taking the appropriately radical actions towards accountability, redress and repair.

I also urge you to respond affirmatively to the asks presented to you by AARAC representatives today, including attending monthly AARAC meetings and supporting their demands for investments in ***this budget season.***

I also echo Sup. Engardio's request to **fully staff the HRC Office of Racial Equity.** As a City employee involved in my Department's (MTA) Racial Equity Action Plan efforts, I have witnessed firsthand the effects of this office being understaffed. As a result, there has been stagnation in our efforts and many missed opportunities to address some of the most pressing racial equity challenges internally and externally.

Finally, I was disheartened to hear from the AARAC representatives during today's hearing that actions and statements of the BOS to the press and the public are undermining their important work, whether intentionally or unintentionally. The Board has the responsibility to fully acknowledge and consider *all* of the facts and recommendations in the Reparations Plan. If there are any board members whose words or actions are actively thwarting or impairing the City's ability to do so, they should be formally censured.

Sincerely,
Erin McAuliff

From: [Solitarie One](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: How About Me?
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 5:42:28 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image.png](#)

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

I am an Irish American, living in San Francisco, whose ancestors (from County Clare) were routinely discriminated against and treated as "sub humans" and "beasts" during the 1800s in the United States. Including San Francisco. See below.


When can I expect my \$5 million reparation payment for

"...decades of harms experienced, and will redress the economic and opportunity losses that IRISH San Franciscans have endured, collectively, as the result of both intentional decisions and unintended harms perpetuated by city policy"?

C. Brady



The Iberians are believed to have been originally an African race, who thousands of years ago spread themselves through Spain over Western Europe. Their remains are found in the barrows, or burying places, in sundry parts of these countries. The skulls are of low, prognathous type. They came to Ireland, and mixed with the natives of the South and West, who themselves are supposed to have been of low type and descendants of savages of the Stone Age, who, in consequence of isolation from the rest of the world, had never been out competed in the healthy struggle of life, and thus made way, according to the laws of nature, for superior races.



THE MOST RECENTLY DISCOVERED WILD BEAST.

Source: *Judy, or London Serio-Comic Journal*, August 3, 1881

GROCERY CART AND HARNESS FOR SALE
G—In good order, and one chestnut horse, 8 years old excellent saddle horse; can be ridden by a lady. Also, young man wanted, from 16 to 18 years of age, able to work. No Irish need apply. **CLUFF & TUNIS**, No. 270 Washington-st., corner of Myrtle-av., Brooklyn.



NO IRISH NEED APPLY

Is proclaimed by some, but DICKSON, The Tailor, of 65 Fifth ave., cor. Wood street, second floor, wants it understood that all are heartily welcome who have old clothes to be cleaned and repaired. Telephone 1558.

se29-su

From: [Kim-Shree Maufas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Mayor London Breed](#)
Cc: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Thank you for your full support of the 111 Reparations Commendations!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:33:45 PM

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

Dear President of the Board and Supervisors, as you sit in the Committee of the Whole and including Mayor London Breed.

Although, I could not be at the hearing today for Item 230078, I have been watching and listening-LIVE.

I have heard all of you pronounce your support for San Francisco Reparations Plan Draft and its 111 Recommendations. Thank you for speaking out against the fear-mongering narratives against Reparations that are being lauded in public and private spaces. Thank you for following through with your affirmative vote.

Please support the work of the African American Reparations Advisory Committee that has taken up the arduous task of providing you, the Mayor, the City, the State, the Nation, and the World with the critical information you need to understand some semblance of all the harms that black people have experienced in San Francisco. I include my family in that my mother and granddaughter both born at SF General Hospital, sixty-six (66) years apart, as we are still experiencing harms of structural and embedded racism **TODAY** in the City and County of San Francisco.

Please support the HRC's Dr. Sheryl Davis and the amazingly successful Dream Keeper Initiative under her leadership. As well as the other well researched programs, initiatives, and sections of the Human Rights Commission/Department.

I thank you for your time and sincere attention.

Dr. Kim-Shree Maufas,
District 9 Resident/
ENCAC Committee Member/
Former President of SFUSD Board of Education/
Sierra Club SF Executive Committee Member

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Support SF Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:03:12 PM

Thank you for your email!

Tracy

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 14, 2023, at 7:15 PM, Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org> wrote:

From: Anna W Yohannes <annawyohannes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:07 PM
Subject: Support SF Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative

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

To the SF Board of Supervisors,

As a Black San Francisco resident, preschool teacher, and child care advocate, I write to you unequivocally support the San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative and ask you to fund them permanently.

As a member of the African American Early Childhood Education Policy Council which has received funding via the Dream Keeper Initiative's grant process, I can attest to the importance of this allocation directly to Black-serving education nonprofits. It is crucial that Black-serving and Black-led community-based organizations are able to access City resources. Almost a third of respondents surveyed by DKI indicated that this funding cycle was the first time they had secured City funds for their programming – that is a significant impact and should continue.

The Dream Keeper Initiative is enacting real and ongoing community accountability and authentic partnership across the City's diverse Black communities. This throughline of what easily falls into a 'For Us, By Us' model has been embraced by and large because it is **empowering and engaging Black San Franciscans in ways that have not been previously seen and supported.**

Thank you for taking the time to consider this matter. **I feel confident that you will do the right thing.**

Sincerely,
Anna Wolde-Yohannes
District 5

From: [Eden Niemela](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:28:04 PM

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

Dear Mayor and Supervisor Mandelman,
I read you will vote soon on reparation for Black Americans in SF.

Reparation of 5 million each Black Americans in SF is absolutely wrong!

Japanese people who went to jail did not get 5 million EACH in Reagan era.

Tech boom affected EVERYONE not only BLACKS.

If you are going to pass this reparations in SF then make it FAIR in every Race including Japanese descendants of people who went to camps!

You can not solve Black history by giving money! You can offer free education, grants on essential needs, free housing, free inpatient rehabilitation, free cars for work and school BUT NOT money because SF don't have money to cover \$5 million each!

If they REFUSED to be educated, refused to work , just want CASH then pretty soon SF will be a Gotham City! It is just like giving them money for guns and mostly more drugs!

Sincerely,
Eden Niemela

Sent from my iPhone

From: [j.h](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:58:54 AM

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

My father, when a child, along with his brothers and sisters, was a sharecropper. How much money does he get?

From: [Randy Johnson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations Crossroads - You Could Ignite Unlimited Violence
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 7:34:19 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Your reparations hearing made national news today. It was apparent that the public speakers were largely Black because non-Blacks are likely afraid to voice their opinion without being assaulted.

I found the speech by the Black woman who retired as a "peace officer" particularly disturbing. She made no justification for the \$5 million per person reparations award other than she is entitled to the money because of her Black privilege and victim mentality. She was gainfully employed in a good paying job for years, but that was not good enough. Based on her age, her family likely moved from Louisiana to CA in the 1960s or 1970s, or 100 years after slavery ended.

If the Board agrees to the reparations shakedown, the impact will be as follows:

1. All Blacks in San Francisco will be targeted with extortion and fraud, whether they got the money or not. They will be considered rich targets. You will see an uptick in kidnappings and ransom demands. You will also see an increase in assaults against Blacks for the same reason (e.g., envy) that Blacks assault Asians.
2. The money granted will be spent quickly by the recipients and their "hanger-on" relatives. They will live large for a few years, just like NFL players, and then they will be broke because they have little financial skills or education.
3. The reparations cause will spread to other Democrat-run hellholes and you will witness White flight from cities to avoid higher taxes, loss of employers and outward disdain directed by Whites who never owned slaves or discriminated against Blacks to undeserving Blacks who were unaffected by slavery.
4. Your actions could be the match that lights off the fuse for the next Civil War. The difference between Civil War 1 and Civil War 2 is that in the first Civil War, northern Whites defended Blacks and eliminated slavery. In the next Civil Wars, Blacks will be the targets. With 87% of the country being non-Black and 13% being Black, I would not want to be a Black person.

The endless victim mentality and false narrative of systemic racism pushed by Democrats needs to stop. If you want to repay victims, maybe you should focus on the descendants of the thousands of Japanese laborers who emigrated to San Francisco and were transported offshore in the early 1900s and dumped into the ocean.

You have an opportunity to stop the insanity or contribute to it. You decide.

Randy Johnson
Houston, TX (Home of the Federal Reparation Queen Sheila Jackson-Lee)

From: [James Stotts](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations?
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 7:45:21 AM

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

So, you assholes in that city care more about giving millions to non-deserving people because of their race but ignore your homeless problem? I guarantee you assholes one thing, if this goes through, you will see racism skyrocket like never before. So, go ahead and pull your stupid stunt.

From: [Monica D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#)
Subject: Re: black reparation
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 8:27:26 AM

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

I heard that the Board of Supes are receptive to black reparation. There's only one problem: taxpayers (aka your bosses) are NOT!

https://muscatinejournal.com/news/national/san-francisco-board-receptive-to-reparation-ideas/article_1bf2cf6c-34bd-5632-bb50-dd13eccc91a6.html

From: [George Glines](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:09:19 AM

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

Reparations

You are insane trying to pay people Reparations for events that happened 150 years ago!

Why don't you pay them for job training!

Why don't you pay Japanese for internment during WW2!

Go to Hell!

glines888@gmail.com

From: [cheryl thornton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fw: Reparations statement for tje Board of Supervisors @ for tje Reparations record
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 11:43:49 AM
Attachments: [The Exclusion of seat 6 in AARAC.docx](#)
[o0188-19.pdf](#)
[20_10 Anti Black Racism Is Public Health Crisis.pdf](#)

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

Cheryl Thornton 

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: cheryl thornton <cherylthornton@sbcglobal.net>
To: bos.legislation@sfgov.org <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023, 03:55:00 PM PDT
Subject: Reparations statement for tje Board of Supervisors @ for tje Reparations record

https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/african-american-workers-blast-city-for-racism-discrimination-in-hiring/article_8abeb286-a87e-530d-bfe5-9c2f7c454711.html

From: [stephen matochik](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 11:56:29 AM

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

As if San Fran isn't already a dump that people are fleeing because of decisions like this . Does this mean that your City will get a refund on affirmative action benefits that were given out all these years ? Wake up San Francisco. Your city is dying a slow death

From: stephen.ru@verizon.net
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Slavery, in a white man's view
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:06:24 PM

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

In the Bible the book of Numbers, God told the Jewish people when he led them out from Egypt, he told them he did not want them to do what was done to them in Egypt but he knew they were going to do it anyway so he set rules and laws for it. Man has always enslaved man Don't matter the race or color they have slave each other. Example Sicily was invaded by Northern Africa, the people of Sicily were turning into slaves and serve the people of Northern Africa. Before America turned into America, the people at that time had to fight for their independence, why because they were slaves to Britain, anyone under the queen was a slave that would include Christopher Columbus. When the people fought for their Independence, they became free and when they became free, they wanted slaves themselves. Because they were slaves themselves. I know of a woman whose great grandfather was a slave in Egypt, when he was set free and went back to Africa he got himself slaves for himself and when he couldn't afford them he killed them. There was only one party that formed at the time and that was a Democrat party there was no other, those people at the time were slaves to Britain, once again when they when they're Independence they wanted slaves because they were slaves, the founding fathers knew this this is why they wanted to put it to an end, but the particular people at the time didn't want to give up their slaves because they were slaves themselves. How in the world do you come to the conclusion that is The White Man's fault, when all men of all colors have having slaves each other, if you want to pull money out of your own pocket and give it to them people of our time now that would be perfectly fine but to take money from taxpayers knowing that all of our ancestors were slaves makes no sense. If I was in your state I would take you to court and sue you. On the grounds that men who were slaves wanted slaves themselves.

[Sent from AOL on Android](#)

From: [susan_epidendio](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Money given to African-American Reparation proposal
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 1:49:06 PM

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

I am asking you to vote NO on giving African-American people money in San Francisco when the practice of slavery was not done here in the first place.

As far as giving money to any one it should be given to the American Indians who we used as slaves and harmed and kick them off their own lands to make way for the people coming here at that time. I am feeling this is not fair to all the others in this state who have worked hard their whole life's to achieve a comfortable life while just because of the color of your skin you can get free money. This is so wrong in so many ways. Please vote No on this issue.

Thank you , Susan Epidendio

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [HRC-Reparations](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Info, HRC \(HRC\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Joel Engardio](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [WaltonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [richie@greenbergqnation.com](#)
Subject: Re: Reparations Plan - REJECT IT NOW!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 4:44:12 PM
Attachments: [image0.png](#)

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

Supervisors and all,

Are you all out of your goddamn minds?!

Who's gonna (again) pay for your radical left bullshit ideology?!

Enough is enough. Screw you.



San Francisco considers reparations proposal to give \$5 million per Black person
[foxnews.com](#)



What to know about San Francisco's reparations plan
[axios.com](#)



San Francisco supervisors open to reparations proposal for Black people
[axios.com](#)



CALIFORNIA · Published March 14, 2023 3:50pm EDT

San Francisco considers reparations proposal to give \$5 million per Black person

Progressive city's Board of Supervisors meeting to debate reparations recommendations despite backlash

By Aaron Kliegman | Fox News



Leo Terrell slams San Francisco reparations plan: This is unconstitutional

Fox News contributor Leo Terrell and 'The Five' co-host Geraldo Rivera react to San Francisco's proposed \$5 million reparations plan and the Washington D.C. crime code overhaul.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors is meeting Tuesday to review a proposal [to dole out \\$5 million each](#) to qualifying Black residents in reparations as a way to make amends for slavery.





foxnews 



Democrat-run city considers paying qualifying Black residents \$5 million each



Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 7, 2023, at 12:51, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

Supervisors and all,

Today's the big day.

Do not fall into this trap.

**SHOW SOME LEADERSHIP.
SHOW SOME COMMON SENSE**

Enough with the absurdity.

**REJECT ITEM #26.
REJECT THE REPARATIONS PLAN
DISSOLVE THE COMMITTEE.**

<image.png>

On Sun, Feb 5, 2023 at 8:39 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor, Supervisors, and other SF officials,

It is with immense stupefaction that I got to learn about the Reparations plans that California and San Francisco have in their boxes.

As other commentators noted,

"San Francisco taxpayers could be on the hook to pay out hundreds of billions of dollars in an unconscionably racist, neo-Apartheid move by a 15-member reparations committee. Their Reparations Plan reads like a blueprint to install racial segregation, impossible to fulfill financial payments and prioritizing the Black community before nearly all aspects of city life, all subsidized by San Francisco's non-Black taxpayers. Another surprise is the plan is already admittedly unlawful on both a state and federal level."

Richie Greenberg created a website which summarizes key provisions, and provides a link to download a copy for yourself, along with my commentary. The website is www.RejectThePlan.com. Please visit the new website ASAP.
<http://www.RejectThePlan.com>

While I do empathize with the black community and acknowledge what happened in this country CENTURIES ago, this is NOT the right approach. NOT the right time. NOT the right message. NOT the right solution.

We already are dealing with enough non-sense when having to listen to indigenous propaganda at the very beginning of every one of your meetings.

San Francisco isn't a stolen land whatsoever, so why do you keep on brainwashing us with such absurd and debunked narrative?

As the preliminary public hearing is being held this week,

I am urging you to showcase some common sense, at the very least once in your political career, and reject this absurd, illegitimate, unconstitutional plan that will only serve the interests of more-debilitating-than ever radical left, and further divide us.

**SHOW SOME LEADERSHIP.
SHOW SOME COMMON SENSE**

**REJECT THE PLAN.
DISSOLVE THE COMMITTEE.**

Your absurd and unwarranted policies have already harmed and destroyed San Francisco so much during the pandemic, with unnecessary and absurd restrictions, beyond reason, and beyond federal and state guidelines.

People have left. Companies have left. To never come back.

San Francisco isn't anymore the great city it used to be. And it will take time to rebuild.

Another absurd plan and this city wouldn't at all recover.

WORKING CLASS CITIZENS, TAX PAYERS, SMALL BUSINESSES/SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS, HOMEOWNERS are already HAMMERED with your policies, taxes, taxes, and again taxes.

So many city mandates increasing our costs of livings, for stupid, questionable programs and pilots you all love to come up with in your wildest dreams, billions of dollars taken away from our savings, from the economy, for everything but improving anyone's quality of life.

**AGAIN, HOW ABOUT SOME COMMON SENSE?
IS IT TOO MUCH TO ASK, GOING FORWARD?**

For god sake, please hold yourselves to higher standards.

Best regards,

JD.

From: [Amelio Schembari](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparation
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 5:46:03 PM

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

No ,No ,No!!!

No reparation for selected group or businesses! Tax payer money should benefit all CITIZENS of the city. Put the money into needed areas. Example: Mental health, clean up the drug and crime problem on the streets, then we can effectively help the truly homeless and hire real police not ambassadors that just stand and chat on the corners with their friends.

Learn to PRIORITIZE!!!

Disgusted Native San Francisco,
Amelio Schembari

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [HRC-Reparations](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Info, HRC \(HRC\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Joel Engardio](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); richie@greenbergnation.com
Subject: Re: Reparations Plan - REJECT IT NOW!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 7:13:24 PM

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

Unsurprisingly, Ronen completely went batshit crazy in all of her statements of support...

Stop playing those stupid games.

Get those radical left lunatic out of here!

On Mar 15, 2023, at 16:43, Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

Supervisors and all,

Are you all out of your goddamn minds?!

Who's gonna (again) pay for your radical left bullshit ideology?!

Enough is enough. Screw you.

<[san-fran-walton.jpg](#)>

San Francisco considers reparations proposal to give \$5 million per Black person
[foxnews.com](#)

<[1675690165759.jpg](#)>

What to know about San Francisco's reparations plan
[axios.com](#)

<[1678839001035.jpg](#)>

San Francisco supervisors open to reparations proposal for Black people
[axios.com](#)

<image0.png>
<image1.jpeg>

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 7, 2023, at 12:51, Julien DeFrance
<julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

Supervisors and all,

Today's the big day.

Do not fall into this trap.

SHOW SOME LEADERSHIP.
SHOW SOME COMMON SENSE

Enough with the absurdity.

REJECT ITEM #26.
REJECT THE REPARATIONS PLAN
DISSOLVE THE COMMITTEE.

<image.png>

On Sun, Feb 5, 2023 at 8:39 PM Julien DeFrance
<julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor, Supervisors, and other SF officials,

It is with immense stupefaction that I got to learn about the Reparations plans that California and San Francisco have in their boxes.

As other commentators noted,

"San Francisco taxpayers could be on the hook to pay out hundreds of billions of dollars in an unconscionably racist, neo-Apartheid move by a 15-member reparations committee. Their Reparations Plan reads like a blueprint to install racial segregation, impossible to fulfill financial payments and prioritizing the Black community before nearly all aspects of city life, all subsidized by San Francisco's non-Black taxpayers. Another surprise is the plan is

already admittedly unlawful on both a state and federal level."

Richie Greenberg created a website which summarizes key provisions, and provides a link to download a copy for yourself, along with my commentary. The website is www.RejectThePlan.com . Please visit the new website ASAP. <http://www.RejectThePlan.com>

While I do empathize with the black community and acknowledge what happened in this country CENTURIES ago, this is NOT the right approach. NOT the right time. NOT the right message. NOT the right solution.

We already are dealing with enough non-sense when having to listen to indigenous propaganda at the very beginning of every one of your meetings, San Francisco isn't a stolen land whatsoever, so why do you keep on brainwashing us with such absurd and debunked narrative?

As the preliminary public hearing is being held this week, **I am urging you to showcase some common sense, at the very least once in your political career, and reject this absurd, illegitimate, unconstitutional plan that will only serve the interests of more-debilitating-than ever radical left, and further divide us.**

SHOW SOME LEADERSHIP.
SHOW SOME COMMON SENSE

REJECT THE PLAN.
DISSOLVE THE COMMITTEE.

Your absurd and unwarranted policies have already harmed and destroyed San Francisco so much during the pandemic, with unnecessary and absurd restrictions, beyond reason, and beyond federal and state guidelines. People have left. Companies have left. To never come back. San Francisco isn't anymore the great city it used to be. And it will take time to rebuild.

Another absurd plan and this city wouldn't at all recover.

WORKING CLASS CITIZENS, TAX PAYERS, SMALL BUSINESSES/SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS, HOMEOWNERS are already HAMMERED with your policies, taxes, taxes, and again taxes.

So many city mandates increasing our costs of livings, for stupid, questionable programs and pilots you all love to come up with in your wildest dreams, billions of dollars taken away from our savings, from the economy, for everything but improving anyone's

quality of life.

**AGAIN, HOW ABOUT SOME COMMON SENSE?
IS IT TOO MUCH TO ASK, GOING FORWARD?**

For god sake, please hold yourselves to higher standards.

Best regards,

JD.

From: [LAURENCE SIMON](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Slavery reparations for black San Francisco residence.
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 7:24:02 PM

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

You are so far out of control on subject matter. I have never seen so many ignorant people in a room. There is no way in hell you can afford 5 million dollars and all the other proposed goodies. You can't even run your city efficiently as it is let alone make the totally unrealistic reparations payouts you are proposing. You all need to resign and let a new more conservative board take over with more realistic goals.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Rosalinda Callejas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 7:33:54 PM

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

This is the most outrageous and ridiculous out of control downhill spiral of ideology. There is no way that you can ever believe that you can be fair and honest in providing reparations for over a 150 year old history. Let me remind you that your party of Democrat/Socialists are the ones who have kept people down by not providing the best in education for all minorities. You are the ones that have perpetuated the welfare system. You are the ones that have done nothing to help the homeless, drug addicts and quality of life. You have run this city and state for decades and it gets worse every year and I am sick and tired of the crap. This is virtue signaling straight and simple. How dare you think that those of us who have worked hard our entire lives to provide for our families and futures that we should be liable for a history of over 150 year old. If that is the case than why aren't you providing reparations for the Native Americans, Mexicans, Chinese, Irish and others.

For those of us who worked hard to purchase our homes, provide education for our children and futures this is a slap in the face. I have seen nothing good come out of San Francisco leadership and it continues to get worse with ideological crap that you push on the everyday citizen. This is just one of the many that has driven people out of this state. Do you ever listen to yourselves or take a hard look at what your policies have done to this city... probably not. It saddens me that my once beautiful city and state is now one of the worst governed. This is your legacy.

A proud American

Rosalinda

Sent from my iPad

From: [Alan Tarot](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations Debate
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 9:07:03 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Reparations Task Force is withholding vital information from you that may change the entire nation's perception of the reparations debate.

--Damien Storm

From: [Tedsmithzip](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reparations Ha! Ha! Ha!
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:43:49 AM

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

You fuckers got to be the laziest, greediest, dumbest bunch of cunts in history. But good on you for giving it a real shot!!

From: [Hub Stackhouse](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); raphael.mandelmann@sfgov.org; [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please OPPOSE expensive, divisive, racist, and destructive "reparations" plan
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 8:22:48 AM

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

Please OPPOSE stealing millions of dollars of taxpayer dollars from current San Franciscans who have never discriminated on the basis of race for a divisive and destructive 'reparations' plan. We must seek Martin Luther King's vision of color-blind society and end racial discrimination. This reparations plan will push us into poverty and create division and backlash. Please oppose it.

Sincerely,
Herbert
San Francisco

From: [Norm Pinto](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Bill G.](#); [C. B.](#); [Perry Evert](#); [Darrel F.](#); nfl092019@yahoo.com
Subject: SF Board of Supes
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 8:57:43 AM

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

Good morning everyone,

Sending this on behalf of our SF team.

First, thank you Supervisor Walton for bringing the Reparations Plan for past, current and **perhaps** even future wrong doings.

Best way of stating this, I noticed a long time ago I don't look like some of my friends on this email and many on the Board of Supervisors. I'm from many backgrounds including Creole. My friends are my friends and have been for many years no matter what each of us look like. We grew up in the Ingleside in the 60's. We have experienced much and personally I feel I have experienced more than my friends based on how I look. I was "that kid" that was followed around in a store while my friends were not. I was pulled over a few times by the SFPD while my friends were not. But my friends always had my back. That's what friends do.

I've shared with my friends, that although we lived on the same block, sometimes, we lived in different worlds. It's an experience that many can not fully understand. I call it The Black Experience.

I saw so many great Community people speak the other night at the Board Meeting. And Mr. Walton, you should understand, the fact, People know sincerity. We feel it. We can tell. It's really offensive to me when some people who are not black, talk black in a futile attempt to connect. I heard safai, ronon and peskin do that.

There was:

Erica Burrell, Latoya Pitcher, and others who called Members of the Board for being on their phones and not paying attention.

And Mr. Rory Gambrel shows up for a fourth time to get a Hearing date!! It appeared Mr. Gambrel was calling out peskin. It sounded like peskin was running down the stairs. Mr. Gambrel deserves a Public Hearing.

Then there was the embarrassing disgraceful behavior of:
a) ahsha safai, comes off as a grandstanding, arrogant, ignorant idiot. He was grandstanding when he made his comments on Agenda item # 14 Reparations. He took African American studies at MIT? But he has not spent a minute in the Black Experience. Huh? He understands the Black Experience??
Okay.

At the end of the general Public Comment item at mark 7:15:25 ahsha and ronon are joyful that Public comment is over. they were happy that Community was done speaking. ahsha has a degree from MIT, it looks like has a degree at SHIT! That's his Legacy. That's how they will be remembered.

b) hillary ronen: nice to hear her grandstand on the reparations item also. she is ready to "throw down" for the Community. And she accepts human beings to be, in her words, sex workers. But she won't get involved to help when the pimp is around. In ronen's words, a sex worker put her kid through college. Cool hillary. Let's grandstand on the kids feelings. And sure enough ronen "the barbarian" is happy and giggling about the end of Public comment. Cool. We were wondering, if she "is really starting to believe her own bullshit or is it more of your bullshit." Who's words were those? And those bogus photos of campaign workers doing whatever.. And remember, ronen's choice for interim mayor was mark farrell rather than Mayor Breed.

Check out the Meat Puppet ronen the barbarian at mark 7:14:20. Is there something funny about what the speaker said about guns? So how women have been sexually assaulted or raped in your district? Could a gun possibly stopped the assault and or rape? Are you that brain dead to not understand that? Who's words were ""The Mission is worse than I've seen it since I took office six years so." Wow! So you admit you failed your District residents. So why not just resign. Welfare recipient!

And as mentioned at the end of Public comment at mark 7:15:25....The Meat Puppet is overjoyed Public comment is over. Perhaps next time thousands of Community Members will show up to use more colorful language that the First Amendment protects.

c) princess catherine stefani has no clue on the value of the gun and how it protects. she should look at how many sexual assault, rapes and other violent crimes occurred in her district

and all districts throughout the City and how a holstered firearm could have stopped these attacks.. Hopefully she understands the US has 330 million People and 400 million guns. Why would this be?? It's called Responsibility, Responsible car drivers, Responsible gun owners.

The biggest questions are how did the Community feel when speaking to the Board the other night? Through Community's eyes, how confident are they in this Board in making progress? Who is on the Board is real? Who on the Board is fake and who is real fake?

And who on the Board, besides Supervisor Walton, goes to Community Meetings on the Reparation matter that you tabled?

One last point. Best case scenario is the Community receives everything they seek, however, at the end of the day, some will always judge us on the color of our skin and the sick, mentally ill racism will continue.

We will continue to follow this matter and other matters concerning Community.

The Community, Public and People

From: [Paul n](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Reparations ?
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 9:08:33 AM

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

Hello,

I've been reading about Shaman Walton's committee to make SF pay reparations to Black people for historical wrongs.

It's good to city government hard art work not addressing current issues with the city like HOMELESSNESS. You are instead concocting ways for spend my tax money fixing non city issues. Fixing national historical wrongs is not the role of city government . One report I read is that you want to give \$5 million to every black person in San Francisco as reparations for slavery. I realize this probably seems like a pretty good deal for Shaman Walton and other black members of city government but THIS IS NOT THE ROLE OF CITY GOVERNMENT. Before I realized you clowns actually had a reparations committee, I would have written this off as a joke.

Now get in your clowns and roll through the Misson or the Tenderloin and take a good look around . People are struggling and ,shockingly, they are not all black. Fixing a historical racist problem cannot by fixed by introducing a new racist problem.

Yes. THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ARE RACISTS. Think about that while you are collecting money to run a city.

Paul Nisbett

From: [Norm Pinto](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Bill G.](#); [C. B.](#); [Perry Evert](#); [Darrel F.](#); nfl092019@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: SF Board of Supes
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 9:33:52 AM

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

Supervisor Walton. The Team (My Friends) reminded me of one last item. Financials. It sounded like many in the Community expected a vote and even payment ASAP of \$ 5 Million. We wondering how that figure came to be and how and why the current immediate expectations of Community were set. We believe REAL and HONEST Transparency should be set to the Community as it sounds like Billions of dollars need to be allocated that might not be allocated by the City of SF.

So, please give Community the Transparency they deserve.

Thank you

The Community, Public and People

On Thursday, March 16, 2023 at 08:56:05 AM PDT, Norm Pinto <love4life0411@aol.com> wrote:

Good morning everyone,

Sending this on behalf of our SF team.

First, thank you Supervisor Walton for bringing the Repairs Plan for past, current and **perhaps** even future wrong doings.

Best way of stating this, I noticed a long time ago I don't look like some of my friends on this email and many on the Board of Supervisors. I'm from many backgrounds including Creole. My friends are my friends and have been for many years no matter what each of us look like. We grew up in the Ingleside in the 60's. We have experienced much and personally I feel I have experienced more than my friends based on how I look. I was "that kid" that was followed around in a store while my friends were not. I was pulled over a few times by the SFPD while my friends were not. But my friends always had my back. That's what friends do.

I've shared with my friends, that although we lived on the same block, sometimes, we lived in different worlds. It's an experience that many can not fully understand. I call it The Black Experience.

I saw so many great Community people speak the other night at the Board Meeting. And Mr. Walton, you should understand, the fact, People know sincerity. We feel it. We can tell. It's really offensive to me when some people who are not black, talk black in a futile attempt to connect. I heard safai, ronon and peskin do that.

There was:

Erica Burrell, Latoya Pitcher, and others who called Members of the Board for being on their phones and not paying attention.

And Mr. Rory Gambrel shows up for a fourth time to get a Hearing date!! It appeared Mr. Gambrel was calling out

peskin. It sounded like peskin was running down the stairs.
Mr. Gambrel deserves a Public Hearing.

Then there was the embarrassing disgraceful behavior of:

a) ahsha safai, comes off as a grandstanding, arrogant, ignorant idiot. He was grandstanding when he made his comments on Agenda item # 14 Reparations. He took African American studies at MIT? But he has not spent a minute in the Black Experience. Huh? He understands the Black Experience??
Okay.

At the end of the general Public Comment item at mark 7:15:25 ahsha and ronen are joyful that Public comment is over. they were happy that Community was done speaking. ahsha has a degree from MIT, it looks like has a degree at SHIT! That's his Legacy. That's how they will be remembered.

b) hillary ronen: nice to hear her grandstand on the reparations item also. she is ready to "throw down" for the Community. And she accepts human beings to be, in her words, sex workers. But she won't get involved to help when the pimp is around. In ronen's words, a sex worker put her kid through college. Cool hillary. Let's grandstand on the kids feelings. And sure enough ronen "the barbarian" is happy and giggling about the end of Public comment. Cool. We were wondering, if she "is really starting to believe her own bullshit or is it more of your bullshit." Who's words were those? And those bogus photos of campaign workers doing whatever.. And remember, ronen's choice for interim mayor was mark farrell rather than Mayor Breed.

Check out the Meat Puppet ronen the barbarian at mark

7:14:20. Is there something funny about what the speaker said about guns? So how women have been sexually assaulted or raped in your district? Could a gun possibly stopped the assault and or rape? Are you that brain dead to not understand that? Who's words were ""The Mission is worse than I've seen it since I took office six years so." Wow! So you admit you failed your District residents. So why not just resign. Welfare recipient!

And as mentioned at the end of Public comment at mark 7:15:25....The Meat Puppet is overjoyed Public comment is over. Perhaps next time thousands of Community Members will show up to use more colorful language that the First Amendment protects.

c) princess catherine stefani has no clue on the value of the gun and how it protects. she should look at how many sexual assault, rapes and other violent crimes occurred in her district and all districts throughout the City and how a holstered firearm could have stopped these attacks.. Hopefully she understands the US has 330 million People and 400 million guns. Why would this be?? It's called Responsibility, Responsible car drivers, Responsible gun owners.

The biggest questions are how did the Community feel when speaking to the Board the other night? Through Community's eyes, how confident are they in this Board in making progress? Who is on the Board is real? Who on the Board is fake and who is real fake?

And who on the Board, besides Supervisor Walton, goes to Community Meetings on the Reparation matter that you

tabled?

One last point. Best case scenario is the Community receives everything they seek, however, at the end of the day, some will always judge us on the color of our skin and the sick, mentally ill racism will continue.

We will continue to follow this matter and other matters concerning Community.

The Community, Public and People

From: [Kathy Broussard](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: March 14, 2023 San Francisco Board of Supervisors Meeting Agenda Item #14 Public Comment Submission
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 12:37:29 PM
Attachments: [March 14, 2023 BOS Public Comment Submission.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,

I respectfully submit my public comment in advance of today's meeting for the record. Please use the PDF copy attached to this email as my official public comment for agenda line item #14.

- 14. [230078](#) [Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative Updates - March 14, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.]**
Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, March 14, 2023, at 3:00 p.m., to hold a public hearing on the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative updates; and requesting the Human Rights Commission, the African American Reparations Advisory Committee, and the Dream Keeper Initiative to present; scheduled pursuant to Motion No. M23-021 (File No. 230077), approved on January 31, 2023. (Clerk of the Board)

02/07/2023; CONTINUED.

Question: Shall this hearing be HEARD AND FILED?

Respectfully submitted by,

Kathy L. Broussard

Meeting date: March 14, 2023

Time: 2:00PM

Agenda Item: #14

Public Comment Submission

=====

Greetings respectfully Board of Supervisors and President of the Board,

Racism and slavery did not end in 1865 with the 13th Amendment. It transcended and became disguised as structured institutions, the government, laws, US Justice System, Black Codes, Jim Crowe, Prisons/penitentiary's, corporations, including introducing laws like Affirmative Action and most recent in San Francisco the Office of Racial Equity, in an effort to make things appear progressive but really aren't.

San Francisco has tried to keep its participation in slavery quiet, when it is a well-known fact that slaves were brought to San Francisco California as slave chattel to work in gold mines. Slavery and indentured servitude was NOT only operative in Southern states.

San Francisco is guilty and remains complicit for many harms that continue to keep blacks and African Americans marginalized. Redlining, theft of properties/land, racially

segregated neighborhoods, segregated schools, forced to live in densely populated and polluted areas of the City.

The City of San Francisco continues to maintain its status quo by continuing these practices until this very day, as Black and African Americans are the lowest paid and most underrepresented when it comes to jobs and home ownership or securing affordable housing.

15 million men women and children were victims of genocide caused by the transatlantic slave trade. Our ancestors were stolen by white people, bought/sold and separated from family (only to never see them again) raped, beaten, lynched, maimed, mutilated, stripped of native languages and cultures, names changes, women and young girls forced to breed more children for financial gain unable to read, speak or write English,....and denied EVERY basic human fundamental right known to man.

An atonement, for 400 plus years of slavery is equal to 365 days x's 400= 146,000 days of **forced free labor**, that allowed white people, still operating many businesses and institutions today, to build unfathomable generational wealth, white supremacy and white privilege.

Wages were not paid to slaves who worked, dark early morning until dark night, in extremely harmful weather conditions, dying right in the fields while our ancestors were forced to continue

working. We inherited family sicknesses and diseases due to the lack of nourishment and non-existent health care. We carry our ancestors' traumas every single day.

Let's do the Math

In the early 1700 records, wages for a white laborer was \$1.00 per day for 8 to 9 hours of work. Our black slave ancestors worked for over 18 hours per day and at that rate;

- **1.00 per day (roughly .05 cents per hour) in 1635 in now valued at \$36.04 per day x's 146,000 days (400 years) = \$5,261,840.00 of LOST GENERATIONAL WEALTH**

Now the average family size consisted of a minimum of 5 to 9 members spread out over various plantations (this leaves lots of ancestors' on other plantations who were lost or killed that cannot be accounted for), so at minimum even if we take the lowest number by using 5 family members accrued generational wealth, that comes up to **\$26,309,200.00** of lost generational wealth EVEN with leaving out numerous unaccounted family members.

This isn't a matter on whether or not Black people deserve reparations.... BECAUSE NO ONE is giving us **anything**. It is an atonement to **RETURN** what was **stolen** from the very

beginning. **White PEOPLE STOLE BLACK PEOPLE** for profit, and built generational wealth, the more slaves the more influential white people were.

What would a National Class Action Lawsuit look like if Black descendants went after every white family heir, that obtained generational wealth from the forced free labors of our ancestors, and made them forfeit their illegal, murderous, and criminally obtained wealth and pay each family what they are rightfully owed, including returning all stolen land and money (acquired then up until now).

San Francisco Board of Supervisors and People of San Francisco let's rewrite history and settle this long-awaited atonement. San Francisco has Blood on their hands if they do not.

God speed!

Kathy L. Broussard

March 14, 2023

(I speak in honor of our ancestors, my father, and descendants of those who were enslaved)

From: [Curtis Bradford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary; Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StephaniStaff@sfgov.org](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for Reparations Proposal from Tenderloin People"s Congress
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 12:02:23 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[TPC=Support-Reparations-Resolution.pdf](#)

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



March 13, 2023

To San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

The Tenderloin People's Congress supports the work of the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee and the Human Rights Commission to address generations of redlining, disinvestment and other forms of systemic racism. We strongly and with utmost urgency ask for your support for the Reparations Resolution before you.

We urge you to vote yes today. While the harms caused by the horrors of slavery, racist practices and discriminatory systems, from the past to the present cannot be undone, moving our institutions towards compensation is the beginning of healing. It is the right thing to do.

While it is way past time for San Francisco to go on record and begin correcting the many years of injustice propagated against our African American San Franciscans, there is no time like the present to begin the process. Please cast your vote to get on the correct side of history and move us all forward.

In sincerity and solidarity,
Tenderloin People's Congress

Who We Are: A grassroots, resident-lead organization based in the Tenderloin since 2015.

Curtis Bradford Co-Chair Tenderloin People's Congress

Community Organizing Manager

(He/Him/His)

cbradford@tndc.org

c 415-426-8982

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

201 Eddy St.

San Francisco, CA 94102

tndc.org



At TNDc, we believe that everyone deserves to thrive. We support tenants and community members in building transformative communities through Homes, Health, and Voice. Together, we can build a future with economic and racial equity. Join us at tndc.org!



March 13, 2023

To San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

The Tenderloin People's Congress supports the work of the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee and the Human Rights Commission to address generations of redlining, disinvestment and other forms of systemic racism. We strongly and with utmost urgency ask for your support for the Reparations Resolution before you. We urge you to vote yes today. While the harms caused by the horrors of slavery, racist practices and discriminatory systems, from the past to the present cannot be undone, moving our institutions towards compensation is the beginning of healing. It is the right thing to do.

While it is way past time for San Francisco to go on record and begin correcting the many years of injustice propagated against our African American San Franciscans, there is no time like the present to begin the process.

Please cast your vote to get on the correct side of history and move us all forward.

In sincerity and solidarity,
Tenderloin People's Congress

Who We Are: A grassroots, resident-lead organization based in the Tenderloin since 2015.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 275 Letters Regarding File No. 230158
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 1:04:00 PM
Attachments: [275 Letters Regarding File No. 230158.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 275 Letters Regarding **File No. 230158:**

Ordinance appropriating \$27,640,247 of General Fund General Reserves to the Police Department; de-appropriating \$31,151,450 from permanent salaries, mandatory fringe benefits, and overtime for increased overtime budget in the Police Department in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023 as required per Administrative Code, Section 3.17, and releasing \$7,430,008 from expenditure reserve; this Ordinance requires a two-thirds approval vote of all members of the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Charter, Section 9.113(c).

Regards,

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

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

From: [Maria Canas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jon Handlery](#)
Subject: HHI Ltr to SF Board of Supervisors. (Attached).
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 3:30:12 PM
Attachments: [03.15.23 HHI Ltr to SF Board of Supervisors re Suppl. Budget - Fund Police.pdf](#)

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

Dear Sir or Madam:

Attached please find a letter from our President and CEO, Jon S. Handlery, at Handlery Hotels, Inc. regarding his Support of Mayor Breed's Supplemental Budget to Fund the Police Department.

Should you have any questions or concerns regarding the attached please contact us. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Best,

Maria
on behalf of Jon Handlery

Maria A. Canas | Executive Assistant to Molly Dean, CFO
Handlery Hotels, Inc
180 Geary Street | Suite 700 | San Francisco | California | 94108
telephone 415.781.4550 ext 107 | facsimile 415.291.9155
email mcanas@handlery.com | web www.handlery.com

This message, including any attachments, is intended for the use of the addressee(s) only, and it may contain information that is confidential, privileged or legally protected. Unauthorized review, distribution or copying of this message or of any accompanying attachments is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please contact me by return email or by telephone, and permanently delete it and any accompanying attachments from any system on which they may be stored.

 **Please consider the environment before printing this email.**



HANDLERY HOTELS

March 15, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

By E-Mail: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Hard copy will not follow.

Dear Supervisors:

I write to you to express my full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

As a top priority for our City to regain its position as a worldwide premier destination, San Francisco needs to have clean and safe streets for travelers, workers and residents alike. The Mayor's budget supplemental will ensure the City's police to have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose any more officers, and we are at a breaking point when it comes to staffing the San Francisco Police Department. Sworn staffing levels have fallen tremendously and the department is more than 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide critical public safety functions. By failing to fund police overtime, calls for service will not be met along with our basic public safety needs as well.


San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Re: Mayor Breed's \$27M Budget Supplemental to Fund Police
March 15, 2023
Page 2 of 2

Additionally, I also write to express my full support for SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are doing an incredible job enhancing public safety in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

I urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so that San Francisco can continue to recover and continue supporting a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jon S. Handlery". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Jon S. Handlery
President and CEO

From: [Pace, Michael](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: police funding discussion today
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:16:00 PM
Attachments: [Scanned from a Xerox Multifunction Printer - 2023-03-15T121332.005.pdf](#)

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

Dear board of supervisors,

Please see attached my letter of support for SFPD supplemental police funding.

Thank you so much.

Michael Pace
General Manager

T: +1 (415) 616-6910
E: michael.pace@ihg.com

Live the InterContinental life



March 15, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

We write to you to express our full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

San Francisco needs to have clean and safe streets as a top priority for our City to regain its position as a premier worldwide destination for travelers, workers, and residents alike. The Mayor's supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose any more officers, and we are at a breaking point when it comes to staffing at the San Francisco Police Department. Sworn staffing levels have fallen tremendously and the department is more than 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide for critical public safety functions. By failing to fund police overtime, calls for service will not be met and our basic public safety needs will not be met.



Additionally, we also write to express our full support for SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are doing an incredible job enhancing public safety in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue to recover and so that we can support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Pace". The signature is stylized with a long horizontal stroke and a vertical stroke crossing it.

Michael Pace
General Manager
InterContinental Mark Hopkins Hotel
999 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: [Rayna Kutsal](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Michael Pace \(michael.pace@ihg.com\)](#); [Alex Bastian](#)
Subject: FW: support letter for police funding
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:10:37 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Scanned from a Xerox Multifunction Printer.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,

Please see the attached letter from Hotel Council of San Francisco Board Member and General Manager of the InterContinental Mark Hopkins, Michael Pace. Michael's letter is in support of the budget supplemental for police funding.

We greatly appreciate your time and consideration in this very important matter.

Best regards,
Rayna Kutsal


Hotel Council
OF
SAN FRANCISCO
Rayna Kutsal

Program Coordinator

[Hotel Council of San Francisco](#)

323 Geary Street, Suite 405

San Francisco, CA 94102

P (415) 391-5197 | F (415) 391-6070

Follow us on [twitter](#) | Connect on [LinkedIn](#)

From: Pace, Michael <Michael.Pace@ihg.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 11:44 AM

To: Alex Bastian <abastian@hotelcouncilsf.org>; Rayna Kutsal <rkutsal@hotelcouncilsf.org>

Subject: support letter for police funding

see attached, thanks,

Michael Pace

General Manager

T: +1 (415) 616-6910

E: michael.pace@ihg.com

Live the InterContinental life



March 15, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

We write to you to express our full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

San Francisco needs to have clean and safe streets as a top priority for our City to regain its position as a premier worldwide destination for travelers, workers, and residents alike. The Mayor's supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose any more officers, and we are at a breaking point when it comes to staffing at the San Francisco Police Department. Sworn staffing levels have fallen tremendously and the department is more than 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide for critical public safety functions. By failing to fund police overtime, calls for service will not be met and our basic public safety needs will not be met.



Additionally, we also write to express our full support for SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are doing an incredible job enhancing public safety in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue to recover and so that we can support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Pace". The signature is stylized with a long horizontal stroke and a vertical stroke crossing it.

Michael Pace
General Manager
InterContinental Mark Hopkins Hotel
999 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94108

From: [L'Estrange, Lilly](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fullmore, Nany](#)
Subject: Letter of Support - Police Supplemental
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 11:14:51 AM
Attachments: [Letter of Support - Police Supplemental.pdf](#)

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

Good Afternoon Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached Letter of Support. Thank you.

Best,

Lilly L'Estrange

Executive Admin

O: 415-486-6433

The Clancy, Autograph Collection

299 2ND St.

San Francisco, CA 94105

www.marriott.com/sfoaw | [Instagram](#) | [View The Clancy Now](#)

The Clancy, a member of Marriott International's extraordinary Autograph Collection.



This communication contains information from Marriott International, Inc. that may be confidential. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

THE CLANCY

Good Afternoon Budget & Appropriations Committee,

My name is Hiwot (Nany) Fullmore and I am the General Manager with Marriott at the The Clancy Hotel in district number 6 or SoMa neighborhood. Additionally, I am a member of the Hotel Council of San Francisco. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to voice my full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental. This budget supplemental will fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

San Francisco needs to have clean and safe streets as a top priority for our City to regain its position as a premier worldwide destination for travelers, workers, and residents alike. The Mayor's supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose any more officers, and we are at a breaking point when it comes to staffing at the San Francisco Police Department. Sworn staffing levels have fallen tremendously and the department is more than 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officer's declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide for critical public safety functions. By failing to fund police overtime, calls for service will not be met, and our basic public safety needs will not be met.

I urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so our city can continue to recover and so that we can support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Yours in hospitality,



Nany Fullmore
General Manager
408.857.1744



From: [Marisa Rodriguez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Union Square Alliance support for SFPD Supplemental
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 4:31:24 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[UnionSqAlliance_Supplemental_SFPD_Budget_Letter_of_Support.docx](#)

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Attached you will find the Union Square Alliance's letter of support for the SFPD Budget Supplemental. We highly support to continue the SFPD budget supplemental to fund overtime policing and public safety ambassadors through the end of this fiscal year.

Thank you,



Marisa Rodriguez
Chief Executive Officer
415-781-7880
marisa@unionsquarealliance.com

291 Geary Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

www.visitunionsquaresf.com
Member Services 415-781-4456



The Union Square Business Improvement District is now the Union Square Alliance.
Please make note of our new name and email address.



March 14, 2023

Budget and Appropriations Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

RE: San Francisco Police Department Supplemental Budget

Dear Budget and Appropriations Committee,

As a direct recipient of overtime policing, we appreciate the opportunity to share our support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

Ensuring San Francisco has clean and safe streets is a top priority as the City begins to regain its momentum and change the challenging narrative that San Francisco is an unsafe place to live, visit, and work. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

Union Square is the heart of the City and our economic core; in order to bring it back to life, post pandemic, we need to ensure our police department has the resources needed to create a safe environment. The downtown area, that includes Union Square, currently makes up 75% of the City's GDP, contains 40% of the City's jobs, has the highest concentration of employment for people of color, and has a 30% vacancy rate. Union Square must bring tourism and conventions back to keep the businesses and hotels afloat. Without the police presence, we are in trouble. Our community has shown their commitment and support to SFPD with their own letters of support that you have received. You have received letters from our hotels, retailers, restaurants, and stakeholders, who are all pivotal industries to our economic fabric. We must continue to fund this supplemental budget to continue supporting our economic recovery.

The City cannot afford to lose officers if it wants to properly curtail crime and negative street activity plaguing our city and leading the negative narrative. Sworn staffing levels have fallen precipitously in the last three years and San Francisco is now 331 officers lower than in 2019 and 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases to provide the same level of service. However, expanded overtime has reaped immediate benefits, including the ability to respond to over 34,000 additional calls for service.



Also important, this supplemental helps continue to support SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, Fillmore, and more. They are trained in community policing, understand the nuance of the communities they serve, and provide an invaluable service at this crucial moment in time, when policing is in crisis.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Marisa Rodriguez", written in a cursive style.

Marisa Rodriguez, CEO

Union Square Alliance

From: [Amy Cleary](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Golden Gate Restaurant Association Letter of support for the Police Supplemental
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 3:06:31 PM
Attachments: [GGRA Letter of support police supplemental .docx.pdf](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please find attached a letter of support for the proposed police supplemental on behalf of the Golden Gate Restaurant Association and our board.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best,
Amy

--

Amy Cleary
Director of Public Policy and Media Relations
Golden Gate Restaurant Association
415.370.9056
amy@ggra.org

March 14, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

On behalf of the Golden Gate Restaurant Association (GGRA) and our Board of Directors, we appreciate the opportunity to share our support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

Ensuring San Francisco has clean and safe streets is a top priority as the City begins to regain its momentum and change the narrative that it's an unsafe place to live, visit, and work. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose officers if it wants to properly curtail drug dealing and illegal use of narcotics, and reduce gun violence, homicides, and violent crimes. Sworn staffing levels have fallen precipitously in the last three years and San Francisco is now 331 officers lower than in 2019 and 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide the same level of service. However, expanded overtime has reaped immediate benefits, including the ability to respond to over 34,000 additional calls for service.

Importantly, this supplemental also will help continue to support SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue on its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Laurie Thomas

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Laurie Thomas". The signature is written in a dark ink and is positioned below the printed name.

Executive Director
Golden Gate Restaurant Association
laurie@ggra.org

From: [Alex Bastian](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Hotel Council + Unions Letter of Support for SFPD Supplemental
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 9:53:38 AM
Attachments: [Hotel Council + Unions Letter of Support for SFPD Supplemental.pdf](#)

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The Hotel Council of San Francisco has teamed up with UNITE Here Local 2, San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, Sign Display Union Local 510, and I.A.T.S.E. Local 16 to express our full support of Mayor Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors. Please see our letter of support attached in this email.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please reach out if you have any questions.

Best,
Alex



Alex Bastian

President & CEO

[Hotel Council of San Francisco](#)

323 Geary Street, Suite 405

San Francisco, CA 94102

P (415) 391-5197 | F (415) 391-6070

Follow us on [twitter](#) | Connect on [LinkedIn](#)



March 14, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

The Hotel Council of San Francisco, UNITE Here Local 2, San Francisco Building & Construction Trades Council, Sign Display Union Local 510, and I.A.T.S.E Local 16 have come together to express our full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

San Francisco needs to have clean and safe streets as a top priority for our City to regain its position as a premier worldwide destination for travelers, workers, and residents alike. The Mayor's supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose any more officers, and we are at a breaking point when it comes to staffing at the San Francisco Police Department. Sworn staffing levels have fallen tremendously and the department is more than 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide for critical public safety functions. By failing to fund police overtime, calls for service will not be met, and our basic public safety needs will not be addressed.

Additionally, we write to express our full support for SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are doing an incredible job enhancing public safety in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

The vitality of our hospitality community depends on investments made to support the health and safety of our community members and infrastructure. The safety of our workers, visitors, and residents is a top priority. We stand together to unite our voices on this important issue. We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental for the reasons stated, and to do everything in your power to enhance the health and safety of our City and community.

Sincerely,



From: [Huldi, Roger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Police Supplemental Funding
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 1:44:22 AM
Attachments: [Letter to BOS Police Supplemental_HCSF.docx](#)

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


Dear Supervisors,

We write to you to express our full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

Warm regards & [Live Exquisite](#)

Roger Huldi
General Manager

The St. Regis San Francisco
125 Third Street San Francisco, California 94103
o. +1 415 284 4050
m. +1 415 846 0941
stregissanfrancisco.com





March 14, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

We write to you to express our full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

San Francisco needs to have clean and safe streets as a top priority for our City to regain its position as a premier worldwide destination for travelers, workers, and residents alike. The Mayor's supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose any more officers, and we are at a breaking point when it comes to staffing at the San Francisco Police Department. Sworn staffing levels have fallen tremendously and the department is more than 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases to provide for critical public safety functions. By failing to fund police overtime, calls for service will not be met, and our basic public safety needs will not be met.



Additionally, we also write to express our full support for SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are doing an incredible job enhancing public safety in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue to recover and so that we can support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Roger

Roger Huldi
General Manager
St. Regis San Francisco

From: [Tracy Everwine](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); joe.engardio@sfgov.org; [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Mayor's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund Public Safety resources
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:44:08 AM
Attachments: [Affordable Housing & Social Service Resources July 2022.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,

Approve the Mayor's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime, public safety ambassadors and additional staffing at the District Attorney's Office to focus on drug dealing.

Efforts to combat illegal activity affecting residents, business owners, visitors, CBD field crews (and all front-line street workers both public and private) need more support from law enforcement!

Community Ambassadors and the City's Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC) are not sufficient (nor are they authorized) to address illegal activity.

The Mid Market area is highly complex and requires extra policing. It is the heart of the downtown core surrounded by Civic Center, the Tenderloin, SoMa and Union Square. With its convenient access to freeways, regional transit lines, residential density and visitor foot traffic – criminals want to do business here.

Mid Market is home to thousands of residents. Many live in newly constructed residential buildings; others live in the District's 30+ single room occupancy hotels, or in numerous other affordable housing units. What's more, there are 27 social services agencies within our District alone (**see attached map**) treating at-risk individuals; many of whom are battling drug addiction amidst our City's Fentanyl crisis. Currently, these individuals step out their door onto streets filled with drug dealers, open-air drug use and other predatory behaviors only law enforcement can address.

The business community, which has worked tirelessly to survive the pandemic, suffers rampant retail theft and a loss of customers and employees due to unsafe conditions inside and outside their place of business. Retail theft also fuels illegal street vending. The selling of stolen goods generates cash that supports drug sales. Only authorized law enforcement may address these issues.

We must put an end to unsafe conditions in Mid Market by all means possible. Just combating the selling of illicit drugs in the area would stem the flow of many of the problems Mid Market and surrounding areas face. With efforts like the Mayor's proposed \$27M additional funding for more SFPD resources and staffing to prosecute drug crimes, we can start to imagine a much brighter and better future.

Please protect our organization's investment in public safety personnel and the City's

investment in Community Ambassador programs by also supporting funding for the essential law enforcement resources to back these services up and restore safe and civil streets in Mid Market.

Sincerely,
Mid Market Community Benefit District

Affordable Housing & Social Service Resources within MMCBD

*Does not include BMR units in Market rate developments



MID MARKET COMMUNITY BENEFIT DISTRICT

	Affordable Housing & SRO Hotels	Address		Social Service Resource Agency	Address		Shelter i
1	1000 Howard	1000 Howard St.	48	1064 Mission Housing	1064 Mission St.	80	Hotel Whitco
2	1064 Mission Housing	1064 Mission St.	49	Access Point	123 10th St.	81	The Good H
3	498 Natoma	498 Natoma St.	50	API Legal Outreach	1121 Mission St.		
4	Alder Hotel	175 6th St.	51	BAART Methodone Clinic	1111 Market St.		
5	Auburn Hotel	481 Minna St.	52	Bayanihan House Community Center	1010 Mission St.		
6	Baldwin Hotel - City Homeless Shelter	174 6th St.	53	Catholic Charities Youth and Family Center	801 Jessie St.		
7	Balmoral Hotel	93 6th St.	54	City Team San Francisco	164 6th St.		
8	Bayanihan House	88 6th St.	55	Citywide UCSF Case Management	982-984-986 Mission St.		
9	Bill Sorro Community	1009 Howard St.	56	Community Forward SF - Sobering Center	1185 Mission St.		
10	Bristol Hotel	56 Mason St.	57	Compass Family Services	1236 Market St.		
11	Chase Hotel	1278 Market St.	58	County Adult Assistance Program General Assistance Office	1235 Mission St.		
12	Desmond Hotel	42 6th St.	59	Crossroads Youth Program	160 6th St.		
13	Donnelly Hotel	1272 Market St.	60	Eviction Defense Collaborative	1338 Mission St.		
14	Dudley Apts.	172 6th St.	61	Food Distribution Center Food Stamp Program	1235 Mission St.		
15	Edith Witt Senior Community	66 9th St.	62	Hospitality House Community Arts Program	1009 Market Street		
16	Haveli Hotel	47 6th St.	63	Hospitality House Community Center	175 6th St.		
17	Helen Hotel	93 6th St.	64	Hospitality House Employment Resources	181 6th St.		
18	Henry Hotel	106 6th St.	65	Human Services Agency	1360 Mission St.		
19	Hillsdale Hotel	51 6th St.	66	Immigration Institute of the Bay Area (IIBA)	1111 Market St.		
20	Hotel Isabel	1095 Mission St.	67	Oasis for Girls	1091 Mission St.		
21	Hotel Potter	1288 Mission St.	68	Peer Wellness Center RAMS & RAMS	1282 Market St.		
22	Hunter Hotel	100 6th St.	69	Quaker Meeting Hall	65 9th St.		
23	Kean Hotel	1018 Mission St.	70	RAMS - Conrad House & Our Family Coalition	1375-85 Mission St.		
24	Knox Hotel	241 6th St.	71	RAMS - CalWorks pre-vocational services	1375 Mission St.		
25	Lawrence Hotel	48 6th St.	72	San Francisco AIDS Foundation	1035 Market St.		
26	Leland Apartments	980 Howard St.	73	San Francisco Health Center	1171 Mission St.		
27	Minna Hotel - Adult Probation	509 Minna St.	74	San Francisco Medical Respite & Sobering Center	1171 Mission St.		
28	Minna Lee Hotel- Adult Probation	146 6th St.	75	Senior Information & Referral	875 Stevenson		
29	Mission Family Apartments	1036 Mission St.	76	SF AIDS Foundation Harm Reduction Center	117 & 117A 6th St.		
30	National Hotel	1139 Market St.	77	SOMCAN	1064 Mission St.		
31	Oak Tree Hotel	45 6th St.	78	Tom Waddell Clinic (under construction)	469 Stevenson St.		
32	Oakwood Hotel	48 5th St.	79	Veterans Equity Center	1010 Mission St.		
33	Orlando Hotel	995 Howard St.					
34	Panoramic	1321 Mission St.					
35	Plaza Hotel	988 Howard St.					
36	Rams Hotel	80 9th St.					
37	Seneca Hotel	34 6th St.					
38	Sharon Hotel	226 6th St.					
39	Shree Ganesh	68 6th St.					
40	St. Cloud Hotel	170 6th St.					
41	Sunnyside Hotel	135 6th St.					
42	Sunset Hotel	161 6th St.					
43	Tenth & Mission Family Housing	1390 Mission St.					
44	The Rose Hotel	125 6th St.					
45	United Hotel	161 6th St.					
46	Whitacker Hotel	41 6th St.					
47	Winsor Hotel	20 6th St.					

From: [Info CBD](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support the current \$27M budget supplemental request to fund more public safety resources.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:17:09 AM
Attachments: [CC SFPD Supplemental.pdf](#)

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

March 8, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Pl #244,
San Francisco, CA 94102
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors:

Please support the current \$27M budget supplemental request to fund more public safety resources.

Community stakeholders and stewards of the public realm (both public and private) such as CCCBD, are in desperate need of more support from authorized law enforcement personnel and the District Attorney's Office to improve public safety – including the safety of our privately-funded field crews.

Streetscape maintenance crews, paramedics, crisis outreach teams, and community ambassador programs such as ours, can not do their job without support from authorized law enforcement personnel. Currently, high levels of drug sales, open-air drug use and organized illegal street vending present numerous challenges and unsafe working conditions for non-law enforcement personnel.

As the seat of City, County, State and Federal government offices in San Francisco, Civic Center is a destination and a resource for all San Franciscans and the greater Bay Area region. Civic Center is also one of the City's top tourist destinations. It is essential we have the public safety resources necessary to support such a large and diverse constituency,

Support for our constituency also includes all front-line, first responders and essential workers in Civic Center. Authorized law enforcement personnel and the enforcement of laws are essential for stemming illegal activity and ensuring we are a safe and healthy district and an asset for downtown.

We thank you for doing everything in your power to strengthen and protect our investment in public safety resources, as well as the City's; and for working to rebuild the City's law enforcement capacity for the district and the City as a whole.

Sincerely,

The Civic Center Community Benefit District



March 8, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Pl #244,
San Francisco, CA 94102
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors:

Please support the current \$27M budget supplemental request to fund more public safety resources.

Community stakeholders and stewards of the public realm (both public and private) such as CCCBD, are in desperate need of more support from authorized law enforcement personnel and the District Attorney's Office to improve public safety – including the safety of our privately-funded field crews.

Streetscape maintenance crews, paramedics, crisis outreach teams, and community ambassador programs such as ours, can not do their job without support from authorized law enforcement personnel. Currently high levels of drug sales, open-air drug use and organized illegal street vending present numerous challenges and unsafe working conditions for non-law enforcement personnel.

As the seat of City, County, State and Federal government offices in San Francisco, Civic Center is a destination and a resource for all San Franciscans and the greater Bay Area region. Civic Center is also one of the City's top tourist destinations. It is essential we have the public safety resources necessary to support such a large and diverse constituency,

Support for our constituency also includes all front-line, first responders and essential workers in Civic Center. Authorized law enforcement personnel and the enforcement of laws are essential for stemming illegal activity and ensuring we are a safe and healthy district and an asset for downtown.

We thank you for doing everything in your power to strengthen and protect our investment in public safety resources, as well as the City's; and for working to rebuild the City's law enforcement capabilities for the district and the City as a whole.

Sincerely,
The Civic Center Community Benefit District

From: [Info Info](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Mayor's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:04:22 PM
Attachments: [MM SFPD Supplemental.pdf](#)

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

Approve the Mayor's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime, public safety ambassadors and additional staffing at the District Attorney's Office to focus on drug dealing.

Efforts to combat illegal activity affecting residents, business owners, visitors, CBD field crews (and all front-line street workers both public and private) need more support from law enforcement!

Community Ambassadors and the City's Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC) are not sufficient (nor are they authorized) to address illegal activity.

The Mid Market area is highly complex and requires extra policing. It is the heart of the downtown core surrounded by Civic Center, the Tenderloin, SoMa and Union Square. With its convenient access to freeways, regional transit lines, residential density and visitor foot traffic – criminals want to do business here.

Mid Market is home to thousands of residents. Many live in newly constructed residential buildings; others live in the District's 41 single room occupancy hotels, or in numerous other affordable housing units. What's more, there are 27 social services agencies within our District alone (see attached map) treating at-risk individuals; many of whom are battling drug addiction amidst our City's Fentanyl crisis. Currently, these individuals step out their door onto streets filled with drug dealers, open-air drug use and other predatory behaviors only law enforcement can address.

The business community, which has worked tirelessly to survive the pandemic, suffers rampant retail theft and a loss of customers and employees due to unsafe conditions inside and outside their place of business. Retail theft also fuels illegal street vending. The selling of stolen goods generates cash that supports drug sales. Only authorized law enforcement may address these issues.

We must put an end to unsafe conditions in Mid Market by all means possible. Just combating the selling of illicit drugs in the area would stem the flow of many of the problems Mid Market and surrounding areas face. With efforts like the Mayor's proposed \$27M additional funding for more SFPD resources and staffing to prosecute drug crimes, we can start to imagine a much brighter and better future.

Please protect our organization's investment in public safety personnel and the City's investment in Community Ambassador programs by also supporting funding for the essential law enforcement resources to back these services up and restore safe and civil streets in Mid Market.

Sincerely,
Mid Market Community Benefit District



Mid Market Community Benefit District is a privately-funded 501c3 not-for-profit organization that works in tandem with City agencies to enhance the Mid Market public realm.

March 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Approve the Mayor's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime, public safety ambassadors and additional staffing at the District Attorney's Office to focus on drug dealing.

Efforts to combat illegal activity affecting residents, business owners, visitors, CBD field crews (and all front-line street workers both public and private) need more support from law enforcement!

Community Ambassadors and the City's Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC) are not sufficient (nor are they authorized) to address illegal activity.

The Mid Market area is highly complex and requires extra policing. It is the heart of the downtown core surrounded by Civic Center, the Tenderloin, SoMa and Union Square. With its convenient access to freeways, regional transit lines, residential density and visitor foot traffic – criminals want to do business here.

Mid Market is home to thousands of residents. Many live in newly constructed residential buildings; others live in the District's 41 single room occupancy hotels, or in numerous other affordable housing units. What's more, there are 27 social services agencies within our District alone (see attached map) treating at-risk individuals; many of whom are battling drug addiction amidst our City's Fentanyl crisis. Currently, these individuals step out their door onto streets filled with drug dealers, open-air drug use and other predatory behaviors only law enforcement can address.

The business community, which has worked tirelessly to survive the pandemic, suffers rampant retail theft and a loss of customers and employees due to unsafe conditions inside and outside their place of business. Retail theft also fuels illegal street vending. The selling of stolen goods generates cash that supports drug sales. Only authorized law enforcement may address these issues.

We must put an end to unsafe conditions in Mid Market by all means possible. Just combating the selling of illicit drugs in the area would stem the flow of many of the problems Mid Market and surrounding areas face. With efforts like the Mayor's proposed \$27M additional funding for more SFPD resources and staffing to prosecute drug crimes, we can start to imagine a much brighter and better future.

Please protect our organization's investment in public safety personnel and the City's investment in Community Ambassador programs by also supporting funding for the essential law enforcement resources to back these services up and restore safe and civil streets in Mid Market.

Sincerely,
Mid Market Community Benefit District

From: [Susan Walsh](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: Letter in Support of Item #29, Adoption without reference to Comm. Calendar File #230278
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 5:01:49 PM
Attachments: [our letter of support to Bd. of Sup"s..docx](#)

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

Attached please find a letter in support of above Item & File #. Please include letter and cc's in file of record.

Item #29 Adoption without reference to Committee Calendar, File #230278.

Susan Walsh

--

Susan Walsh
Lower Nob Hill Neighborhood Alliance Working Group
Lower Nob Hill Neighborhood Alliance Leadership Team
susan@lowernobhill.org



3/10/2023

Board of Supervisors

C/O Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

Suite #244

SF, CA 94102

Board of Supervisors,

The Lower Nob Hill Neighborhood Association (LNHNA) is in full support of the Resolution put forth by Supervisor Aaron Peskin which urges the Recreation and Parks Department and its Commission to immediately adopt flexible criteria for its acquisition of potential open space and green recreation, parklet and pocket park sites in Lower Nob Hill. This Resolution calls for *prioritizing smaller parcels* of 2,000 sq. ft. to 5,000 sq. ft. in order to create open space, green recreation, parklet and pocket park sites which we so desperately need in our corner of San Francisco.

Lower Nob Hill is literally a concrete jungle in many respects with very little “green space” available to create any parks moreover parks greater than 5,000 square feet. This particular resolution, which directly addresses prioritizing smaller parcels (2,000 to 5,000 sq. feet), is integral to the much needed “greening” of our community. Our neighborhood is a close-packed district of residential buildings with a height of three to seven stories high. For blockfront after blockfront the apartments and hotels march along at nearly even cornice lines, breasting similar bay windows and fire escapes above the sidewalk steps and storefronts. It is on the National Register of Historic Places as an Apartment & Hotel District. But alas....it has no parks because it is a concrete jungle. Our residents need places to relax, breathe in fresh air, take the children to play, enjoy peace and quiet. Currently we have very little if any.

Lower Nob Hill includes the Post and Geary Street Corridors which both serve as the gateways, both in and out, of Union Square. While cars bustle by in and out, pedestrians likewise walk this gateway as they stroll from Van Ness to Powell. The addition of green spaces and parklets along the way would provide opportunities for pedestrians and strollers alike to stop, rest, take in the views, enjoy the beauty of our Historic and Unique corner of our City on their way into downtown. Everyone wins!

The Lower Nob Hill Neighborhood Alliance strongly supports this resolution and will stand ready to support whatever it takes to bring small parcels of green space into our beloved community.

Leadership Team of Lower Nob Hill Neighborhood Alliance: Susan Walsh, Thao Jones-Hill, Brian Gerrity, Shelby Fabianac

CC: bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org

Cc: Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org and Alisa.Somerra@sfgov.org

From: [Kate Robinson](#)
To: [Jalipa Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: IN SUPPORT OF \$27 MILLION POLICE BUDGET SUPPLEMENTAL
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 4:22:20 PM
Attachments: [TLCBD_LOS_27 Million_Supplemental.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:

As the Executive Director for the [Tenderloin Community Benefit District](#) (TLCBD), I am writing to support the \$27 million police budget supplemental to fund operations through the end of the fiscal year. The San Francisco Police Department is a valued partner to the TLCBD and the broader Tenderloin community which we serve, and we support Mayor Breed's request to maintain adequate funding levels to provide no less than the same level of service in the Tenderloin and our neighboring communities. The success of the Tenderloin means the success of San Francisco as a whole – as a city, we must ensure that the resources our community receive reflect the prioritization our community deserves. We request that the majority of this funding is dedicated to addressing the crisis of fentanyl dealing in the Tenderloin, particularly expanding operations at night so Tenderloin residents can sleep.

The TLCBD is a non-profit organization established by a diverse group of Tenderloin residents and property owners who share a common mission to uplift and improve the conditions of the neighborhood through the power of grassroots organizing and citywide collaboration. For nearly two decades, the TLCBD has served our culturally rich, family-dense, and vibrant community and now conducts critical neighborhood services such as street cleaning, park stewardship, and safe passage programs to walk children to and from their local schools. Our mission involves making the Tenderloin a special and welcoming place, ensuring that the unique fabric of our beloved community is woven with neighborhood pride, economic opportunity, and a commitment to empowering those who live and work in the Tenderloin.

As one of the most important fixtures to maintaining a safe and healthy environment in the Tenderloin, the police are integral partners in mitigating our neighborhood's most pressing issues, such as open-air drug dealing, violent crime, theft, human trafficking, and vandalism. Specifically, this funding would support SFPD Tenderloin Station's ability to sustain and expand on its recent efforts to eliminate fentanyl drug dealing in our community. SFPD's capacity to serve the Tenderloin depends on its department being well-equipped and properly staffed. Community consensus says we need to recruit, train, and retain more police officers who embody San Francisco's inclusive values, and this

supplemental funding will prevent any mandated service cuts and a new hiring freeze.

By approving the \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police operations, the Board of Supervisors can not only help prevent the detrimental impacts that could come due to an understaffed police department but also meet an increased need for law enforcement in the Tenderloin and operations for tourism development and sustain the impactful community ambassadors program citywide.

For these reasons and more, we respectfully ask that the Board of Supervisors approve the \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police operations as soon as possible so the San Francisco Police Department can better serve our communities and respond to the fentanyl crisis in the Tenderloin.

On behalf of our organization, I appreciate your consideration.

Thank you,

Kate Robinson | Executive Director
Pronouns: She | Her | Hers | [why pronouns matter](#)
Tenderloin Community Benefit District
512 Ellis St. | 415.292.4812 | [tlcbd.org](#)
....A Vibrant Community For All



Monday, March 10, 2023

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

RE: TLCBD IN SUPPORT OF \$27 MILLION POLICE BUDGET SUPPLEMENTAL

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

As the Executive Director for the [Tenderloin Community Benefit District](#) (TLCBD), I am writing to support the \$27 million police budget supplemental to fund operations through the end of the fiscal year. The San Francisco Police Department is a valued partner to the TLCBD and the broader Tenderloin community which we serve, and we support Mayor Breed's request to maintain adequate funding levels to provide no less than the same level of service in the Tenderloin and our neighboring communities. The success of the Tenderloin means the success of San Francisco as a whole – as a city, we must ensure that the resources our community receive reflect the prioritization our community deserves. We request that the majority of this funding is dedicated to addressing the crisis of fentanyl dealing in the Tenderloin, particularly expanding operations at night so Tenderloin residents can sleep.

The TLCBD is a non-profit organization established by a diverse group of Tenderloin residents and property owners who share a common mission to uplift and improve the conditions of the neighborhood through the power of grassroots organizing and citywide collaboration. For nearly two decades, the TLCBD has served our culturally rich, family-dense, and vibrant community and now conducts critical neighborhood services such as street cleaning, park stewardship, and safe passage programs to walk children to and from their local schools. Our mission involves making the Tenderloin a special and welcoming place, ensuring that the unique fabric of our beloved community is woven with neighborhood pride, economic opportunity, and a commitment to empowering those who live and work in the Tenderloin.


As one of the most important fixtures to maintaining a safe and healthy environment in the Tenderloin, the police are integral partners in mitigating our neighborhood's most pressing issues, such as open-air drug dealing, violent crime, theft, human trafficking, and vandalism. Specifically, this funding would support SFPD Tenderloin Station's ability to sustain and expand on its recent efforts to eliminate fentanyl drug dealing in our community. SFPD's capacity to serve the Tenderloin

depends on its department being well-equipped and properly staffed. Community consensus says we need to recruit, train, and retain more police officers who embody San Francisco's inclusive values, and this supplemental funding will prevent any mandated service cuts and a new hiring freeze.

By approving the \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police operations, the Board of Supervisors can not only help prevent the detrimental impacts that could come due to an understaffed police department but also meet an increased need for law enforcement in the Tenderloin and operations for tourism development and sustain the impactful community ambassadors program citywide.

For these reasons and more, we respectfully ask that the Board of Supervisors approve the \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police operations as soon as possible so the San Francisco Police Department can better serve our communities and respond to the fentanyl crisis in the Tenderloin.

On behalf of our organization, I appreciate your consideration.



Kate Robinson
Executive Director, TLCBD

CC: The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

From: [Paul Wallace](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BO3\)](#)
Cc: [Mayor London Breed](#)
Subject: Budget and Finance Meeting - SFPD Budget Supplemental
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 3:07:36 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[Richard Maye to March 15 2023 meeting.pdf](#)

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



March 10, 2023

Re: March 15, 2023
Budget and Finance Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Email: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Cc: mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org

Supervisors: Connie Chan, Rafael Mandelman, and Asha Safai

Dear Budget and Finance Committee:

I am writing *on behalf of Trinity Management Services* to reinforce my support for Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund invaluable police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year. In addition, as a Union Square stakeholder, I want to show my gratitude for all support to date. The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also vital to the health of our economy. We are a critical component of the City's greater economy and rely on our police department to keep all San Franciscans, workers, and tourists safe.

Our company owns and manages several prominent buildings in the Union Square area, including: 201 Post Street, 233 Post Street, 111 Maiden Lane, 105 Grant and 140 Geary Street. Some of our retail tenants include: Cartier; Fendi; Hermes; Van Cleef and Arpels; Valentino and Bottega Veneta. With 8 – 10 floors of offices in most of our properties, the role that SFPD plays in the day-to-day lives of our tenants, their staff, the office personnel, and the shoppers/visitors is enormous.

I feel that it is important to have police officers out on the street engaging in community policing and addressing crime. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service through this fiscal year.

1145 Market Street, 12th Floor,
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 864-1111, Fax: (415) 864-5188
TrinitySF.com

An active, fully staffed and engaged police department is crucial for the revitalization of our Union Square community. Shoppers, store-staff, office workers, tourists, visitors, and the general public at large, need to feel safe when in Union Square. What used to be a vibrant destination shopping and business area, became blighted during the pandemic. Further, the "riots" hit us very hard, with storefronts being smashed, trucks driving through storefronts, their occupants attempting to steal (we had this happen at two of our buildings!) ... we have gone through a nightmarish few years! Theft, security officers being thrown to the floor by thugs and thieves, storefront windows being smashed (in fact one of our tenants had the same pane of glass in their storefront broken 3 times, at \$20k a pop!

It's difficult to encourage office staff to return to the workplace for many reasons, including their safety, then when leases come due for expiration and/or renewal ... tenants are downsizing, or even worse, walking away. Yes, the media hasn't helped during these difficult times, by broadcasting our woes, but we can come back strong, we will come back strong, we are coming back strong.

The police presence in Union Square of late has been fabulous, we need to keep this up and improve where possible. It is so encouraging to see the officers present, active and engaged. We NEED this, we need your support. If we slide again, the general public will suffer, the property owners will suffer and the City ultimately will suffer with decreased revenues from property taxes, sales taxes and businesses falling by the wayside.

Importantly, this supplemental will also help continue staffing SFPD Community Ambassadors. Due to these unprecedented shortages, these retired officers are essential to continue providing foot beat patrol in critical areas across the City, such as Union Square.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,



Paul Wallace
Commercial Property Manager
(415) 864-1111





March 10, 2023

Re: March 15, 2023
Budget and Finance Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Email: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Cc: mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org

Supervisors: Connie Chan, Rafael Mandelman, and Asha Safai

Dear Budget and Finance Committee:

I am writing *on behalf of Trinity Management Services* to reinforce my support for Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund invaluable police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year. In addition, as a **Union Square stakeholder**, I want to show my gratitude for all support to date. The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also vital to the health of our economy. We are a critical component of the City's greater economy and rely on our police department to keep all San Franciscans, workers, and tourists safe.

Our company owns and manages several prominent buildings in the Union Square area, including: 201 Post Street, 233 Post Street, 111 Maiden Lane, 105 Grant and 140 Geary Street. Some of our retail tenants include: Cartier; Fendi; Hermes; Van Cleef and Arpels; Valentino and Bottega Veneta. With 8 – 10 floors of offices in most of our properties, the role that SFPD plays in the day-to-day lives of our tenants, their staff, the office personnel, and the shoppers/visitors is enormous.

I feel that it is important to have police officers out on the street engaging in community policing and addressing crime. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service through this fiscal year.

1145 Market Street, 12th Floor,
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 864-1111, Fax: (415) 864-5188
TrinitySF.com

An active, fully staffed and engaged police department is crucial for the revitalization of our Union Square community. Shoppers, store-staff, office workers, tourists, visitors, and the general public at large, need to feel safe when in Union Square. What used to be a vibrant destination shopping and business area, became blighted during the pandemic. Further, the "riots" hit us very hard, with storefronts being smashed, trucks driving through storefronts, their occupants attempting to steal (we had this happen at two of our buildings!) ... we have gone through a nightmarish few years! Theft, security officers being thrown to the floor by thugs and thieves, storefront windows being smashed (in fact one of our tenants had the same pane of glass in their storefront broken 3 times, at \$20k a pop!

It's difficult to encourage office staff to return to the workplace for many reasons, including their safety, then when leases come due for expiration and/or renewal ... tenants are downsizing, or even worse, walking away. Yes, the media hasn't helped during these difficult times, by broadcasting our woes, but we can come back strong, we will come back strong, we are coming back strong.

The police presence in Union Square of late has been fabulous, we need to keep this up and improve where possible. It is so encouraging to see the officers present, active and engaged. We NEED this, we need your support. If we slide again, the general public will suffer, the property owners will suffer and the City ultimately will suffer with decreased revenues from property taxes, sales taxes and businesses falling by the wayside.

Importantly, this supplemental will also help continue staffing SFPD Community Ambassadors. Due to these unprecedented shortages, these retired officers are essential to continue providing foot beat patrol in critical areas across the City, such as Union Square.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,



Paul Wallace
Commercial Property Manager
(415) 864-1111



From: [Spencer Sechler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Support For Mayor Breed's Budget Supplemental for SFPD Funding
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 2:37:50 PM
Attachments: [Pass the Budget Supplemental for SFPD Funding - Spencer Sechler D5 3.10.2023.pdf](#)

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

Good afternoon,I am sending a letter of support for the Mayor's budget supplemental to further fund the SFPD.Please ensure that the Board Members and that Budget and Finance Committee Members receive my letter.

Thank you for your service to the City!

Spencer Sechler
spencersechler@gmail.com
415.798.7873

March 10, 2023

Budget and Finance Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Email: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org

Supervisors: Connie Chan, Rafael Mandelman, and Asha Safai

Dear Budget and Finance Committee:

I am writing on behalf of the Union Square Alliance and Union Square Foundation to ask your support for Mayor Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund invaluable police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year. In addition, as a Union Square stakeholder, **I want to show my gratitude for support to date.** The recovery of San Francisco is dependent on safety; and a **fully staffed San Francisco Police Department** will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also vital to the health of our economy. We are a critical component of the City's greater economy and rely on our police department to keep all San Franciscans, workers, and tourists safe. This funding is crucial for our police department to accomplish this.

I am a resident of District 5, and work on a daily basis in the Financial District. I am also on the Board of Directors of the Union Square Foundation and have previously served on the Board of Directors of the Union Square BID/Alliance and the Yerba Buena CBD. My job takes me to a wide variety of locations throughout San Francisco. As I travel through the city each day, it is apparent that we need police officers out on the street engaging in community policing and addressing crime. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service through this fiscal year.

As a citizen and worker in San Francisco, this supplemental budget request is important to both myself, and the company I work for. After living here since 1999, I now find that I am sometimes fearful of walking down the street in my own neighborhood, which coincidentally is only 1/2 block from one of our police stations. In years past, I greeted everyone who I walked by, waved, and asked people if they needed assistance to cross the street....but now it seems that more and more I keep my head down, don't make eye contact, and don't engage others in my neighborhood. Why? I am fearful that I may put myself in danger by engaging others on the street. For someone like me who has lived as a compassionate person; feeling this way really brings on apathy. I wonder how many other citizens of San Francisco feel the same way. I wonder if visitors, convention attendees, tourists, and workers feel the same way.

This supplemental will also help continue staffing SFPD Community Ambassadors. Due to the unprecedented shortage of police officers, these retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in critical areas across the City, such as Union Square, which I have considered as the jewel of the city since I first became a citizen of San Francisco.

I ask you to strongly consider **passing** this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue on its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Thank you for your Leadership,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Spencer Sechler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Spencer" and last name "Sechler" clearly legible.

Spencer Sechler
Citizen of San Francisco – District 5
Employed in San Francisco
spencersechler@gmail.com
415.798.7873

From: [Rena Leddy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support \$27M police funding supplemental
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 4:02:02 PM
Attachments: [Support Police Funding Letter 030123.pdf](#)

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

On behalf of the Mid-Market Foundation and Mid-Market Business Association, please accept and share this letter with the Board of Supervisors for the Police Budget Supplemental when it is considered. Thank you!

--

Rena Masten Leddy

Vice President

Urban Place Consulting Group

Mobile: (310) 600-3247

www.urbanplaceconsulting.com



March 1, 2023

President Aaron Peskin and Board of Supervisors
City of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of the Mid-Market Business Association we urge you to support Mayor Breed's request for a \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime through the end of the fiscal year. The supplement will help ensure that the police department can retain the current below bare minimum level of staffing required to prevent drug dealing and crime from increasing. Without this supplemental funding, the police department will lose current police shifts and be unable to address the rampant open air drug markets in the city.

The Mid-Market neighborhood has suffered greatly from the open-air drug dealing occurring on virtually every block. Small business and residents in the neighborhood have been negatively impacted. Mid-Market is currently suffering a 40% vacancy rate of street level retail. We are working with the private sector businesses, property owners, arts and cultural organizations to change the experience along Market Street. But, all of the investment and energy will be for naught if the open-air drug dealing does not end. We believe this cannot happen without the assistance of SFPD.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue on its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steve Gibson', is written in a cursive style.

Steve Gibson
Executive Director

From: [Ivy Yee-Sakamoto](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); police-supplemental@growsf.org; [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the supplemental police budget
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 5:05:07 PM

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

We must pay our police officers and keep the police academy open. Passing the supplemental police funding bill is absolutely essential. Without this funding, the Police Academy will not be able to train new officers until next fiscal year, the department will lose even more qualified officers, and calls for help will go unanswered since officers won't be able to work overtime.

Supervisor Chan, police officers are working overtime to keep us safe. Not voting to approve their overtime flies in the face of what the majority of regular San Franciscans demand from City Hall. Do not fail the vast majority of San Franciscans who want police to do their jobs.

Supervisor Chan, please introduce the supplemental funding measure at Budget Committee and vote YES.

Thank you.

Ivy Yee-Sakamoto

From: [erlend bo](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 5:55:31 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

erlend bo
bo.erlend@gmail.com
3192 sacramento
san francisco, California 94109

From: [Steve Menasche](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 5:57:06 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Steve Menasche
steve@realvo.com
29 Park Hill Ave
san Francisco, California 94117

From: [Scott Jacques](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 5:59:05 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Scott Jacques
scott@nk-interactive.com
7633 Geary Blvd
San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Christina Tucker](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:00:54 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Christina Tucker
ctucker.0306@gmail.com
670 Eddy St Apt 320
San Francisco, California 94109-7967

From: [Calum Mackay](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:02:23 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Calum Mackay

Calum Mackay

CalumLMackay@gmail.com

55 Hancock Street, Apt 2

San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Charlotte Worcester](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:02:26 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors, especially Supervisor Connie Chan:

I wholeheartedly support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

And, if Supervisor Connie Chan holds this up, she and her supporting colleagues will be at the top of the list for accountability for the abyss of problems that will follow such folly. All anti-police ideology MUST be taken off the table, and the security of ALL San Franciscans (and visitors) be put in TOP PRIORITY. Ms. Chan: do NOT meddle with our safety and well-being by refusing to include the \$27 million in SFPD supplemental funding. Imposing a faulty belief system/anti-police ideology that is FAILING us will be a political mistake of epic proportions.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Charlotte Worcester
beubarlotte@yahoo.com
515 Chenery Street
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [George Cavage](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:02:31 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

George Cavage
gcavage@gmail.com
1483 Sutter Street, unit 510
San Francisco, California 94109

From: videogirl@mac.com
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:05:43 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

This is very important!

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

videogirl@mac.com
2477 Folsom St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Susan Abbott](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:06:18 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Susan Abbott
suzy.abbott.sf@gmail.com
1906 Ocean Avenue, Apartment 7
San Francisco , California 94127

From: [Gail Mametsuka](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); police-supplemental@growsf.org; [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the supplemental police budget
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:13:03 PM

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

We must pay our police officers and keep the police academy open. Passing the supplemental police funding bill is absolutely essential. Without this funding, the Police Academy will not be able to train new officers until next fiscal year, the department will lose even more qualified officers, and calls for help will go unanswered since officers won't be able to work overtime.

Supervisor Chan, police officers are working overtime to keep us safe. Not voting to approve their overtime flies in the face of what the majority of regular San Franciscans demand from City Hall. Do not fail the vast majority of San Franciscans who want police to do their jobs.

Supervisor Chan, please introduce the supplemental funding measure at Budget Committee and vote YES.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Diana Witonsky](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:15:45 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Diana Witonsky
dhwitonsky@gmail.com
37 Alpha St.
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Victoria Frambach](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:16:17 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Please authorize the additional funds to help improve the safety of San Franciscans.

Thank you,
Victoria F
District 11

Victoria Frambach
vframbach@gmail.com
15 Hollywood Court
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Lisa Smith](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:19:50 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Lisa Smith
lsmith68@gmail.com
1370 41st avenue
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Sarah Ferris](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:20:33 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Sarah Ferris
sefe2@yahoo.com
2336 Octavia st
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Stephen DeLuco](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:22:26 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Stephen DeLuco

Stephen DeLuco
stephen.deluco@gmail.com
187 Idora Avenue
San Francisco, California 94127

From: [jim.coughlan](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); police-supplemental@growsf.org; [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the supplemental police budget
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:32:44 PM

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

We must pay our police officers and keep the police academy open. Passing the supplemental police funding bill is absolutely essential. Without this funding, the Police Academy will not be able to train new officers until next fiscal year, the department will lose even more qualified officers, and calls for help will go unanswered since officers won't be able to work overtime.

Supervisor Chan, police officers are working overtime to keep us safe. Not voting to approve their overtime flies in the face of what the majority of regular San Franciscans demand from City Hall. Do not fail the vast majority of San Franciscans who want police to do their jobs.

Supervisor Chan, please introduce the supplemental funding measure at Budget Committee and vote YES.

Thank you.

From: [Drew Wolfe](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:44:52 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Drew Wolfe
wolfea@gmail.com
1826 Eddy Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Karen Schwartz](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:52:52 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Karen Schwartz
kielygomes@yahoo.com
PO Box 14350
San Francisco , California 94114

From: [Karen Schwartz](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:53:24 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Karen Schwartz
kielygomes@yahoo.com
PO Box 14350
San Francisco , California 94114

From: [mary.petrie](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:58:53 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

mary petrie
mfpetrie@gmail.com
475 molimo
San francisco, California 94127

From: [Paul Pak](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:58:59 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Paul Pak
pypak1@gmail.com
1454 30th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [James Reece](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 7:13:11 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

James Reece
macreecejr@yahoo.com
821 Folsom St, No 504
San Francisco , California 94107

From: [Eddy Sapiro](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 7:17:31 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Eddy Sapiro
eddysapiro@yahoo.com
226 16th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Christina Pappas](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 7:18:18 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Christina Pappas
scoutca66@gmail.com
228 16th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Tessa Sapiro](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 7:19:50 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Tessa Sapiro
tessorca9@gmail.com
226 16th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Cole Sapiro](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 7:21:22 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Cole Sapiro
riptidelax31@gmail.com
226 16th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Nicholas Weininger](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 7:22:41 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Nicholas Weininger
nweininger@pobox.com
575 Magellan Ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Angela Stephenson](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 7:52:05 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Angela Stephenson
angela.barbus@gmail.com
276 Page Street
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Paul Foppe](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 7:55:56 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Paul Foppe
hugfoppe@gmail.com
2935 Judah Street
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Kevin Vaarsi](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 8:01:05 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Kevin Vaarsi
kvaarsi@yahoo.com
542 Noe Street, San Francisco, CA, USA
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Steve Snyder](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 8:07:02 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Steve Snyder
stevesny@gmail.com
445 darien way
san francisco, California 94127

From: [Jason LaMacchia](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Pass the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 8:15:43 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

Do this!!!! I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Jason LaMacchia
drift-dolor0x@icloud.com
1571 11th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Brad Smallwood](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 8:18:34 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Brad Smallwood
lakeypeak@yahoo.com
2010 48th Ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Abby Davis](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 8:22:33 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Abby Davis
abbyj.davis@gmail.com
262 Funston Ave
San Francisco , California 94118

From: [Alexander Castro](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); police-supplemental@growsf.org; [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the supplemental police budget
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 8:26:04 PM

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

We must pay our police officers and keep the police academy open. Passing the supplemental police funding bill is absolutely essential. Without this funding, the Police Academy will not be able to train new officers until next fiscal year, the department will lose even more qualified officers, and calls for help will go unanswered since officers won't be able to work overtime.

Supervisor Chan, police officers are working overtime to keep us safe. Not voting to approve their overtime flies in the face of what the majority of regular San Franciscans demand from City Hall. Do not fail the vast majority of San Franciscans who want police to do their jobs.

Supervisor Chan, please introduce the supplemental funding measure at Budget Committee and vote YES.

Thank you,

Alexander Castro

From: [Kathleen McTiernan](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 8:33:12 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Kathleen McTiernan
k.kmctiernan@sbcglobal.net
1600 12th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [M](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); police-supplemental@growsf.org; [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the supplemental police budget
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 8:49:01 PM

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

We must pay our police officers and keep the police academy open. Passing the supplemental police funding bill is absolutely essential. Without this funding, the Police Academy will not be able to train new officers until next fiscal year, the department will lose even more qualified officers, and calls for help will go unanswered since officers won't be able to work overtime.

Supervisor Chan, police officers are working overtime to keep us safe. Not voting to approve their overtime flies in the face of what the majority of regular San Franciscans demand from City Hall. Do not fail the vast majority of San Franciscans who want police to do their jobs.

Supervisor Chan, please introduce the supplemental funding measure at Budget Committee and vote YES.

This city has become a cesspool, and a very dangerous one at that. Defend the police is the most irresponsible and ignorant policy one could force on a city. This needs to stop immediately. How about we honor the men and women who put their lives on the line to protect people in this city, rather than drag them through the mud for preposterous progagandized rhetoric which only serves to hurt everyone.

Thank you.

From: [Gideon Kramer](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 9:08:34 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023. This is a tiny amount to help make a dent in an intolerable situation.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Gideon Kramer
gykramer1@gmail.com
48A Dorland St.
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Emily Flemming](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 9:20:32 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

Public Safety is the #1 priority on the minds of San Franciscans, the #1 thing needed to get S.F. to rebound and as such it should be treated as the #1 priority on the minds on our leaders on the board of supervisors. I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department in full.

Working in Real Estate in the Bay Area, I see the numbers and hear the reasons why investors are avoiding investing in our City: safety, and crime are top concerns. As a SF resident they are my top concerns. Please expedite all matters that concern safety, especially the Budget Supplemental measures to ensure our police department has the resources they need to ensure the safety and well-being of our City. If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Emily Flemming
emflemming@gmail.com
1547 Clay St. Apt. 204
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Pablo Lo Giudice](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 9:23:45 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Pablo Lo Giudice
pablopablo10@hotmail.com
601 Van Ness Ave Suite E3-429
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Dennis Wu](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 9:42:54 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Dennis Wu
wu.dennis888@gmail.com
185, Lunado Way
San Francisco, California 94127-2854

From: [Jonah Purinton](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 9:51:20 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Jonah Purinton
jonah.purinton@gmail.com
1357 Clay St Apt 13
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Cora Shaw](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 9:52:32 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Cora Shaw
uzes.charm@gmail.com
451 Guerrero st
San Francisco , 94110

From: [Stephanie Jeong](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 10:10:57 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department, so should you.

The budget to the SF Police Department should not be cut, when there is still crime.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Stephanie Jeong
stephaniejeong52@gmail.com
146 Wood St. \$8
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Frank Noto](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 10:24:53 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Frank Noto
frank@fnstrategy.com
15 Quintara Street
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Jason Jungreis](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 10:28:42 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Jason Jungreis
jasonjungreis@gmail.com
527 47th Avenue,
san francisco, California 94121

From: [Kristap Baltin](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 10:49:18 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Kristap Baltin
kbaltin@yahoo.com
3932 22nd street
San Francisco , California 94114

From: [Frank Noto](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 10:52:13 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Honorable Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Frank Noto
frank@fnstrategy.com
15 Quintara Street
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Joanne Cheng](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 11:15:00 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Joanne Cheng
joannecheng8@hotmail.com
1447 Judah Street
SF, California 94122

From: [Paul Mohun](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 11:42:36 PM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Paul Mohun
prm5@georgetown.edu
521 Euclid Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Meina Young](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 12:14:11 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe. Please protect public safety and protect SF livelihoods.

Thank you.

Meina Young
meinayoung1@gmail.com
1508 Anza St.
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Ron Lee](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 12:24:15 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Ron Lee
rlee288@aol.com
5013 DIAMOND HEIGHTS, BLVD
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94131

From: [Raymond Fabrizio](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 1:53:17 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department. Please enact it.

Raymond Fabrizio
fabrcius@yahoo.com
195 7th St Apt 206
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [John Beighley](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 3:27:23 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

John Beighley
johnbeighley@gmail.com
1819, 16th Ave
San Francisco, 94122

From: [Christopher Xavier](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 4:23:08 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Christopher Xavier
acxavier@aol.com
1700 16th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Alice Xavier](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 5:17:43 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Alice Xavier
acxavier@aol.com
1700 16th Ave
SF, California 94122

From: [Margaret Shamlian](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 5:59:06 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Margaret Shamlian
margaretshamlian@gmail.com
1818 15th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Lydia Cassorla](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: GET it DONE! Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 6:19:30 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Lydia Cassorla
lydia@cassorla.com
1801 14th avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Charles Farrugia](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 6:37:23 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Charles Farrugia
283 Gambier St.
S.F. CA 94134

Charles Farrugia
Helpmlpark@gmail.com
283 Gambier St.
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Mike sullivan](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 6:45:28 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Mike sullivan
michaelsullivan415@gmail.com
59 Woodland Avenue
San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Ashley Green](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 6:49:22 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Ashley Green
dewilde.ash@gmail.com
4332 19th St
San Francisco, California 94114-2417

From: [Doug Lenzo](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 7:05:33 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

And, I support allocating even more funding to our “Friends in Blue” to keep our streets safe!

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Doug Lenzo

Doug Lenzo
douglenzo@hotmail.com
75 Waller St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Gail Mametsuka](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); police-supplemental@growsf.org; [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the supplemental police budget
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 7:06:46 AM

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

We must pay our police officers and keep the police academy open. Passing the supplemental police funding bill is absolutely essential. Without this funding, the Police Academy will not be able to train new officers until next fiscal year, the department will lose even more qualified officers, and calls for help will go unanswered since officers won't be able to work overtime.

Supervisor Chan, police officers are working overtime to keep us safe. Not voting to approve their overtime flies in the face of what the majority of regular San Franciscans demand from City Hall. Do not fail the vast majority of San Franciscans who want police to do their jobs.

Supervisor Chan, please introduce the supplemental funding measure at Budget Committee and vote YES.

Thank you.
Gail Mametsuka

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Doug Lenzo](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney
Date: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 7:09:39 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

It's no surprise that drugs and increased crime go hand-in-hand. We should make a concerted effort to stop turning our heads from illegal drug use as if it were acceptable public behavior!

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 2022 compared to the second half of 2021.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you,

Doug Lenzo

Doug Lenzo
douglenzo@hotmail.com
75 Waller St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Terry Lewis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Support for 27M budget supplemental
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 12:54:55 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

March 15, 2023
Budget and Finance Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Email: Cc: Supervisors: Connie Chan, Rafael Mandelman, and Asha Safai

Dear Budget and Finance Committee:

I am writing to show my support for Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund invaluable police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year. In addition, as a Union Square stakeholder, I want to show my gratitude for support to date. The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also vital to the health of our economy. We are a critical component of the City's greater economy, and rely our police department to keep all San Franciscans, workers, and tourists safe.

I live (D3)and work (D5)in the City.

I feel that it is important to have police officers out on the street engaging in community policing and addressing crime. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service through this fiscal year.

Having safe streets is really important for visitors and for groups planning meetings in SF. I am the General Manager at the Hilton/Parc 55 and the reputation of San Francisco is suffering domestically and globally due to perceptions about the safeness of our city.

I

This supplemental will also help continue staffing SFPD Community Ambassadors. Due to these unprecedented shortages, these retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in critical areas across the City, such as Union Square.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Terry Lewis | Complex General Manager

REPRESENTING THE HILTON HOTELS OF SAN FRANCISCO UNION SQUARE

t: +1 415-202-7096 | m: +1 415-203-7260 | terry.lewis@hilton.com



[HILTON SAN FRANCISCO UNION SQUARE & HILTON PARC 55 SAN FRANCISCO](#)

333 O'Farrell Street | San Francisco CA 94102 | USA

This transmission is not a digital or electronic signature and cannot be used to form, document, or authenticate a contract. Hilton and its affiliates accept no liability arising in connection with this transmission. Copyright 2023 Hilton Proprietary and Confidential

From: [Richard Manso](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 1:19:53 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

From your constituent Richard Manso

Email rmanso2016@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [RICHARD MANSO](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 1:30:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent RICHARD MANSO

Email rmanso2016@gmail.com

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for the DA's office.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisors Mandelman and Engardio's ordinance appropriating \$199,286 of General Fund General Reserves for three new positions in the Office of the District Attorney to address open-air drug dealing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023.

Long-awaited cooperation between our Mayor, District Attorney, and the Police Chief has resulted in significant progress in arresting drug dealers that prey on our most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Arraignments for felony narcotic sales have nearly doubled for the second half of 22 compared to the second half of 21.

Our District Attorney's Office requires this small amount of additional funding to prosecute this nearly doubling of cases and we strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to authorize these additional funds.

Thank you.

From: [David Nolley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 2:36:51 PM

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

General email Board Of Suervisors,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

David Nolley
danolley@aol.com
1754 Great Highway
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Frederick Bullock](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 5:32:15 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

From your constituent Frederick Bullock
Email fred.bullock@outlook.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Aditya Bhumbra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 7:45:08 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Aditya Bhumbra and I live/work in District 5. I'm an organizer with DSA SF.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Aditya Bhumbra
District 5

Aditya Bhumbra
adit.bhumbra@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Bianca Gonzalez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 7:46:18 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Bianca and I live in District 11.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Bianca Gonzalez
District 11

Bianca Gonzalez
bgonzalez12@dons.usfca.edu

San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Jesse Stout](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 7:57:59 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Jesse Stout and I live and work in District 6.

Many San Francisco residents and city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government. It is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

In 2022, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved SFPD's massive \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

SFPD already spends A LOT per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

The recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

San Francisco is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting

police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

Americans already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets.

Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

We ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

Board of Supervisors, please reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Jesse Stout
District 6 resident

Jesse Stout
jesséstout@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Christina Warren](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:04:36 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Christina and I live/work in District 10. I'm writing on behalf of myself and the Democratic Socialists of America, San Francisco.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Christina Warren

Christina Warren

christinaewarren@gmail.com

15 Graystone Terrace

San Francisco, California 94114-2113

From: [Eddy Hernandez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:05:32 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Eddy Hernandez and I live in District 11. I'm an organizer in the Tech Workers Coalition.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Eddy Hernandez
District 11

Eddy Hernandez
edward.d.hernandez@gmail.com
256 Brighton Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Will Swafford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:10:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Will Swafford
SF District 2

Will Swafford
littleswaff811@gmail.com
2550 Turk Blvd.
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Michael Howley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:46:24 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Michael and I live in District 8. I've lived in San Francisco my whole adult life, and in all that time I've only ever seen SFPD take from the city while doing nothing for us.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive \$713 million SFPD budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Michael Howley
District 8

Michael Howley
howley.michaelj@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Brett Bertocci](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 9:01:53 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Brett Bertocci and I live in District 8.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Brett Bertocci
D8

Brett Bertocci
bertocci@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Fiona Anderson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 9:18:09 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Fiona Anderson and I live/work in District 7.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

FIONA ANDERSON
DISTRICT 7

Fiona Anderson
fbanderson17@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94112

From: [L Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 9:18:40 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

From your constituent L Wong
Email renonv87@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Atakan Deviren](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 9:54:43 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Atakan and I live/work in District 7

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Atakan Deviren
District 7

Atakan Deviren
atakandeviren04@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94116

From: sfpaulie@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 10:28:26 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Paul Aguilar and I live in District 9. I am also the chair of the HIV caucus of the Harvey Mountain Democratic LGBTQ Club, a board member of Marty's Place Affordable Housing Corporation, and a person who has been living with HIV and AIDS for the last 35 years.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

I myself have been fighting for funds for long-term survivors to access much needed mental health services in the wake of having survived the worst years of the AIDS pandemic. additionally with the almost 11, 000 folks over the age of 50 who are living with HIV housing and security and food insecurity are number one and number two on their list of needs. How can the city justify this kind of expense when people are going hungry?

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets.

Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Paul Aguilar
1165 Treat Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94110
District 9

sfpaulie@gmail.com

From: [Justin Truong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 11:28:36 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Justin Truong
Email justintruong56@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Simone Manganelli](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 11:31:22 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Simone Manganelli and I am a longtime resident and homeowner of District 8.

I am tired of sending this email, week after week, month after month, year after year. Stop giving cops money. Don't give them any more money, and cut their existing money.

Cops don't need more money. Cops should be fired. Cops ROUTINELY lie, murder, and kill San Franciscans. They still use many times the use of force against Black people that they do against white people, even though the Mayor and Police Chief are Black and supposedly care about these disparities. (Spoiler alert: they don't.)

Of major cities, San Francisco is by far the city that devotes more money per capita to cops, who sit around and do nothing, and intentionally try to get the DA booted from office.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues

this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration. All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Simone Manganelli
Resident, Homeowner, District 8

Simone Manganelli
simsimbean+copsarepigs@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Wendy Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 5:39:42 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

From your constituent Wendy Smith
Email wsmith61a@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Edward Parillon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 6:24:58 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Ed Parillon and I live in District 9.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Ed Parillon
District 9 voter and SFUSD parent

Edward Parillon
eparillon@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Alex Lantsberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 6:34:09 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Alex Lantsberg

lantsberg@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94124

From: [Stephen Woods](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 6:59:27 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Stephen Woods and I live in District 4. My wife is a teacher in the SFUSD, and over the last year has had to deal with missed paychecks, chaos and staff shortages. Just this week we found out the district made an error with taxes! So all this is going on and in the district and nobody seems to care or want to fix it. What I'm hearing from our city leaders is just that we need to make "hard choices" about school funding. So against this backdrop I was pretty horrified to hear that the Mayor was calling for yet more funding increased for SFPD! And for starting salaries that are HIGHER than the highest salary paid to teachers in SFUSD! The following comes from a form letter, but I support it, and I would except the city to not increase SFPD pay.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding

to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration. All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Stephen Woods
D 4

Stephen Woods
saw@stephenwoods.net

San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Kyle Borland](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 7:06:54 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Kyle Borland and I live/work in District 10. I am a member of both LGBTQ+ Democratic clubs, Harvey Milk and Alice Toklas, as well as DSA SF.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Kyle Borland
District 10

Kyle Borland
kgborland23@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94124

From: [Nayeli Maxson Velazquez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:14:04 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Nayeli Maxson Velazquez and I live and work in District 8. I work in the SF LGBTQ center and am a member of UAW 2320, DSA SF, and Senior and Disability Action.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets.

Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Nayeli Maxson Velazquez
District 8

Nayeli Maxson Velazquez
nayelimax@gmail.com
474 Sanchez Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Kelsey Pool](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:29:07 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Kelsey Pool and I live/work in District 19.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police

officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Kelsey Pool
District 19

Kelsey Pool
kelseyip71@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Matt Laroche](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: I do not support increasing the SFPD budget
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:39:34 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Matt and I live/work in District 4.

I am disappointed to see the news that the mayor and many supervisors are planning to increase police funding in San Francisco. I believe we should be reallocating a meaningful amount of money from policing to more positive forms of support for people who need support.

The SFPD is already funded highly per capita and we have high police staffing per capita; however, SFPD is taking longer to respond to calls and has stopped enforcing traffic laws. I do not believe we should reward the SFPD with more money while they are operating as poorly as they are.

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Matt Laroche
District 4

Matt Laroche
mlaroche@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Elizabeth Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 8:53:12 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

From your constituent Elizabeth Clark

Email swimeclark@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Brian Adler](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:48:05 AM

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

Clerk Angela Calvillo,

Dear Supervisors,

I support the Budget Supplemental for the San Francisco Police Department.

If the Budget Supplemental does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut police hours and patrols in our neighborhoods. Hiring of new police officers will be halted, at a time when SF has 340 fewer police than it did in 2019. This is unacceptable.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours. This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy for our current shortage of SFPD officers is urgently needed to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Brian Adler
familyadler@hotmail.com
2600 26th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Terri Saul](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 10:07:50 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Terri and I work in District 5,

Money needs to flow toward teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, nurses, therapists, and other essential workers, not to the overly bloated police budget.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city.

Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding

to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Terri Saul
D5 worker

Terri Saul
terrisaul@gmail.com

Berkeley, California 94705

From: [Edna Kozikaro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 10:23:04 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Edna and I live/work in District 4. I organize with the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) San Francisco chapter.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

I have spent the last 3 years really committing to local organizing in San Francisco, in particular around homelessness, and what I have witnessed time and time again is austerity and massive lacks of capacity for every single issue that affects people living and working in San Francisco. A constant lack of resources allocated, while a massive resource pool exists in the police budget. It does not take much investigation to see the result of prioritizing the police budget at the expense of ALL other budgets in the City. It is shameful to see this dynamic play out in San Francisco, similarly to how it plays out with outrageous military spending on the federal level. One thing I read and hear time and time again out of City departments is that SF is considered an example for homelessness policy. If true, that is terrifying. HSH's own recent reporting has provided detailed accounts of the costs it would take to meaningfully decrease and curb ongoing homelessness, and there is no sufficient funding allocated to this effort, yet PLENTY of money to increase the violent SFPD. This rings true in so many key areas of SF's functioning. IT IS UNACCEPTABLE.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police

department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Edna Kozikaro

D4

Edna Kozikaro

ednakozikaro@gmail.com

2629 irving street

san francisco, California 94122-1516

From: [Mark Hogan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 10:31:35 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Mark Hogan and I live in District 4 and own a business in District 10.

It seems like every time I read the news in San Francisco, I'm reminded that our transit agencies are facing a "Fiscal Cliff" and there are going to be "hard decisions" ahead... yet now I see that the SFPD is going to get yet another handout outside the budget process.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does

nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Mark Hogan
Resident, District 4

Mark Hogan
mark.hogan@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Lea McGeever](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 10:37:57 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Lea and I live/work in District 6.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Lea
D6

Lea McGeever
lea.mcgeeve@gmail.com

,

From: [Jason Morrison](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 11:18:07 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

From your constituent Jason Morrison
Email jason.p.morrison@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Serena McNair](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: This D6 Resident Asks You to STOP SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 12:09:36 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Serena and I live in District 6.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing. It is nauseating to see this come up when we don't even have a functioning payroll system for SFUSD teachers, MUNI is looking at cutting service, and supportive services like the Tenderloin Center are closing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend. SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem. It is astonishing that we put so much money into an organization that consistently does not provide positive results. Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer-to-resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime. My partner and I have been dealing with a violent person who has moved onto our street, who attacked someone with a chain one night. SFPD did not respond that night, or to other calls about this person. At this point, it feels useless to even contact SFPD.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. CCSF students had to attempt to learn in rooms as cold as 42 degrees on the CCSF campus this winter. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability, which has worsened conditions on the streets. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%. I refuse to believe that millions more dollars going into SFPD's coffers would do more to serve and protect San Francisco residents and visitors than if it were slated to fund our schools, healthcare, supportive housing, and city infrastructure.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, I ask every San Francisco resident, and in particular the Mayor and Supervisors that we rely on to represent us: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Serena McNair, District 6 Resident

Serena McNair
serena.d.mcnair@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Artem Ivanov](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 12:19:45 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Artem and I live and work in District 3. I am a member of the Democratic Socialists of America.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Artem Ivanov
District 3

Artem Ivanov
aivanov34758@gmail.com
861 Sutter St Apt 408
San Francisco, California 94109-6148

From: [Enia Titova](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Please oppose SFPD budget increase
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 12:39:24 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

My name is Enia Titova and I live in your district.

I'm writing to you with a request that you vote to oppose the request to increase the SFPD budget.

Last week, I called into the committee meeting re the City's complete failure on its VisionZero mission. And what I heard appalled me: Commander Walsh spent his entire time blaming his officers' lack of enforcement on anything and everything: body cams, the length of time it takes to perform administrative tasks associated with writing a citation, completely made up statistics. Everything but take accountability for the fact that SFPD officers have given up on enforcing the law in this city.

And now they want more money?!

Why?! Have they shown any progress towards accomplishing the goals of public safety each time their budget is increased?

There's absolutely no accountability in our police department. Why would officers bother to do their jobs when all they hear is their leadership blaming the lack of their success on understaffing. What rank and file officers hear is: regardless of what I do, I will not lose my job. So why bother doing it?

So to ask us, the tax payers of San Francisco, to increase their budget once again, when other vital city services are going unfunded in a way that has all but killed civil life and social safety nets in this city is outrageous.

When we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

I ask you to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Enia Titova
West Portal resident

Enia Titova
enia.titova@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Kurt Nelson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop spending more money on SFPD
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 12:40:27 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Kurt Nelson and I live in D5 and work in District 6 at Pinterest.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

In addition, Matt Dorsey has a conflict of interest in funding the exact organization he used to be in charge of raising public perception and funds for.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Kurt Nelson
District 5
333 Haight St

Kurt Nelson
kurtisnelson@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Jan Hewitt](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 1:30:20 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Ian Hewitt
District 9

Ian Hewitt
ianrhewitt@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Nicholas Marinakis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 2:23:34 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Nicholas Marinakis
hoyanakis@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Leonor Melara](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 2:47:11 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Leonor Melara
leonormelara@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94132

From: [Feng Han](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 3:11:13 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Feng and I live and work in District 9.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Feng Han
San Francisco District 9

Feng Han
fengzee@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Harvey Williams](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 4:41:19 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Harvey and I live in District 8.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police

officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Harvey W
District 8

Harvey Williams
hwilliams@gmail.com

,

From: [Gabriel Goffman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 5:39:56 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Gabriel Goffman
gfgoffman@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Selby Wynn Schwartz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Support community instead of over-policing us
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 6:08:51 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Selby Wynn Schwartz and I live in District 3. I've lived in San Francisco for many years, and like many people in my Lower Nob Hill neighborhood, I am very concerned about safety and well-being in my community.

When I say "health and well-being," I mean: protected bicycle lanes EVERYWHERE! better public health care! free public transportation! proper mental health resources! enough affordable housing! a strong post-incarceration support system to help people get jobs and help them begin to give back to their communities! no more hand-outs and tax breaks for massive tech corporations! lots of community ambassadors helping people find housing and substance-abuse programs! plentiful funding for public art and the artists who make it possible! an end to San Francisco's shameful history of police violence against people of color and low-income communities!

What I DON'T mean by "health and well-being" is \$713 million--or more--for the SFPD. We already have scores of police officers hanging around Union Square, protecting luxury handbags, which is a waste of money. We already have a terrible record of officers harassing and using violence on communities of color. What we need are more teachers, more bus drivers, more community ambassadors, more social workers, more nurses, and more public services for ALL of us. I stand with DSA in asking: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Sincerely,
Selby Wynn Schwartz
D3

Selby Wynn Schwartz
selbywynn@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Jason Levine](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Invest in care and community, not cops!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 6:13:04 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Jason Levine and I live and work in District 2.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend. SFPD does not have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability.

Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Jason Levine
District 2
3070 California Street, Apt 102
San Francisco, CA 94115

Jason Levine
jasonlevine3@gmail.com
3070 California Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Tammy Vinson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 6:18:37 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Tammy, and I live in District 8.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend. SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Tammy Vinson
District 8

Tammy Vinson
tammyvinson@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Scott Feeney](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\) - BOS Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: [Re: SFPD Budget Supplemental: Give the money to Muni!](#)
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 7:21:53 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

Hi I'm Scott, a District 9 resident.

Please reject the proposed SFPD budget supplemental, and instead give the money to Muni to restore transit service.

I used to ride the 12-Folsom bus regularly, now I can't rely on it because service cuts have made it so infrequent due to Muni operator shortages.

In contrast, there is NOT a shortage of police officers in San Francisco. That is fiction. The SF Chronicle recently reported that we have more police officers per capita than any other big city in the state, and cited crime researchers who did not support the idea that hiring more police would improve public safety. (https://url.avanan.click/v2/https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/Is-the-San-Francisco-Police-Department-actually-17079550.php__YXAzOnNmZHqYOmE6bz04ZGQ2YTkzMjgxMzZlOTQyMzFIMzkyYzkyZDFkNGIzMj02OjcxZjM6YjRlMjdiYTQyMzgzYjMyNjkyZGE1ZmFkNjRmODk2NjYwN2F0ThMTI5MmFYzUzYThhN2VhNTVMTAzNGQ1Zj00IQ)

SFPD has an accountability problem, not a funding problem. Its own reports show, for example, that traffic cops in some stations wrote ZERO tickets in December for safety-critical "focus on the five" violations (https://url.avanan.click/v2/https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/stay-safe/crime-data/traffic-violation-reports__YXAzOnNmZHqYOmE6bz04ZGQ2YTkzMjgxMzZlOTQyMzFIMzkyYzkyZDFkNGIzMj02OjA4YWl6M2RkY2NkYmZkZlZj00ODQ4NmMzYTQxNmJmN2M1NGFkZGMxZmZlYzQ3ZTA1NDYxM2QxY2MzZmZlMTE4NTFjYTE2Yj00IQ). Why would we give more money to a department that isn't doing its job with what it has?

In fact, in 2022, the police contract was just amended to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. Transit operators got none of these concessions, nor did other city workers like teachers, street cleaners, firefighters or nurses. So the police already just got rewarded for not doing their jobs. Why do that again?

I also agree with the points made in all the form letters you are receiving against the SFPD giveaway, but I wanted to make it snappy and emphasize Muni because, as a transit rider, this is so frustrating. Muni has scaled back and delayed planned service restorations several times. It faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and its board of directors has been forced to consider the possibility of cutting service by 25%.

Please reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into essential public services that will rebuild SF -- like Muni.

Scott Feeney
370 Shotwell St
SF, CA 94110

Scott Feeney
scott@oceanbase.org

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [K. R. Schwartz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 7:37:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent K. R. Schwartz
Email kielygomes@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [John Grogg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:03:18 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is John Grogg and I've lived in District 3 for five years now. The proposed SFPD budget increase is unacceptable.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

John Grogg
District 3

John Grogg
john.grogg@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Elizabeth Creely](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:47:02 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Elizabeth Creely and I live in District 9.

We need to fund MUNI, more quick build bike infrastructure and increase pedestrian safety.

We do not need to spend more money on policing. Nope.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does

nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Elizabeth Creely
District 9

Elizabeth Creely
creely12@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Maria Schulman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 10:36:18 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Maria Schulman

maria.schulman@gmail.com

1000 1/2 Dolores Street

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Javier G. Madrigal Jr.](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: stop sfpd giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:47:50 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Javi and I live in 94102.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police

officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Javier G. Madrigal Jr.

Javier G. Madrigal Jr.
javier.g.madrigal@gmail.com
540 O'Farrell St apt 603
San Francisco , California 94102

From: [Seema Gokhale](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 5:14:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Seema Gokhale
Email seema.v.gokhale@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Andrew Bader](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 6:49:22 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Andrew Bader

DREW.BADER@GMAIL.COM

1534 35th avenue

San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Emily Alter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 8:33:34 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Emily Alter and I live in the Richmond District, where I grew up.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Emily Alter
District 1

Emily Alter
emralter@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Meredith Nelson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 8:52:38 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Meredith and I live/work in District 1.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Meredith Nelson
meredithgn@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From: [William Van Der Laar](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 9:15:53 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is William Van Der Laar and I live in District 8.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. The extreme inequality in this city creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

I call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

William Van Der Laar
District 8

William Van Der Laar
bvanderlaar@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Debbie Symanovich](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 9:48:18 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

From your constituent Debbie Symanovich
Email debbiesymanovich@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I VERY STRONGLY support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD!!

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Isabel Kalogiannis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SFPD does not need the extra money
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 9:52:16 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Isabel Kalogiannis and I live in Supervisorial District 5.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Isabel Kalogiannis
isabelzoe@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Connor Kelley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 10:09:18 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Connor Kelley and I live and work in District 10. I work for the San Francisco Marin Food Bank and am a member of OPEIU Local 29.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the Mayor and many Supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric. Invest in housing, invest in hunger alleviation, invest in education, invest in climate protection, invest in medical care, invest in the library. The SFPD has shown time and time again that, despite insane budgets, they are incapable or unwilling to do what they should be doing - let's put our money into what we actually value.

Connor Kelley
District 10

Connor Kelley
ckelley876@gmail.com
829 22nd Street
San Francisco, California 94107

From: [Nick DeRenzi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways! Fund our school, accessible housing and healthcare!!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 11:01:25 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Nick DeRenzi and I live in District 1. I am also a member of Critical Resistance who has worked in coalition to get SF to invest in community programs and solutions that are not based on punishment and surveillance. It's unfortunate to be back asking our elected officials to stop the unrestricted funding to SFPD and the DA, while so many San Franciscans are facing food insecurity, housing insecurity, and a lack of health based services for the on going nation-wide drug epidemic.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Nick DeRenzi
District 1 resident

Nick DeRenzi
nick@criticalresistance.org

San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Jamie Zawinski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 11:21:19 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Jamie and I live and own a business in District 6.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Jamie Zawinski
District 6

Jamie Zawinski
nope@nope.nope

San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Gina White](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:13:43 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Gina White
District 8

Gina White
ginabythebay@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Meina Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:38:33 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Meina Young

Email meinayoung1@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Alex Rosenberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:40:43 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a long-time SF resident, living down the street from the Police Academy. (They are awful neighbors. I'd like the elementary school back.)

I'm tired of the sob story that SFPOA and SFPD chiefs keep telling us about their needs. They aren't doing the basics of their jobs. They intentionally underperformed so as to facilitate the political removal of the D.A.

San Francisco needs to be better than these political shenanigans.

I suffered three garage break-ins. I gave an hour of footage, including faces of perpetrators to the Burglary Unit. They did nothing. I located some of my stolen items, with matching serial numbers, on a website. I had to verbally browbeat the Burglary Unit to recover these items, which they did by calling the listing person and asking them to turn them in. No arrest was made and no investigation occurred. I have suffered a high loss, well over the felony limit, and they did nothing. According to the webhost where the video was posted for them to download, they didn't bother.

Do not cave in and give SFPD a blank check as they're asking for! I'd like to see reform of SFPOA and removal of any chiefs that were complicit in the scheme to underperform for political reasons. I've had enough of SF being made an example of on right-wing news because of the collaboration of these right-wing police leaders.³

Alex Rosenberg
76 Turquoise Way
San Francisco, CA 94131

Alex Rosenberg
alexr@leftfield.org

San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Armelle Coutant](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 1:12:16 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Armelle Coutant and I live in District 9.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Armelle Coutant
9th Supervisorial District

Armelle Coutant
armelle.a.coutant@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [christen_alqueza](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 1:57:26 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Christen and I live/work in District 1 and am a proper member of Richmond District Rising.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Christen Alqueza
District 1

christen alqueza
christenw00t@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Nicholas Kline](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 2:07:41 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Nick Kline and I live and work in District 1.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's contract to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city.

Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

Dumping millions into SFPD does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets.

Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Nick Kline
District 1
88 31st Avenue

Nicholas Kline
drvambu@aol.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Michael Ottum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 3:11:13 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Mike Ottum
District 9

Michael Ottum
mike.ottum@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: trainrose@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 5:11:06 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

trainrose@gmail.com

,

From: [David Uyeda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 8:24:07 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

From your constituent David Uyeda
Email dkuyeda@hotmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Lea McGeever](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways! But for real.
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 9:42:17 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Lea and I live in District 6.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Lea McGeever
D6 resident

Lea McGeever
lea.mcgeever@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Isao Kaji](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 9:51:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Isao Kaji

harrisonkaji@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Leslie Boin Podell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:06:07 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

From your constituent Leslie Boin Podell

Email leslie@podell.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Calvin Lau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:07:02 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

From your constituent Calvin Lau
Email calvinlau@comcast.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Kenneth Camp](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:15:25 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

From your constituent Kenneth Camp
Email kennycamp@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Peter Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:25:21 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Peter Lee
Email peterboothlee@hotmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

Here in the Richmond, formerly one of our very safest neighborhoods, within One (1) Year- my car was broken into 8 times. Nothing of value inside, but my Catalytic Converter was stolen Twice, (\$3,500.00 Each Time),, and (6) Six windows were broken (with tinting \$500.00 Each). TOTAL- Over \$10,000.00 Reason- The Understaffed SFPD has created a LAWLESS CITY.

Consequently, I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Roz Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:38:25 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

From your constituent Roz Smith
Email slowstreetroz@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Mike Jones](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:55:20 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

From your constituent Mike Jones
Email mj357@comcast.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Kathryn Hyde](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:55:22 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

From your constituent Kathryn Hyde
Email rekathryn@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Mike Jones](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:55:31 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Mike Jones
Email mj357@comcast.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Leslie Koelsch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:05:18 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

From your constituent Leslie Koelsch
Email koelsch1886@comcast.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Sara Roepke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:05:19 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

From your constituent Sara Roepke
Email roepke@adobe.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Gary Decad](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:10:19 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

From your constituent Gary Decad
Email gmdecad@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD. It is also clear that San Francisco needs financial assistance from Governor Newsom and the Federal Government to build new mental health facilities in the State which were removed by Governor Reagan. In addition, we cannot wait 5-10 years for the SFPD to hire new police officers and need State and Federal recruitment efforts and provide housing to police so they can live and work in San Francisco. This can be done and we will mobilize our taxpayers in SF to make this happen.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep

San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Alison Fong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Alison Fong
Email ayfong1@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Lou Ann Bassan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:25:25 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

From your constituent Lou Ann Bassan
Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [David Lehr](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:30:28 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

From your constituent David Lehr
Email lehr.david@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Betty Parodi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:30:33 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Betty Parodi
Email dooney@pacbell.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Susan McDonough](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:40:21 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Susan McDonough
Email sdrcrm@hotmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Betty Lamb](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:50:20 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

From your constituent **Betty Lamb**
Email sale_item@mindspring.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [TEVIS MARTIN](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:50:22 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

From your constituent TEVIS MARTIN
Email TPMartinIII@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Ira Schneiderman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:55:18 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

From your constituent Ira Schneiderman
Email schneido@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Holly Baxter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:04:09 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

From your constituent Holly Baxter
Email baxter.holly@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Mark Staton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:12:09 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

From your constituent Mark Staton
Email msstaton@sbcglobal.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Rob Higginbotham](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:20:19 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

From your constituent Rob Higginbotham
Email jch1965@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

Please approve this Supplemental!!

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you,
Rob Higginbotham

From: [Braden Edwards](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:30:23 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Braden Edwards
Email bradenedwards@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Linda Mathews](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:39:53 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

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

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

THIS SHOULD BE NON NEGOTIABLE. My friend's son was robbed at gunpoint last week. Two men each had guns on his stomach while they robbed him. He was walking back from the train to his son. 15 year old. Now he can't stop thinking about it.

The damage you are doing by NOT voting to help is unacceptable.

YOU ARE MAKING SF MORE UNSAFE with your ineffective policies. At a minimum, we need our SFPD to be funded for more overtime. It's not the long term solution, but we need this NOW. We need to hire more SFPD to the regular police force.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will

have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Gail Rutherford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 10:56:41 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

From your constituent Gail Rutherford
Email gail_rutherford@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Yedi Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:03:45 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Yedi Wong
Email wongye@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [B. Collene Stout](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:04:29 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

B. Collene Stout
trainrose@gmail.com

Montville, New Jersey 07045

From: [Michael Cerchiai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:20:16 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

From your constituent Michael Cerchiai
Email mcerchiai@me.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Brenda Kwee McNulty](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:46:55 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

From your constituent Brenda Kwee McNulty
Email kweenulty@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Iris Vaughan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:21:09 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

From your constituent Iris Vaughan
Email iris.l.vaughan@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Mark Clark](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:43:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Mark Clark
Email mpclark704@icloud.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Tina Nunes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:50:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Tina Nunes
Email tinanunesober@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Richard Ash](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 12:55:16 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

From your constituent Richard Ash
Email richardwesleyash@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fully fund the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) by supporting Mayor Breed's proposed budget supplemental of \$27 million. As you may already know, the funding will allow SFPD to maintain overtime police hours, continue neighborhood patrols, and disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin.

It is my understanding that Budget and Finance Committee Chair, Connie Chan, has been stalling on this matter. I implore you to do everything in your power to ensure that this proposal is heard and passed during the upcoming hearing on March 15th. The consequences of not passing this proposal by the end of March are dire, as SFPD will have to cut 10-15% of police hours, which is unacceptable.

As a responsible and urgent measure to keep San Franciscans safe, it is imperative that SFPD receives the funding needed to address the current shortage of officers. Increasing SFPD officer overtime is a short-term remedy that is necessary for maintaining current levels of service.

I urge you to take swift action and fully support Mayor Breed's proposal for the SFPD Budget Supplemental. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further information.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely

From: [Greg Batista](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:14:57 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

From your constituent Greg Batista
Email gbatista@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Margaret de Clercq](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:15:32 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Margaret de Clercq
Email ninadeclercq@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Eric Roddie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 1:34:09 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

From your constituent Eric Roddie
Email ericdotroddie@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short-term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Paul Norris](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 2:08:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Paul Norris
Email paul.norrisii@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Kathy D'Or](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 2:25:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Kathy D'Or
Email kathydor@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Andrew Dai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 2:43:48 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Andrew and I live/work in District 9. I am a DSA member and a laid off tech worker.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Andrew Dai
District 9

Andrew Dai
a@andrewdai.co

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Angie Yap](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 3:37:48 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

From your constituent Angie Yap
Email ayhc69@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Bev Lipson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:18:56 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

From your constituent Bev Lipson
Email buzbev@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Ken Lipson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:19:39 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

From your constituent Ken Lipson
Email klios007@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Joseph McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:25:28 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Joseph McFadden
Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Brett Ortiz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:30:22 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

From your constituent **Brett Ortiz**
Email ortizbrett@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

Brett Ortiz

From: [Michael H Samson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:35:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Michael H Samson
Email michaelhsamson@comcast.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Zahra Sobolski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 4:40:21 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Zahra Sobolski
Email Fatiehk@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Erika Kim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:01:21 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Erika Kim
Email e_kimch@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.
Erika Kim

From: [Peter Fortune](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:10:20 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Peter Fortune

Email pt4tune@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Barbara Dwyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 5:44:50 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

From your constituent Barbara Dwyer
Email montereydivingwoman@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Mabel Ng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 6:24:17 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

From your constituent Mabel Ng
Email mcfng@hotmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Jane Day](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 7:41:46 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

From your constituent Jane Day
Email janeday@earthlink.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

It is unfortunate that we don't have more police offers and have to rely on overtime. Increasing overtime is as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers. But it absolutely has to be done (and urgently) to keep San Franciscans safe.

(The next phase will be attracting more police officers to San Francisco. San Francisco is getting ever more scary and I'm sure more people are buying guns for home defense; but it's not a good route to have to go.)

Thank you.

From: [Garret Tom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:02:16 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

From your constituent Garret Tom
Email Gntom@bu.edu

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Jabez Wesly](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 8:35:27 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Jabez and I live in District 3.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into state workers who actually make the world a better place— teachers, transit workers, trauma-conscious compassionate crisis response.

Jabez Wesly
District 3

Jabez Wesly
wjabezkingsly@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94108

From: [Sem Lederman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 9:57:58 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

From your constituent Sem Lederman
Email llederman@hotmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: djfour@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Sunday, March 12, 2023 11:00:09 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

djfour@gmail.com

,

From: [Jill Roberts](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 6:09:14 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Jill and I live in District 2.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Jill Roberts

Jill Roberts
jr5230@nyu.edu

New York, California 94118

From: [Eliya Cutler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:20:16 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Eliya and I live in District 8 and work in District 9.

I was devastated to hear about the planned significant budget increases for SFPD. It's 2023 and we all know that policing is a fundamentally racist institution that is not serving the needs of non-white San Franciscans. In particular, we know that SFPD has a worse track record on race issues than other police departments around the state. It shocks me to think that we are making moves to become an even more exclusionary city, given how great the disparities already are between wealthy & poor, white and POC, housed & unhoused, etc in the city today.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds — and is frankly insulting to the public. We do not need more police officers or more incentives for police officers. We need better social services that reduce the causes of many needless police calls (e.g. housing more people).

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

I urge the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Elliya Cutler
Districts 8 & 9
377 San Jose Ave & 2300 Harrison St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Elliya Cutler
elliya.cutler@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Ana Navarro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:26:44 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Ana Navarro and I live in District 4.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Ana Navarro

Ana Navarro
anaisabelnavarro97@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Robin McMillan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:51:37 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

From your constituent Robin McMillan
Email rkmcmillan@viselect.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Cheryl Meeker Meeker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:56:39 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Cheryl Meeker and I live/work in District 5.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Cheryl Meeker
SF District 5

Cheryl Meeker Meeker
cherylmeeker@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Grant Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 10:00:22 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

From your constituent Grant Young
Email g_e_young@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget 2\$27m Supplemental for SFPD.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you. G Young

From: [Shae Watson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 11:35:50 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Shae and I live in District 2.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

What does this say about our values when the Police Officer's Association and SFPD are given priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Thank you,
Shae Watson
District 2

Shae Watson

shaelynjoy@gmail.com

,

From: [Grant Ingram](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 12:07:15 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

From your constituent Grant Ingram

Email grant.ingram@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Ruth Parker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 12:27:34 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Ruth Parker
Email rsparker27@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Anthony Fox](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 1:38:33 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Anthony Fox
Email sftonyfox@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Alexander McNees](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 2:08:03 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

From your constituent Alexander McNees
Email amcnees@hotmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Dear Supervisors,
Supervisors

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Stefan Muhle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Budget Supplemental
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 3:14:47 PM
Attachments: [ATT00001.png](#)
[ATT00002.png](#)
[ATT00003.png](#)
[ATT00004.png](#)
[ATT00005.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing you to express my full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

San Francisco needs to have clean and safe streets as a top priority for our City to regain its position as a premier worldwide destination for travelers, workers, and residents alike. The Mayor's supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose any more officers, and we are at a breaking point when it comes to staffing at the San Francisco Police Department. Sworn staffing levels have fallen tremendously and the department is more than 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide for critical public safety functions. By failing to fund police overtime, calls for service will not be met and our basic public safety needs will not be met.

Additionally, we also write to express our full support for SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are doing an incredible job enhancing public safety in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue to recover and so that we can support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Stefan Muhle

VP, Regional Managing Director

NOBLE HOUSE
HOTELS & RESORTS

Argonaut Hotel

Hotel Zoe Fisherman's Wharf

495 Jefferson Street, San Francisco, CA 94109

(o) 415-407-3592

smuhle@noblehousehotels.com



From: [Stefan Muhle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for budget supplemental
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 3:17:55 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

We are writing to you to express our full support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

San Francisco needs to have clean and safe streets as a top priority for our City to regain its position as a premier worldwide destination for travelers, workers, and residents alike. The Mayor's supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose any more officers, and we are at a breaking point when it comes to staffing at the San Francisco Police Department. Sworn staffing levels have fallen tremendously and the department is more than 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide critical public safety functions. By failing to fund police overtime, calls for service will not be met and our basic public safety needs will not be met.

Additionally, we also write to express our full support for SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are doing an incredible job enhancing public safety in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue to recover and so that we can support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth (Betsy) & Stefan Mühle
672C Corbett Avenue
San Francisco CA 94114

From: [Noah Sloss](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 5:55:47 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Noah Sloss

noahsloss@gmail.com

2280 Pine St Apt 102

San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Sylvia Terpstra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 6:59:24 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Sylvia Terpstra
Email skterp@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Roger Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:07:48 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

From your constituent Roger Wong
Email outersunsetresi@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Kimberly Olson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:29:38 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Kimberly Olson
Email skiolson@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Evan Owski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:41:45 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Evan Owski and I live in District 5.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Sincerely,
Evan Owski
District 5

Evan Owski
eowski@gmail.com

,

From: [Andrew Bader](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:48:40 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

Andrew Bader

DREW.BADER@GMAIL.COM

1534 35th avenue

San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Marshall Terpstra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 9:13:55 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

From your constituent Marshall Terpstra
Email mjterps@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Jason Mai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 10:50:43 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Jason and I live in District 1.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Jason
District 1

Jason Mai
jmai1026@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Kate English](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:41:07 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

From your constituent Kate English
Email kenglish1775@comcast.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Senta Tsantilis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 12:25:09 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

From your constituent Senta Tsantilis
Email sptsantilis@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Debra Taube](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:13:38 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Debra Taube. I work in SF.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Debra Taube
2282 Union SF 94123

Debra Taube
debra.taube14@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94123

From: [Emma Neukrug](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:24:44 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Emma and I live in District the Bay Area. I work with Critical Resistance.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Emma

Emma Neukrug
eneukrug@yahoo.com

Berkeley, California 94709

From: [Karrie Keyes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:43:01 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Karrie

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Karrie

Karrie Keyes
karberry67@gmail.com

Alameda, California 94501

From: [Josephine Zhao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:55:10 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

From your constituent Josephine Zhao
Email josephine_zhao@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Steve Sarver](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Police Funding
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:55:40 PM

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

Hi,

I want to register my support for the Mayor's \$27M additional funding for the police department.

We must ensure that we make every effort for San Francisco to have clean and safe streets. This is a basic requirement for any community and my employees and customers tell me all the time that this is their number one issue with San Francisco.

Our economic core needs this support from our police and the police need our financial support.

Sincerely,
Steve Sarver

Business owner in San Francisco for over 24 years



an evolution of



Steve Sarver | Owner
San Francisco Soup Company, dba Ladle & Leaf
451 6th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone (415) 867-9434 | Fax (415) 869-1578
steve@sfsoupco.com
[Here's my calendar link](#) to make finding time easy.

From: [Sarah Bacon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Comment for Budget & Appropriations Mtg. 3/15/23
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 3:16:07 PM

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

Hi,

My name is Sarah Bacon and I am the owner of Nourish Cafe, with locations in the Inner Richmond and Nob Hill neighborhoods.

I am writing today in support of Mayor Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

This additional funding will ensure the police will be able to continue to meet current levels of service, and it will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

This is essential for our industry's continuing recovery efforts. We must ensure that San Francisco has clean and safe streets, which includes police patrols, police responses to small businesses, and general safety on our streets. I ask you to support this supplemental funding.

Thank you,

Sarah Bacon
Nourish Cafe

From: [Kristin Vines](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 3:22:14 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

From your constituent Kristin Vines
Email kristinvines@pacbell.net

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

About a week ago, my 15 year old son was held at gunpoint and robbed in our neighborhood, Midtown Terrace. Thankfully he is OK and the police responded promptly. However, it is critical to protect the people of SF and continue to have police presence. These criminals already believe they are untouchable given how the city has handled crime and prosecutions over the past couple of years and they are starting to push the boundaries. I am concerned for the safety of my family and friends if we cut this funding. **DO NOT** make this critical mistake!

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.
-Kristin Vines

From: [Michael Bobroff](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 4:19:18 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

From your constituent Michael Bobroff
Email bobroff1@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Heather Kirkpatrick](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 5:42:06 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

From your constituent Heather Kirkpatrick
Email h.kirkpatrick3@gmail.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Sam Sullivan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 5:47:32 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Sam Sullivan and I live/work in District Six.

At a time when the wealth divide in our city is growing larger and more and more San Franciscans are being left behind, huge budget increases to the SFPD are not the way forward, particularly before budget negotiations even begin.

I ask you to give increased funding to community services, particularly around healthcare and housing, rather than our already wealthy police department.

Sincere thanks,
Sam Sullivan
District Six

Sam Sullivan
twistedmumble@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Kristen McCaffery](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the Mayor's Police Supplemental
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:17:53 PM

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

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

We appreciate the opportunity to share our support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

Ensuring San Francisco has clean and safe streets is a top priority as the City begins to regain its momentum and change the narrative that it's an unsafe place to live, visit, and work. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose officers if it wants to properly curtail drug dealing and illegal use of narcotics, and reduce gun violence, homicides, and violent crimes. Sworn staffing levels have fallen precipitously in the last three years and San Francisco is now 331 officers lower than in 2019 and 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide the same level of service. However, expanded overtime has reaped immediate benefits, including the ability to respond to over 34,000 additional calls for service.

Importantly, this supplemental also will help continue to support SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset,

and Fillmore.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue on its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Kristen McCaffery

Kristen McCaffery
Owner
415-672-3600 c.
Mr. Digby's
1199 Church St, SF 94114

From: [Olivia Madison](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop Pouring Money into SFPD !
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:29:35 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Olivia and at a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police

officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Olivia

Olivia Madison
oliviamadison4@gmail.com

Oakland, California 94618

From: [Bev Sutton](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); police-supplemental@growsf.org; [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the supplemental police budget
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 7:34:12 PM

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

We must pay our police officers and keep the police academy open. Passing the supplemental police funding bill is absolutely essential. Without this funding, the Police Academy will not be able to train new officers until next fiscal year, the department will lose even more qualified officers, and calls for help will go unanswered since officers won't be able to work overtime.

Supervisor Chan, police officers are working overtime to keep us safe. Not voting to approve their overtime flies in the face of what the majority of regular San Franciscans demand from City Hall. Do not fail the vast majority of San Franciscans who want police to do their jobs.

Supervisor Chan, please introduce the supplemental funding measure at Budget Committee and vote YES.

Thank you.

From: [Alison Traina](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:13:45 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Alison Traina, and I live and work in Oakland. At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Sup. Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many

others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

We already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets.

Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Respectfully,
Alison Traina, M.Ed, PCC

Alison Traina
alison.traina@gmail.com

Oakland, California 94611

From: [Tom Sparks](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:22:49 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

From your constituent Tom Sparks
Email jf@nospam.minions.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

You can not divert any more money from SFPD, it harms people from every community.

Thank you.

From: [Marianne Oest](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 8:51:26 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Marianne Oest
Email marianne_oest@yahoo.com

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

Message to the Board of Supervisors Dear Supervisors,

I support the Mayor's Budget Supplemental for SFPD.

The SFPD Budget Supplemental will provide \$27 million of immediate funding to the SF Police Department to maintain overtime police hours.

This allows SFPD to continue to staff its efforts to continue to meet current levels of service, disrupt drug dealing in the Tenderloin and continue neighborhood patrols.

If it does not pass by the end of March, SFPD will have to immediately cut 10-15% of police hours and this is unacceptable.

Increasing SFPD officer overtime as a short term remedy to our current shortage of SFPD officers is a responsible and urgently needed measure to keep San Franciscans safe.

Thank you.

From: [Emily Algire](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 9:24:33 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Emily and I live in District 5 in near Civic Center.

At a time when many San Francisco residents and workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend an outsized proportion of our budget on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's contract to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the city voluntarily opening up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors approved a massive \$713 million budget for the SFPD in 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced into part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical

treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. We live in an atomized society where the richest people hoard all the wealth while the working class fight each other for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's basic needs are not met, they have no other choice but to break the rules of a society that denies them food, water, housing, etc. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Emily
District 5

Emily Algire
emily.algire@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Christopher Mika](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 10:25:01 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Christopher Mika and I live in the Tenderloin District 5.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Christopher Mika
District 5.

Christopher Mika
mika.christopher@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Andrew Bloom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Budget Supplemental for SFPD
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 10:49:01 PM

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

March 14, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

As a 30-year resident of San Francisco and merchant in the Tenderloin over the past 12 years, I appreciate the opportunity to share my support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

Ensuring San Francisco has clean and safe streets is a top priority as the City begins to regain its momentum and change the narrative that it's an unsafe place to live, visit, and work. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose officers if it wants to properly curtail drug dealing and illegal use of narcotics, and reduce gun violence, homicides, and violent crimes. Sworn staffing levels have fallen precipitously in the last three years and San Francisco is now 331 officers lower than in 2019 and 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide the same level of service. However, expanded overtime has reaped immediate benefits, including the ability to respond to over 34,000 additional calls for service.

Importantly, this supplemental also will help continue to support SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

I urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue on its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

--

Andrew Bloom
Director of Operations

Brenda's French Soul Food
frenchsoulfood.com
652 Polk St., SF 94102

Brenda's Meat & Three
brendasmeatandthree.com
919 Divisadero St., SF 94115

Brenda's Oakland
brendasoakland.com
4045 Broadway, Oakland 94611

From: [caroline.truong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 10:49:49 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Austin and I grew up in District 3 and 6, and work in District 6.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Austin Truong
Born and Raised in San Francisco

caroline truong
catruong19@gmail.com

Oakland, California 94607

From: [Sayuri Falconer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:38:59 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Sayuri Falconer and I live/work in District 3.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

I personally have been on food stamps while living in San Francisco this past year and a half and thanks to public programs like CalFresh I have survived long enough to acquire the skills I need to get a full time job and become self sufficient, which means more of my tax dollars disappointingly going to police instead of young people like me who moved here for the opportunity to make a difference despite the cost of living.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, housing, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Sincerely,

Sayuri Falconer
District 3
1534 Jones St. San Francisco 94109

Sayuri Falconer
sayuri.anya@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94109

From: [The New Spot On Polk](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: additional funding for the Police department
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:23:58 AM

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

March 15, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

As a 30-year resident of San Francisco and merchant in the Tenderloin over the past 12 years, I appreciate the opportunity to share my support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

Ensuring San Francisco has clean and safe streets is a top priority as the City begins to regain its momentum and change the narrative that it's an unsafe place to live, visit, and work. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose officers if it wants to properly curtail drug dealing and illegal use of narcotics, and reduce gun violence, homicides, and violent crimes. Sworn staffing levels have fallen precipitously in the last three years and San Francisco is now 331 officers lower than in 2019 and 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide the same level of service. However, expanded overtime has reaped immediate benefits, including the ability to respond to over 34,000 additional calls for service.

Importantly, this supplemental also will help continue to support SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

I urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue on its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sam Elbandak
The New Spot On Polk
(415) 519-4460

From: [Town's End Brunch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: additional funding for the Police department
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:29:03 AM

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

March 15, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

As a 30-year resident of San Francisco and merchant in the Tenderloin over the past 12 years, I appreciate the opportunity to share my support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

Ensuring San Francisco has clean and safe streets is a top priority as the City begins to regain its momentum and change the narrative that it's an unsafe place to live, visit, and work. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose officers if it wants to properly curtail drug dealing and illegal use of narcotics, and reduce gun violence, homicides, and violent crimes. Sworn staffing levels have fallen precipitously in the last three years and San Francisco is now 331 officers lower than in 2019 and 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide the same level of service. However, expanded overtime has reaped immediate benefits, including the ability to respond to over 34,000 additional calls for service.

Importantly, this supplemental also will help continue to support SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

I urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue on its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sam Elbandak

Operating Partner

Town's End Brunch

m. (415) 519-4460



From: [Christopher Cook](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Urging You to Stop the SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:30:30 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Christopher Cook and I live/work in District 9. I'm a longtime resident and regular voter.

At a time when many working-class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Christopher Cook
District 9 San Francisco

Christopher Cook
christopher-d-cook@hotmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110-2548

From: [John Angel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 3:50:34 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT]

John Angel
john.angel@sfc.edu

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [paul breed](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 7:56:07 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Paul and I live in bernal heights.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Paul Breed,

paul breed
netfire4@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Tomas Hemstad](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 8:27:34 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is [name] and I live/work in District [number]. [If applicable, mention your organization/affiliation here].

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely

underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Tomas Hemstad, District 6

Tomas Hemstad
hemstad.tomas@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Lea McGeever](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 8:46:23 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Lea and I live in District 6.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Lea
D6 resident

Lea McGeever
lea.mcgeeve@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Lauren Woomer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 9:24:38 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Lauren Woomer and I live in District 8. I am writing today to oppose giving SFPD another budget increase and encourage instead spending that money on other services that help San Franciscans who need it most.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration. And Supervisor Matt Dorsey still calls for increased signing bonuses for new officers, which would just continue this unfair and unjustified use of public funds.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive \$713 million SFPD budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend. Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. And still Mayor London Breed introduced an ordinance seeking an additional \$27.6 million for SFPD's budget for this fiscal year (2023), which would bring this year's budget to a total of \$740.6 million. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators

being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Massive inequality like that seen in San Francisco creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs for food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they will resort to other means of meeting their needs in order to survive. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. In fact, our criminal punishment system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into services for the most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Lauren Woomer
District 8

Lauren Woomer
woomerl@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Kenneth Zankel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Anna Zankel](#); [Sarina Eastman](#); [Christina Sanchez](#); [Laurie Thomas](#); ggra@ggra.org
Subject: The owners of The Grove and Empire Pizza Support Mayor Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental: see below
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 9:51:34 AM
Attachments: [4A6DA187-304A-4102-A871-A57335D1AFC4.png](#)
[7B2FC416-3081-40B4-BC79-DFC646274ABA.png](#)
[B9978CF8-96FA-43CE-9EC2-95E4BA7724EA.png](#)
[568CC7E8-7237-4F47-AF3C-6B67FF641AEC.png](#)
[787DC716-DBAF-4D40-929A-31001E6B6CC6.png](#)
[516980A1-6B87-44C9-9F43-A74478772DD6.png](#)

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

March 15, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin, Honorable Connie Chan,
Honorable Catherine Stefani, Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio, Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey, Honorable Myrna Melgar, Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

We are the owners/operators of **The Grove - Yerba Buena** and **Empire Pizza**, both located on Mission Street between 3rd and New Montgomery. (Is that a “downtown interest”?) By “owners”, we mean it’s all our own money invested and at risk, not venture capital or private equity.

We also have lived 5 blocks away for 19 years.

Here are some numbers for our businesses that we blame on this City’s lack of police in general and foot officers specifically.

. **\$80k/year we pay in private security guard costs.** Because very, very rarely are beat cops on the block - even though within 2 blocks are Moad, SFmoma, Contemporary Jewish Museum, Yerba Buena Gardens, W Hotel, St Regis, Hyatt, and local retailers. Our security is not to protect merchandise, not to protect cash - rather, to protect customers and staff. So we can stay in business.

We are 2 neighborhood restaurants, not Tiffany! How can you leave us and others like us in this mess?


. **\$1.8mm sales have 100% of what would be been profits for our investment and work are instead applied to security.**

. **60,000 meals: the number we need to serve to get the 1.8mm sales to pay security.**

Why?

Because within just 2 months we experienced, On Restaurant Premises, we had 2 young customers robbed at gunpoint for an iPhone, 1 older customer punched out by a passerby he

had never seen in his life, multiple employees scared to come to work because lunatic was threatening them with large shards of broken glass. And much more.







Not to mention the incidents that are very rarely reported in police stats but happen weekly: junkies shooting up on the sidewalk, customers and passersby being screamed at by lunatics in an intimidating manner, certain people with their pants down defecating, litter thrown at guests and passersby.

Our security stops an average of 4 - 8 potentially dangerous incidents every day.


Every thriving city needs to get two basic things right: It has to be safe for people and safe for commerce.

Downtown and much of Soma is safe for neither.

City government's leaders have failed us, our guests and staff and neighbors on the most basic of essential.

Please, please, please pass this ESSENTIAL bill for \$27 million budget supplemental.

If it doesn't get MUCH better we can decide that for safety and sanity we have had enough and our restaurants would again look as they did in December 2020:



Kenneth and Anna Zankel

Kenneth and Anna Zankel
Owners

The Grove
Yerba Buena

Empire Pizza

415.254.9315

kzankel@thegrovesf.com
TheGroveSF.com

This transmission may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. The recipient may not reproduce, copy, or forward (electronically or otherwise) materials contained herein. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the information contained herein (including any reliance thereon) is STRICTLY PROHIBITED.

From: [Elisabeth Nevolo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:32:55 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Elisabeth.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Elisabeth Nevolo
enevolo1@comcast.net

San Rafael, California 94903

From: [Hugh O'Connor](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:49:29 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

SFPD's problems are not financial.

Hugh O'Connor
hughoconnor805@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Nik Evasco](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:53:43 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Nik Evasco and I live/work in District 1.

3 years after commitments from city leaders to reduce and defund our violent police force I can't believe we are considering giving them more money.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Nik Evasco
D1

Nik Evasco
nikevasco@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Anne Richards](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 11:08:25 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Anne Richards and I live and work in District 8.

I'd like to start by inviting my supervisor, Raphael Mandelman, to pay close attention to the constituents in your district like myself who DO NOT SUPPORT throwing police at every social problem. You tend to erase us when you make comments. Thanks.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does

nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Anne Richards
SF District 8

Anne Richards
drwrchrds@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Brian Burrell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: No to SFPD supplemental funds
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 12:37:28 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Brian and I live in District 2.

With an impending budget deficit and already historic amounts of money spent on SFPD I'm asking the board of supervisors to vote no on supplemental funds for SFPD overtime.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Brian
District 2

Brian Burrell
briburrell@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94129

From: [Alison Brokke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 1:30:51 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Alison Brokke.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Alison Brokke

Alison Brokke
alisonbrokke@gmail.com

Oakland, California 94609

From: [Makenzie Boyle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 5:37:40 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Makenzie and I live in District 5.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000

annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Makenzie Boyle
Resident of District 5

Makenzie Boyle
mkboyle@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Makenzie Boyle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop SFPD Giveaways!
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 5:37:59 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Makenzie and I live in District 5.

At a time when many working class residents and San Francisco city workers are facing potential eviction, hunger, a lack of jobs offering living wages, and countless other crises that could be addressed by local government, it is unsurprising but disappointing to see the mayor and many supervisors fighting to spend more money on policing.

Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding (i.e., contract) to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. In addition to the fact that the city voluntarily opened up the SFPD contract for negotiation, the SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, and other essential workers were denied such consideration.

The Mayor and Board of Supervisors also approved a massive SFPD's \$713 million budget for 2023, which it is on track to overspend.

SFPD doesn't have a budget problem, they have an accountability problem.

Compared to similar jurisdictions around the country, SFPD already spends more per capita on policing, and has a higher police officer to resident ratio than similar cities. This latest move continues an ongoing trend of increased police spending, despite data from the SF police department itself showing that crime has decreased compared to previous years. Meanwhile, the SFPD is taking longer and longer to respond to calls, including serious calls about violent crime.

Supervisor Matt Dorsey's recent call for increased signing bonuses for new officers continues this unfair and unjustified use of public funds. Just last year, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment to the Police Officers Association's memorandum of understanding to include longevity bonuses, pay raises, and sign-on bonuses. The SFPD was the only agency that received all three of these concessions from the city. Teachers, sanitation workers, firefighters, bus drivers, etc. were denied such consideration.

All of this paints a clear picture: this is a blatant display of SFPD exceptionalism which does nothing to solve the root causes of San Francisco's tattered social fabric.

The city is in crisis. Crucial functions that boost the city's wellness continue to be severely underfunded. Even well-tenured teachers in San Francisco typically make less than \$80,000 annually, putting them below the poverty line and below the earnings of a starting police

officer. City College of San Francisco is similarly facing a budget crisis, with many educators being laid off and many others being forced to part time roles as classes are canceled. Many public health workers were supposed to be hired to support linkages to housing and medical treatment in the Tenderloin, but plans have repeatedly fallen through with little accountability. Muni faces a \$215 million deficit as federal pandemic funding runs out, and could potentially cut service by 25%.

As a country, we already know that our community's safety is dependent not on increased policing, but funding of our social pillars, such as health, education, and safer streets. Under capitalism, we live in an atomized society where the capitalists hoard all the wealth while the working class fights for scraps. This inequality creates the conditions of desperation that lead to crime. When a person's needs: food, water, housing, healthcare, transportation, education, are not met, they have every right (even a duty) to break the rules of a society that denies them to all. Punishment of individuals does nothing to end the conditions that lead to crime, nor is it intended to. Police exist to protect property and maintain a hierarchical order through the threat of violence. Our criminal "justice" system regularly breaks families apart, puts them in debt due to fees and penalties, and reinforces desperate situations that lead to more crime. Restorative justice is transformative when we look to build better people instead of punishing them. The solution: solidarity and socialism. Creating a society where we work together to meet our collective needs will always be more effective than an order rooted in violence.

In the face of this injustice, we ask every San Francisco resident: when we give the Police Officer's Association and SFPD priority and political weight over our teachers, public health workers, and public transportation, what does this say about our values?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Makenzie Boyle
Resident of District 5

Makenzie Boyle
mkboyle@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Rick Girling](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [jodav1026@gmail.com](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: \$27 million SFPD supplement
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 5:50:03 PM

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

Honorable Budget and Appropriations Committee,

Today, I listened for a couple hours to your hearing. Unfortunately, I was not able to wait for more hours to make my views known. In the future, I would appreciate if the Supervisor's time had some time limits to allow the public our 1 minute remarks. Otherwise, it seems like you do not care about our opinions.

Nevertheless, here is my statement regarding the \$27 million SFPD supplement.

My name is Richard Girling and I've been a resident of SF for 48 years and I currently live in District 9.

While most San Franciscans have to live within their means, evidently the SFPD does not. As a former SFUSD teacher, we were always told there just wasn't the money to hire enough staff. Overtime was never an issue, as teachers get none.

I completely disagree with Mayor Breed's budget request for an additional \$27 million to the SFPD to its over \$700 million allocation at the same time all other departments are asked to cut costs.

The SFPD needs to take a hard look at how they use staff and resources. One example, anyone who is politically active in SF can easily see is that at any demonstration, police are a huge contingent, often being paid overtime, regardless of the potential for problems. Certainly fewer officers can be deployed for these duties.

I am certain there are plenty of other measures that can be taken for the

police department to use their budget more efficiently as illustrated by Supervisor Walton and the BLA rather than adding a supplement of \$27 million.

Sincerely,
Rick Girling
182 Banks St
SF CA 94110

From: [Chung, Anna](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Letter of Support
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 5:52:17 PM

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

March 15, 2023

Budget and Finance Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Supervisors: Connie Chan, Rafael Mandelman, and Asha Safai

Dear Budget and Finance Committee:

I am writing, representing Saks Fifth Avenue, to show my support for supporting Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund invaluable police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year. In addition, as a Union Square stakeholder, I want to show my gratitude for support to date. The recovery of our city is dependent on safety and a fully staffed SFPD will play an important role protecting not only our citizens but also vital to the health of our economy. We are a critical component of the City's greater economy, and rely on our police department to keep all San Franciscans, workers, and tourists safe.

Running a major anchor luxury business in Union Square that employs over 200 people that either live in the city or commute in from all over the Bay Area to work in Union Square, I feel that it is important to have police officers out on the street engaging in community policing and addressing crime. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service through this fiscal year.

Before the SFPD presence in Union Square, we had several major mob style grab and runs. Customers and associates alike have commented how unsafe they felt coming into the square. One of our associates who is no more than 100 lbs got hit across the street as she was walking to work. I have personally witnessed a group of men jump out of a car to steal out of a parked car right in front of our business in broad daylight. We had a client that got everything stolen out of her vehicle another time. We had clients ask for a generic shopping bag so they do not get unnecessary attention. There are too many stories to share. But since the increase in staffing of the SFPD throughout Union Square, there has been a positive change and everyone from clients to employees have given us feedback on how they feel so much safer. Importantly, this supplemental will also help continue staffing SFPD Community Ambassadors. Due to these unprecedented shortages, these retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in critical areas across the City, such as Union Square.

We urge you to strongly consider passing this supplemental budget so San Francisco can continue its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Anna Chung

From: [Brenda Buenviaje](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support of Mayor Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 6:33:37 PM

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

March 15, 2023

Board President Aaron Peskin
Honorable Connie Chan
Honorable Catherine Stefani
Honorable Shamann Walton
Honorable Joel Engardio
Honorable Dean Preston
Honorable Matt Dorsey
Honorable Myrna Melgar
Honorable Rafael Mandelman
Honorable Hillary Ronen
Honorable Ahsha Safai

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Supervisors,

As a 25-year resident of San Francisco and merchant in the Tenderloin over the past 16 years, I appreciate the opportunity to share my support of Mayor London Breed's \$27 million budget supplemental to fund police overtime and public safety ambassadors through the end of the fiscal year.

Ensuring San Francisco has clean and safe streets is a top priority as the City begins to regain its momentum and change the narrative that it's an unsafe place to live, visit, and work. We applaud the City's focus on this issue over the past year, and this supplemental will ensure the police have the funding necessary to continue to meet current levels of service. Most importantly, this will prevent mandated service cuts in addition to a hiring freeze.

The City cannot afford to lose officers if it wants to properly curtail drug dealing and illegal use of narcotics, and reduce gun violence, homicides, and violent crimes. Sworn staffing levels have fallen precipitously in the last three years and San Francisco is now 331 officers lower than in 2019 and 541 officers below the staffing analysis recommended level.

As the number of officers declines, the need for overtime increases in order to provide the same level of service. However, expanded overtime has reaped immediate benefits, including the ability to respond to over 34,000 additional calls for service.

Importantly, this supplemental also will help continue to support SFPD Community Ambassadors. These retired officers are essential to continue to provide foot beat patrol in areas across the City like Union Square, the Castro, Fisherman's Wharf, West Portal, Sunset, and Fillmore.

I urge you to strongly consider passing this budget supplemental so San Francisco can continue on its path to recovery and ensure we are doing all we can to support a safe and healthy San Francisco.

Thank You!

Brenda Buenviaje - Brenda's French Soul Food, Brenda's Meat & Three

From: [Robin Ruan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Stop Funding Cops
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 10:06:45 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

My name is Robin and I'm a high schooler who lives in the Bay Area. The last thing we need during a pandemic is more funding towards cops. Please invest into our communities instead. Crime comes from poverty. I am fortunate enough to go to a well funded school and not face housing/food insecurity. However, I know other at risk teens who've stolen things and peddled drugs to support their families. Most of these teens are people of color, LGBTQ+, or disabled. If San Francisco claims to support Black Lives Matter, why would the city grow policing when it's institutionally racist? Why is homelessness such a rampant issue in SF? How can funneling more money to police fix this city?

We call upon the Board of Supervisors to reject these proposed SFPD giveaways, and reinvest the money into repairing our torn and tattered social fabric.

Robin

Robin Ruan
robinruan79@gmail.com

Sunnyvale, California 94086