FILE NO. 251077

Petitions and Communications received from October 23, 2025, through October 30, 2025, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on November 4, 2025.

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

From the Office of the Mayor (MYR), making the following appointments. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

· Appointment pursuant to Administrative Code, Sections 2A.233-2A.234, and Charter, Section 16.108-1, to the Children, Youth, and Their Families' Oversight and Advisory Committee:
o Lucas Liang - term ending January 17, 2027
· Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 3.105(j), to the position of Inspector General
o Alexandra Shepard - indefinite term

From the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), submitting the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation for Temporary Street Closures (ISCOTT) October 23, 2025, corrected meeting minutes Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Human Services Agency (HSA), submitting an update on the Federal Government Shutdown and CalFresh Benefits. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms. 3 Forms. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Commission on the Environment, submitting a Resolution urging the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Commission Streamlining Task Force to 3 Support Retaining the Commission on the Environment's Governance Body Status. Resolution File No. 2025-07-COE. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(H), submitting a notice of a Federal grant line-item budget revision in excess of 15%. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a notice of proposed changes in regulations related to the recreational take of rockfish, cabezon, greenling, and lingcod, and a notice of decision of decision not to proceed with a rulemaking

related to recreational striped bass harvest size limits. 2 Notices. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) eliminate the North Beach Special Use District and consolidate certain controls into the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, 2) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 3) expand allowable uses in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, 4) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 5) reduce limitations on Restaurants and Bars in the Jackson Square Special Use District. File No. 250682. 17 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From Alliance for A Better District 6, regarding the Hearing to consider appointing four members, terms ending April 22, 2027, to the Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee. File No. 251023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution urging the Police Department and the Department of Emergency Management to designate all 911 calls reporting drug use or suspected drug activity within 1,500 feet of parks, playgrounds, and schools as “Priority A” calls requiring swift and immediate response. File No. 250639. 150 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From members of the public, regarding the Ordinance 1) amending Division I of the Transportation Code to reduce the time that large vehicles may be parked on City streets from overnight to two hours, and modify the time that commercial vehicles may be parked on City streets; 2) amending the Administrative Code to require City departments, including but not limited to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Police Department, to assist the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) with administering a Large Vehicle Refuge Permit Program that exempts certain large vehicles from the two-hour parking restriction under certain conditions; 3) urging SFMTA to develop a fair review process and to develop further exceptions to the two-hour restriction as may be needed to support the public interest; 4) amending the Park Code to impose a two-hour parking limit on large vehicles on park property; 5) amending the Port Code to impose two-hour parking limits on large vehicles on Port property; and 6) affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. File No. 250655; Ordinance No. 122-25. 60 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution urging the Treasurer and Tax Collector to design and establish a non-depository municipal finance corporation, to be known as the San Francisco Green Bank, subject to the appropriation of funds for such work. 60 Letters. File No. 251059. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution supporting the Bay Area Air District's timely implementation of Rules 9-4 and 9-6 that establish zero-emission standards for building appliances. 3 Letters. File No. 251064. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From members of the public, regarding banning plastic cigarette filters. 88 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From members of the public, regarding the renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields. Copy: Each Supervisor. 2 Letters. (15)

From members of the public, regarding Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan; Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan; General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan; and Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan. File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071. 74 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Kim Wong, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From members of the public, regarding Great Highway/Sunset Dunes. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From members of the public, regarding the Vaillancourt Fountain in Embarcadero Plaza (formerly Justin Herman Plaza). 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From members of the public and various organizations, regarding proposed ballot measures to fund the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). 209 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance appropriating $3,500,000 from the General Reserve to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to expand access to existing coordinated immigrant legal and community response services in Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2026. File No. 251080. 17 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From Howard Chabner, regarding curb ramps. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From Rebuild the Bay, regarding conversion of strip malls into affordable housing. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Small Business Forward, regarding Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to create the Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Program ("Program") to provide financial support, including grants and loans, to businesses impacted by construction relating to the City residential rezoning program adopted in 2025-2026; establishing the Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Fund ("Fund") to receive monies for the Program; designating the Office of Small Business and Office of Economic and Workforce Development to administer the Fund and the Program and

promulgate rules and regulations in furtherance of the Program; and amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to allow taxpayers to designate a portion of their gross receipts taxes for deposit in the Fund. File No. 250782. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 1021, regarding the Hearing of the Board of Supervisors to sit as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, April 25, 2023, at 3:00 p.m., to hold a public hearing on the operational impact of labor disputes at the Felton Institute on the employees, patient services, compliance with written agreements, and workplace harmony. File No. 230463. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Rebecca Eddy, regarding public safety at the Polo Fields Bathroom in Golden Gate Park. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Doug Bright, regarding the Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the E-Bike Incentive Fund to support implementation of an electric bicycle (or “e-bike”) incentive program administered by the Department of the Environment. File No. 240967; Ordinance No. 268-24. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From the Dogpatch & NW Potrero Hill Green benefit District (GBD), submitting the GBD Annual Independent Financial Review for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025; the GBD Approved Budget Overview for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2026; and the GBD Annual Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2024. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

Item 1

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Appointment Notice - Children, Youth and Their Families" Oversight and Advisory Committee
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:26:00 AM
Attachments:	Communication Memo 10_21_25.pdf Form_700_2024.pdf Notice of Appointment - BOS.pdf Lucas Liang Resume 9_23_2025-1.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Mayor, regarding the appointment of Lucas Liang to the Children, Youth, and Their Families' Oversight and Advisory Committee (Seat 1).

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: Adeyemi, Andre (MYR) <andre.adeyemi@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 10:06 AM
To: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Cc: Dorsey, Sherrice (CHF) <sherrice.dorsey@dcyf.org>; Corteza, Rebecca (CHF) <rebecca.corteza@dcyf.org>
Subject: Appointment Notice - Children, Youth and Their Families' Oversight and Advisory Committee

Good Morning,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to notify the Board of Supervisors of mayoral appointments.

The Mayor is appointing Lucas Liang to the Children, Youth and Their Families' Oversight and Advisory Committee (Seat 1)

Please find the necessary documentation attached. Should you need any additional information or have any questions regarding the nomination, please do not hesitate to

contact me.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

-Andre

Andre Adeyemi
(Book time with me)
Director of Appointments
Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
(415) 554-4000

Want to make an impact? Apply here for mayoral appointment consideration!

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

October 21, 2025

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Sections 2A.233-2A.234, and Charter, Section 16.108-1 of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby make the following appointment to the Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee:

Lucas Liang – Seat 1, designated for youths 19 years of age or younger and recommended by the Youth Commission (formerly held by Ryan Galvez, term expired), for the unfinished portion of a two-year term ending January 17, 2027.

I am confident that Lucas will serve our community with dedication and insight. Attached are his qualifications, which demonstrate how his appointment reflects the diverse communities, neighborhoods, and populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

Youth Commission
City Hall ~ Room 345
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

(415) 554-6446
(415) 554-6140 FAX

TO: **Office of San Francisco Mayor Daniel Lurie**

CC: Andre Adeyemi, Director of Appointments
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

FROM: San Francisco Youth Commission Director Esquivel Garcia

DATE: Monday, October 20, 2025

RE: SUBJECT: Recommendation of Lucas Liang to DCYF OAC Seat One

Hello Director Adeyemi,

The San Francisco Youth Commission voted to recommend Lucas Liang to the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families Oversight and Advisory Council on Monday, October 20th. The San Francisco Youth Commission has full confidence in the leadership of former District 4 Youth Commissioner Liang to serve in this new role within DCYF OAC's representing youth from across San Francisco. Lucas is a detail-oriented decision maker and we are excited for him to step into this new opportunity.

In Solidarity,

Alondra Esquivel Garcia (she/her)
San Francisco Youth Commission Director

***

Please do not hesitate to contact Youth Commissioners or Youth Commission staff (415) 554- 6446 with any questions. Thank you.

Lucas Liang

Education

St. Ignatius College Preparatory — San Francisco, California
GPA UW/W: 3.992/4.567 — Class of 2026

Experience

San Francisco Youth Commission — San Francisco, California
Legislative Affairs Officer and District 4 Member — September 2024 – September 2025

- Analyzed legislation affecting San Francisco youth in order to explain its impact to commissioners.
- Organized youth town hall with over 50 attendees.
- Edited 80-page Budget and Policy Priorities report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

Office of Assemblymember Catherine Stefani — San Francisco, California
District Intern — June 2025 – August 2025

- Took note of and responded to constituents' bill comments and opinions.
- Coordinated with the state Employment Development Department to get constituents their paid leave money.

Office of Supervisor Joel Engardio — San Francisco, California
Legislative Intern — June 2024 – August 2024

- Answered constituent phone calls and emails regarding concerns such as uneven sidewalks and illegal dumping.
- Contacted city departments such as Public Works and Rec and Parks to request work on behalf of constituents.

Marjan Philhour for District 1 Supervisor — San Francisco, California
Field Intern — June 2024 – August 2024

- Knocked on over 400 doors in the Richmond District for a city supervisor campaign.
- Inputted voter outreach data from door knocking and phone banking into campaign software.

School Leadership & Activities

Inside SI (student newspaper)
Editor-in-Chief — August 2025 – Present

St. Ignatius Mock Trial
Courtroom Journalist and Pretrial Attorney — September 2022 – Present

St. Ignatius Asian Students Coalition
Lead Secretary — August 2025 – Present
Executive Board Member — August 2024 – Present

St. Ignatius Young Democrats
Co-president — August 2025 – Present

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)
Subject: FW: Appointment of Inspector General - Alex Shepard
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:42:00 AM
Attachments: Appointment of Inspector General - Alex Shepard.pdf

---

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached memo appointing Alexandra Shepard as the Inspector General.

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: Adeyemi, Andre (MYR) <andre.adeyemi@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:57 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Wagner, Greg (CON) <greg.wagner@sfgov.org>; Slaughter, Staci (MYR) <staci.slaughter@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Ma, ChiaYu (CON) <chiayu.ma@sfgov.org>; delaRosa, Mark (CON) <mark.p.delarosa@sfgov.org>; Horrell, Nate (CON) <nate.horrell@sfgov.org>
Subject: Appointment of Inspector General - Alex Shepard

Good Morning,

I hope this message finds you well. Attached please find a letter from Mayor Lurie formally approving the Controller's appointment of Alex Shepard as Inspector General of the Controller's Office.

This approval reflects the Mayor's confidence in Mr. Shepard's qualifications and commitment to upholding accountability and integrity within City operations. The Mayor's Office appreciates the Controller's leadership in advancing this important oversight role.

Please let me know if you require any additional documentation.

-Andre

Andre Adeyemi
(Book time with me)
Director of Appointments
Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
(415) 554-4000

Want to make an impact? Apply here for mayoral appointment consideration!

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

October 24, 2025

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Section 3.105(j) of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, I hereby approve the appointment of Alexandra Shepard for the position of Inspector General.

The Controller appointed Alexandra Shepard to serve as the Inspector General on October 22, 2025. The appointment of the Inspector General is for an indefinite term and will become effective on the effective date of the motion the Board of Supervisors adopts confirming their appointment. The Inspector General will serve at the discretion of the Controller.

Should you have any questions related to this appointment, please contact my Chief of Staff, Staci Slaughter.

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

Item 2

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	BOS-Operations; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Entezari, Mehran (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject:	FW: CORRECTED Minutes of the ISCOTT Hearing on October 23
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 8:21:50 AM
Attachments:	ISCOTT_1603_Minutes.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached from the SFMTA, a corrected meeting minutes from the October 23, 2025, ISCOTT public hearing.

Regards,

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

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

From: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:56 PM
To: SpecialEvents <SpecialEvents@sfmta.com>
Subject: CORRECTED Minutes of the ISCOTT Hearing on October 23

Good afternoon –

Attached are the *corrected* minutes of the October 23, 2025, ISCOTT public hearing.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

Nick Chapman
Manager, Temporary Street Closures I Special Events
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Pronouns: he/him, they/them

ISCOTT MINUTES

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION FOR
TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES

Meeting of October 23, 2025 - Thursday, 9:00 AM

1603rd Regular Meeting

Online Meeting

COMMITTEE	REPRESENTATIVE
SFMTA	Bryant Woo (Chair)
SFPD	Sgt. Eric Elias, Off. Ronald Quock, Off. Osmin Fuentes, Off. Rubin Rhodes
SFFD	Lt. Erin Yamamura, Insp. Brandon Murray
Public Health	Aron Wong
Public Works	Edgar Garcia
Entertainment Commission	May Liang
Planning	Absent

DEPARTMENTS	REPRESENTATIVE
SFMTA Special Events	Nick Chapman, Dianne Yee
SFMTA Transit	Leslie Bienenfeld, Helen Kwan
SFMTA Enforcement	James Sarracino

SFMTA Temporary Signs	Gretchen Rude, Houston Forrester, Matthew Madsen, Bradley Wilkinson, Gary Chau, Sean Muneno
SFMTA Taxis	Scott Leon
Emergency Management	Kayleigh Hillcoat

GUESTS	ITEM	GUESTS	ITEM
Alexander Mott		Juan De Dios	
Aprill Lacey		Andrew Seigner	
Scott Bravmann		Frog Gilmore	
Cardella, Raymond		Savannah Schoelen	
Douglas Burnham		Barry Taranto	
Lisa Bower		Sherri Young	
Carol Lau		Tamanna	
Kerry Birnbach		MissJ	
Molly		Monica Munowitch (SFMTA)	
Kara Wright		jarret beaudis	
Raynell Cooper (BoS)		Joel Reske	
Anthony Healy- London		Gurusha Mengi	
Jason Smith		Chris Miller	
Scott Feeney		Paco	
Julianna		Dave Alexander	
Nivardo		Lloyd Silverstein	
John Farkas		Aris K	

Mariana Narvaez		Jamie	
Manon		Ian Storm Taylor	
David Robinson			

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 9, 2025, MEETING (ACTION ITEM)

The Committee adopted the Minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

These proposed actions are an Approval Action as defined by S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31.

CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Anderson Street between Jarboe and Tomkins avenues

Saturday, November 1, 2025, 1 pm to 9 pm

Block Party - 400 Anderson Street

B. 28th Ave between Lincoln Way and Irving Street

Friday, October 31, 2025, 4 pm to 10 pm

Trick-or-Treat - 28th Ave

C. Jefferson Street between Hyde Street and westerly terminus

Saturday, August 8, 2026, 1 am to 2 pm

Alcatraz Sharkfest Swim 2026

APPROVED (6-0)

REGULAR CALENDAR

D. Shotwell Street between 21st and 22nd streets

Friday, October 31, 2025, 1:30 pm to 10 pm

Trick-or-Treat - Shotwell 2025

APPROVED (6-0)

E. 12th Avenue between Lincoln Way and Irving Street

Friday, October 31, 2025, 3 pm to 9 pm

Trick-or-Treat - 12th Ave

APPROVED (6-0)

F. O'Farrell Street between Steiner and Fillmore streets

Saturday, January 3, 2026, through

Saturday, December 26, 2026

7 am to 3 pm **each Saturday**

Fillmore Farmers' Market

APPROVED (6-0)

G. 1325 9th Ave/Irving Lot between 8th and 9th Avenues

Sunday, January 4, 2026, through

Sunday, December 27, 2026

7 am to 3 pm **each Sunday**

Inner Sunset Farmers' Market

APPROVED (6-0)

H. Noe Street between Market and Beaver streets

Wednesday, April 1, 2026, through

Wednesday, November 18, 2026

1 pm to 8:30 pm **each Wednesday**

Castro Farmers' Market

APPROVED (6-0)

I. Lincoln Way between La Playa and Great Highway

Sunday, January 11, 2026, 7 am to 10:30 am

Hot Chocolate Run

APPROVED (6-0)

J. Vermont Street between 20th and 22nd streets

Sunday, April 5, 2026, 9 am to 9 pm

Bring Your Own Big Wheel

APPROVED (6-0)

K. Irving Street between 22nd and 25th avenues; 23rd Avenue between Judah Street and Lincoln Way (Muni and local access only); 24th Avenue between Judah Street and Lincoln Way

Intersection closed: Irving Street at 24th Avenue

Friday, December 12, 2025, 12 pm to 11:59 pm

Sunset Holiday Night Bazaar

APPROVED (6-0)

L. 23rd Street between Bryant and York streets

Saturday, December 13, 2025, 9 am to 7 pm

TPPC en el Barrio

ON HOLD

M. Grove Street between Polk and Larkin streets

Friday, November 7, 2025, 7 am to

Saturday, November 8, 2025, 3 am

BGCA - Doechii - Live From the Swamp

APPROVED (6-0)

N. Utah Street between 16th and Alameda streets; 15th Street between Potrero Avenue and Vermont Street; Alameda Street between Potrero Avenue and Vermont Street; San Bruno Avenue between 16th and Alameda streets

Tuesday, December 30, 2025, 5 pm to

Friday, January 2, 2026, 9 am

Great Northern - Breakfast of Champions/It's a New Day

ON HOLD

O. Front Street between California and Sacramento streets; Halleck Street between Front and Battery streets

Thursday, November 6, 2025, 11 am to

Friday, November 7, 2025,1:30 am

Urban Land Institute Conference Closing Party

APPROVED (6-0)

P. Carl Street between Cole and Clayton streets

Tuesday, November 18, 2025, 8 am to

Friday, November 21, 2025, 8 pm

and

Carl Street between Shrader and Cole streets (Muni and local access only)

Intersection closed: Cole Street at Carl Street (Muni only)

Thursday, November 20, 2025, 12 noon to 11:59 pm

Cole Valley Pop-Up Town Square

APPROVED (6-0)

Categorically exempt from CEQA: CEQA Guidelines Section 15304 Class 4(e) minor temporary use of land having negligible or no permanent effects on the environment, including carnivals, sales of Christmas trees, etc. and/or Section 15305 Class 5(b) minor alterations in land use limitations, including street closings and equipment for special events

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (ACTION ITEMS)

The following item has been environmentally cleared by the Planning Department on April 19, 2021, Addendum #2 to San Francisco Better Streets Plan Project [Case No. 2021-003010ENV (addendum to Case No. 2007.1238E)]:

None

ROADWAY SHARED SPACES CLOSURES (INFORMATIONAL ITEMS)

The following items are presented for informational purposes and public comment. Closures are subject to review and approval by the SFMTA Board.

Q. Elm Street between Van Ness Avenue and Polk Street

Thursday, December 4, 2025, through
Friday, December 4, 2026
8 am to 4 pm, Monday through Friday
Elm St – School Street

Recommended for referral to the SFMTA Board (6-0)

R. Hayes Street between Gough and Octavia streets

Friday, November 28, 2025, through

Saturday, November 28, 2026

4 pm to 10 pm, each Friday

10 am to 10 pm, each Saturday

HVNA – Shared Space

Recommended for referral to the SFMTA Board (6-0)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY'S OFFICES, ONE SOUTH VAN NESS, SAN FANCISCO, CA 94103, DURING NORMAL BUSINESS HOURS. PLEASE CONTACT TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES AT specialevents@sfmta.com *

Sound Producing Devices

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

Disability Access

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact (415) 701-4683 at least two business days before the meeting. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to perfumes and various other chemical-based scented products. Please help the City to accommodate these individuals.

Know Your Rights under the Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator by mail to Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco CA 94102, by phone at (415) 554-7724, by fax at (415) 554-7854 or by email at *sotf@sfgov.org*. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at web site *http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine*.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2200, fax (415) 581-2217, web site *www.sfgov.org/ethics*.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Appeal Rights under S.F. Admin. Code Chapter 31: For identified Approval Actions, the Planning Department or the SFMTA has issued a CEQA exemption determination or negative declaration, which may be viewed online at the Planning Department's website. Following approval of the item by ISCOTT, the CEQA determination is subject to appeal within the time frame specified in S.F. Administrative Code Section 31.16 which is typically within 30 calendar days. For information on filing a CEQA appeal, contact the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, or call (415) 554-5184. Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or submitted in writing to the City prior to or at such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.

Item 3

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Fed Shutdown and SFHSA
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:31:00 AM
Attachments:	BOS Memo - Govt Shutdown CF Impact.pdf image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA), submitting an update on the Federal Government Shutdown and CalFresh Benefits.

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: LaBarre, Elizabeth (HSA) <elizabeth.labarre@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 4:56 PM
To: Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>; Burke, Robyn (BOS) <robyn.burke@sfgov.org>; Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>; Chin, Linshao (BOS) <linshao.chin@sfgov.org>; Sciammas, Charlie (BOS) <charlie.sciammas@sfgov.org>; Kong, Fiona (BOS) <Fiona.Kong@sfgov.org>; Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>; Donovan, Dominica (BOS) <dominica.donovan@sfgov.org>; Dahl, Bryan (BOS) <bryan.dahl@sfgov.org>; Ebadi, Mahanaz (BOS) <mahanaz.ebadi@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; Gaona, Sasha (BOS) <sasha.gaona@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; Han, Feng (BOS) <feng.han@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; Gutierrez Garcia, Jessica (BOS) <Jessica.GutierrezGarcia@sfgov.org>; Macfie, William (BOS) <william.macfie@sfgov.org>; Cooper, Raynell (BOS) <raynell.cooper@sfgov.org>; Logan, Samantha (BOS) <sam.logan@sfgov.org>; Ho, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.ho@sfgov.org>; Marie, Sophie (BOS) <sophie.marie@sfgov.org>; Mathewson, Melanie (BOS) <melanie.mathewson@sfgov.org>; Ha, Anh (BOS) <anh.v.ha@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Hare, Emma (BOS) <emma.hare@sfgov.org>; Bell, Tita (BOS) <tita.bell@sfgov.org>; Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; Lee, Amy (BOS) <amy.lee5@sfgov.org>; Nagano, Tomio (BOS) <tomio.nagano@sfgov.org>; Del Rosario, Mick (BOS)

<mick.delrosario@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Hebb, Jack (BOS) <jack.hebb@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Lopez-Weaver, Lindsey (BOS) <Lindsey.Lopez@sfgov.org>
Cc: Rhorer, Trent (HSA) <Trent.Rhorer@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Fed Shutdown and SFHSA

Hello Board of Supervisors Aides,
For your reference, I am forwarding the Memo Executive Director Trent Rhorer sent to all Supervisors earlier this afternoon (3:30pm) regarding the federal government shutdown's impact on CalFresh benefits for San Franciscans.

Thank you,

Elizabeth LaBarre
Executive Assistant to Trent Rhorer
Commission Secretary, Human Services Commission

O: (415) 557-6540
Office Address:
PO Box 7988
San Francisco, CA 94120-7988

www.SFHSA.org

SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

From: Rhorer, Trent (HSA) <Trent.Rhorer@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 3:29 PM
To: Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>
Cc: Smith, Susie (HSA) <susie.smith@sfgov.org>; LaBarre, Elizabeth (HSA) <elizabeth.labarre@sfgov.org>; Young, Teresa (HSA) <teresa.young@sfgov.org>; Thongsavat, Adam (MYR) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Modi, Kunal (MYR) <kunal.modi@sfgov.org>; Lutvak, Charles (MYR) <charles.lutvak@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fed Shutdown and SFHSA

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Attached please find a memo from HSA detailing the impact of the federal government shutdown on HSA's CalFresh Program. Please don't hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or need additional information.

Thanks.

Trent Rhorer
Executive Director
SF Human Services Agency
415-760-7620 (m)

SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

Memorandum

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
From: Trent Rhorer, Executive Director, Human Services Agency
CC: Kunal Modi, Mayor's Chief of Health, Human Services and Homelessness
Adam Thongsavat, Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors
Date: October 27, 2025
Subject: Update on Federal Government Shutdown and CalFresh Benefits

The Human Services Agency continues to monitor the federal government shutdown's impact on recipients of CalFresh food benefits in San Francisco. The purpose of this memo is to provide the Board of Supervisors with an update on the current situation.

Recent communication from both the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the California Department of Social Services has infomed us that **the continued federal government shutdown will delay the provision of CalFresh benefits starting November 1.** This will delay food benefits for the almost 112,000 individuals in 83,000 households who receive CalFresh benefits in San Francisco through HSA. The shutdown affects CalFresh benefits because they are 100% federally funded.

HSA is currently working with the Mayor's Office and community-based organizations to identify emergency food support options, and we will provide more information on https://www.sfhsa.org/ as updates become available.

It is important to note that CalFresh is still available for the month of October. Clients will be able to use their EBT card to access their existing benefits as usual through the federal government shutdown. We will share more information if anything changes. In addition, individuals can still apply for new CalFresh benefits in November (online at https://benefitscal.com/, on the phone at (415) 557-5000, or in person at one of our service centers) but benefit receipt will likely be delayed until the shutdown ends.

CalFresh: Client Impacts

On average, San Franciscans receive around $20M in monthly CalFresh benefits, which averages to $178 per person per month. However, many single adults receive up to $275 per month and most families with children receive over $400 monthly.

Below is a breakdown of CalFresh clients by supervisorial district and age group.

Impacts by Supervisor District

Supervisor District	# Persons
District 1	5,297
District 2	2,880

Supervisor District	# Persons
District 3	10,752
District 4	6,421
District 5	22,655
District 6	11,113
District 7	5,022
District 8	3,398
District 9	10,831
District 10	15,209
District 11	12,127
Other	6,150
Total	111,855

Citywide Impacts by Age Group

Age Group	# Persons
0-17	17,943
18-24	6,507
25-59	38,951
60+	48,454
Total	111,855

Communications Strategies and Efforts

HSA developed a multifaceted communications strategy to inform CalFresh recipients, HSA staff, CBO partners, and other City departments about the pause in CalFresh benefits.

These efforts include:

- Providing a script that HSA eligibility workers will use to inform clients who contact our benefit service centers regarding their CalFresh benefits.
- Publishing an announcement on the HSA homepage and information on a dedicated webpage with more details.
- Developing an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) message when clients call the HSA contact center by phone.
- Drafting a client text message, available in English, Spanish, Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese and Russian – pointing people to the HSA website for more info.
- Posting information on HSA social media channels.
- Drafting communication to CBO partners on CalFresh impacts.
- Drafting communication to HSA employees with benefit updates.
- Drafting a media holding statement in case of press inquiries.
- Drafting lobby signage to deploy in HSA service centers.

- Sharing information with other City departments for awareness.
- Tracking and resharing State / CA Department of Social Services (CDSS) content as appropriate, such as a CalFresh FAQ.

Other SFHSA-Administered Benefits

At this time, other federally funded benefits and programs administered by HSA, including Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), and child welfare services are not impacted.

Item 4

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	3 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:43:00 AM
Attachments:	3 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for 3 approved requests to waive 12B requirements.

Requester: Shirley Yoshida
Department: LIB
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000010466
Requested total cost: $193,409.00
Short Description: Statista Inc., Contractor, shall supply Campus License International with ecommerceDB

Requester: Shirley Yoshida
Department: LIB
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000010466
Requested total cost: $193,409.00
Short Description: Statista Inc., Contractor, shall supply Campus License International with ecommerceDB

Requester: Leon Ho
Department: DPH
Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
Supplier ID: 0000059478
Requested total cost: $7,997.96
Short Description: Inventory cycle count services for LHH Pharmacy Department.

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

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-10-30 11:40:24 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004603	Request Status:	Rejected by CMD Analyst
Requested for:	Shirley Yoshida	State:	Rejected
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2025-10-29 06:48:38	Requesting Department:	LIB
		Requester Phone:	(415) 557-4209
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Shirley Yoshida
		Watch list:	Shirley Yoshida, Marcus Lange

Short Description:

Statista Inc., Contractor, shall supply Campus License International with ecommerceDB

Supplier ID:	0000010466	Requested Amount:	$0.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	Modification – Prior Waiver Approved in ServiceNow	Increase Amount:	$32,155.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$161,254.00
		Total Requested Amount:	$193,409.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:	CMD12B0001253		
Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000016811
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:	2022-11-01
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-10-31

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	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:

Statista is an online statistics, market research and business intelligence portal. It provides access to data from market and opinion research institutions, as well as from business organizations and government institutions in English, French, German and Spanish. The purpose to this product is to provide patrons of SFPL online information and services they require and request for business and personal reasons. This is a sole source product given Statista maintains all copyright privileges for their products and products must be purchased directly through Statista.

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

I have email the vendor encouraging them to be 12B compliant and attached the 12B Compliance Process to vendor

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Regina Chan
CMD Analyst Decision:	Rejected	Select the reason for this request:	
CMD Analyst Comments:	Effective 6/1/2025 - Amended Adminstrative Code 21.30. Adds 21.30(f) Content and Data Subscriptions • As defined in Administrative Code Sec. 21.30(f), content and data subscriptions include purchases of "usage rights to review, download, or republish proprietary content, including but not limited to digital content, digital databases, digital media libraries, or print media." Content and data subscriptions are limited to cases where the City is consuming data. Examples include but are not limited to online periodicals, training manuals, video libraries, and information databases. Exempts content and data subscriptions from competitive solicitation requirements and contracting obligations that contractors are typically required to agree to (e.g. Equal Benefits, MCO, HCAO, Salary History, Sweatfree, LBE requirements); waivers are neither required nor applicable. Dose not waive BOS approvals for contracts greater then $10mil. or 10 years.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Regina Chan	CMD Director Decision:	
Reason for Determination:			

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

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

Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:
Explain why this is a Sole Source:

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

City Property Status:
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

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

Sole Source – Property Contract Justification Reason:

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

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

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

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :
12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

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

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:
Public Entity Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:
Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

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

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is a sole source database that the citizens of San Francisco came to expect us to carry. Not being able to provide these materials to our patrons is a disservice to them.

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

This is sole source.

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

It does not conflict. Vendor is still working on 12B certification, pending status

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

No

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 = CMD12B0004603
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	2025-10-29 07:15:07		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 6aa655032b7036506469ff10de91bf02
Sort Order: None

10 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-10-29 07:01:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Draft	2025-10-29 07:01:07	2025-10-29 07:15:08	14 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 07:15:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Dept. Head approval	2025-10-29 07:15:08	2025-10-29 07:15:08	0 Seconds	true
2025-10-29 07:15:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Draft	2025-10-29 07:15:08	2025-10-29 08:56:35	1 Hour 41 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 08:56:35	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-10-29 08:56:35	2025-10-29 09:46:49	50 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 09:46:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-10-29 09:46:49			false
2025-10-29 07:01:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Draft	2025-10-29 07:01:07	2025-10-29 07:15:08	14 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 07:15:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Dept. Head approval	2025-10-29 07:15:08	2025-10-29 07:15:08	0 Seconds	true
2025-10-29 07:15:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Draft	2025-10-29 07:15:08	2025-10-29 08:56:35	1 Hour 41 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 08:56:35	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-10-29 08:56:35	2025-10-29 09:46:49	50 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 09:46:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004603	Rejected by CMD Analyst	2025-10-29 09:46:49			false

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-10-30 11:40:45 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004604	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Shirley Yoshida	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michael Lambert	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Limited (Under 250K)
Opened:	2025-10-29 13:06:37	Requesting Department:	LIB
		Requester Phone:	(415) 557-4209
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Shirley Yoshida
		Watch list:	Shirley Yoshida, Marcus Lange

Short Description:

Statista Inc., Contractor, shall supply Campus License International with ecommerceDB

Supplier ID:	0000010466	Requested Amount:	$0.00
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	Modification – Prior Waiver Approved in ServiceNow	Increase Amount:	$32,155.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$161,254.00
		Total Requested Amount:	$193,409.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:	CMD12B0001253		
Document Type:	Contract	Enter Contract ID:	1000016811
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:	2022-11-01
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-10-31

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	false
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	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:

Statista is an online statistics, market research and business intelligence portal. It provides access to data from market and opinion research institutions, as well as from business organizations and government institutions in English, French, German and Spanish. The purpose to this product is to provide patrons of SFPL online information and services they require and request for business and personal reasons. This is a sole source product given Statista maintains all copyright privileges for their products and products must be purchased directly through Statista.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:
I have email the vendor encouraging them to be 12B compliant and attached the 12B Compliance Process to vendor
Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Ruth Santana	CMD Director:	Regina Chan
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	Provides patrons of SFPL online information and services they require and request for business and personal reasons, the access offers data from market and opinion research institutions, as well as from business organizations and government institutions in English, French, German and Spanish.		

CMD Director

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

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

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 is a sole source database that the citizens of San Francisco came to expect us to carry. Not being able to provide these materials to our patrons is a disservice to them.

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

This is sole source.

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

It does not conflict. Vendor is still working on 12B certification, pending status

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

No

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 = CMD12B0004604
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michael Lambert	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	2025-10-29 13:07:39		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 1b2d26032bf836506469ff10de91bfeb
Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-10-29 14:57:05	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Completed	2025-10-29 14:57:04			false
2025-10-29 13:06:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Draft	2025-10-29 13:06:37	2025-10-29 13:07:39	1 Minute	true
2025-10-29 13:07:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Draft	2025-10-29 13:07:39	2025-10-29 13:07:40	1 Second	true
2025-10-29 13:07:40	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Dept. Head approval	2025-10-29 13:07:40	2025-10-29 13:31:07	23 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 13:31:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-10-29 13:31:07	2025-10-29 13:44:25	13 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 13:44:30	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-10-29 13:44:25	2025-10-29 14:57:04	1 Hour 12 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 14:57:05	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Completed	2025-10-29 14:57:04			false

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-10-29 13:06:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Draft	2025-10-29 13:06:37	2025-10-29 13:07:39	1 Minute	true
2025-10-29 13:07:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Draft	2025-10-29 13:07:39	2025-10-29 13:07:40	1 Second	true
2025-10-29 13:07:40	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Dept. Head approval	2025-10-29 13:07:40	2025-10-29 13:31:07	23 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 13:31:11	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-10-29 13:31:07	2025-10-29 13:44:25	13 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 13:44:30	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004604	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2025-10-29 13:44:25	2025-10-29 14:57:04	1 Hour 12 Minutes	true

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details

Run Date and Time: 2025-10-30 11:41:11 Pacific Daylight Time

Run by: ServiceNow Admin

Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0004605	Request Status:	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval
Requested for:	Leon Ho	State:	Work in Progress
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
		12B Waiver Type:	Standard
Opened:	2025-10-29 14:06:49	Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 754-2326
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Leon Ho
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

Inventory cycle count services for LHH Pharmacy Department.

Supplier ID:	0000059478	Requested Amount:	$7,997.96
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	$0.00
		Previously Approved Amount:	$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Total Requested Amount:	$7,997.96

Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000972368
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2025-10-29
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2026-06-30

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

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

(a) The Animal Connection

(b) The Animal Connection sell agricultural supplies that Laguna Honda Hospital need to purchase for the farm.

(c) LHH Honda Hospital need to purchase agricultural supplies from The Animal Connection to operate the farm and feed the animal.

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

We have requested The Animal Connection to become 12B compliance. In the interim, we are seeking a waiver to order agricultural supplies.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

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

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director

CMD Director:	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:

LHH Honda Hospital need to purchase agricultural supplies from The Animal Connection to operate the farm and feed the animal.

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

The Animal Connection have a new owner and vendor Suppier ID 0000059478. The new owner is in the process to become 12B compliance.

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

We have requested The Animal Connection to become 12B compliance. In the interim, we are seeking a waiver to order agricultural supplies.

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

LHH Honda Hospital need to purchase agricultural supplies from The Animal Connection to operate the farm and feed the animal.

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 = CMD12B0004605

Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	2025-10-29 14:19:10		

Related List Title: Metric List

Table name: metric_instance

Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = d1fa728b2b3c36506469ff10de91bfe0

Sort Order: None

8 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2025-10-29 15:29:00	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-10-29 15:28:58			false
2025-10-29 14:06:50	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	Draft	2025-10-29 14:06:50	2025-10-29 14:19:10	12 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 14:19:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	Draft	2025-10-29 14:19:10	2025-10-29 14:19:10	0 Seconds	true
2025-10-29 14:19:10	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	Dept. Head approval	2025-10-29 14:19:10	2025-10-29 15:28:58	1 Hour 9 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 15:29:00	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2025-10-29 15:28:58			false
2025-10-29 14:06:50	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	Draft	2025-10-29 14:06:50	2025-10-29 14:19:10	12 Minutes	true
2025-10-29 14:19:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	Draft	2025-10-29 14:19:10	2025-10-29 14:19:10	0 Seconds	true
2025-10-29 14:19:10	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0004605	Dept. Head approval	2025-10-29 14:19:10	2025-10-29 15:28:58	1 Hour 9 Minutes	true

Item 5

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); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Commission on the Environment Resolution re COE"s Governance Body Status
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:33:00 PM
Attachments:	Resolution File No 2025-07-COE.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached resolution from the Commission on the Environment.

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

[Support for Retaining the Commission on the Environment's Governance Body Status]

Resolution urging the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Commission Streamlining Task Force to Support Retaining the Commission on the Environment's Governance Body Status.

WHEREAS, The Commission on the Environment is an established 29-year-old governance body that was created when San Francisco voters passed a charter amendment in 1995, with the objective to improve, enhance, and preserve the environment; and to promote San Francisco's long-term environmental sustainability, as laid out in Section 4.118 of the City Charter; and

WHEREAS, The Commission on the Environment is responsible for the oversight and management of the San Francisco Environment Department; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Environment Department, under the Commission's direction, has successfully pioneered local environmental policies and programs such as the adoption of the three-bin waste management system, the City's original Sustainability Plan in 1997, the Integrated Pest Management Program, the Safe Medicine Disposal Program, the City's municipal Buy Green initiatives, the prohibition of flame retardants in furniture, the development of the Environmental Justice Grants Program, the ban on single use plastic bags, the requirements for electric vehicle readiness in new construction, the formulation of the City's ambitious net-zero emission goals by 2040, the mandates for fossil fuel-free, all-electric new construction requirements, and—most recently—the requirements for all-electric major renovations; and

WHEREAS, These landmark environmental ordinances and bold climate action initiatives have been recognized and emulated both nationally and internationally and have secured San Francisco's status as a global environmental leader; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco's trailblazing efforts culminated in San Francisco's selection as the host city for the Global Climate Action Summit in 2018; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco's Board of Supervisors declared a climate emergency in April 2019, requesting immediate and accelerated actions locally to address the climate crisis; and

WHEREAS, The City adopted its updated Climate Action Plan in 2021, featuring 34 strategies and 174 associated actions designed to address the climate crisis; and

WHEREAS, Since FY 22-23 – FY 24-25, the City appropriated approximately $6 million of General Fund dollars between 2022-2025 to support the Department's Climate, Building Decarbonization, Climate Equity Hub, and Clean Transportation Teams; and

WHEREAS, The Department leveraged General Fund dollars to win $84 million in grants since 2022; and

WHEREAS, Today, commitments to climate action and the necessary funding for that climate action are being rolled back at the federal level; and

WHEREAS, In 2025, the federal government reversed key environmental commitments and weakened climate protections, including rolling back clean energy investments, incentives, and the Environmental Protection Agency's Endangerment Finding; and

WHEREAS, The federal government has frozen or rescinded approximately $38 million in federal grants previously awarded to the San Francisco Environment Department, including $36.2 million in funding for EV infrastructure and building decarbonization; and

WHEREAS, The federal government's abandonment of climate protection has placed additional pressure on local jurisdictions to curb the climate crisis and prioritize the health and safety of their communities; and

WHEREAS, The City reduced the Environment Department's annual budget by approximately $1.2 million for Fiscal Year 2025-26; and

WHEREAS, The Environment Department is projected to incur an additional budget reduction of $0.9 million in Fiscal Year 2026-27 as the City further reduces General Fund Dollars and the San

Francisco Public Utilities Commission ends its approximately two-decade work order with the Department; and

WHEREAS, In September 2025, the Commission Streamlining Task Force, established under Proposition E, voted 4-1 to convert the Commission on the Environment to an advisory body that will sunset after three (3) years; and

WHEREAS, A significant environmental and climate policy-making and City-wide coordination vacuum would be created with the elimination of the Commission; and

WHEREAS, The decision to convert and potentially eliminate the Commission on the Environment will eliminate the only public forum dedicated to climate and environmental issues in San Francisco, and signal San Francisco's declining commitment to addressing those issues, despite the climate emergency that the City faces and that was formally declared by the City in April 2019; and

WHEREAS, The recent and upcoming Environment Department budget cuts will significantly and adversely impact the Department's ability to implement the City's Climate Action Plan at a time when local climate action is more important than ever; and

WHEREAS, In aggregate, these actions threaten San Francisco's position as a global climate and environmental innovation leader; now, therefore be it,

RESOLVED, That the Commission on the Environment opposes the current recommendation by the Commission Streamlining Task Force to convert the Commission to an advisory body that will sunset after three (3) years; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission on the Environment urges the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Commission Streamlining Task Force to retain the Commission on the Environment's governance body status; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission on the Environment urges the Board of Supervisors and Mayor to adequately fund the Department and the Climate Action Plan to maintain San

Francisco's global leadership on climate and fulfill the commitments to addressing the climate emergency as outlined in the City's Climate Emergency Resolution.

I hereby certify that this Resolution was adopted by the Commission on the Environment at its meeting on October 27, 2025.

Alice Hur

Alice Hur, Commission Affairs Officer

Vote: 6-0 Approved

Ayes: Commissioners Bermejo, Hunter, Riles, Sullivan, Tompkins, Yuen

Noes: None

Absent: Commissioner Ahn

Item 6

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: ELC Enhancing Detection Expansion
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:30:00 PM
Attachments:	San Francisco ELC Expansion Budget Revision_10.15.25 APPROVED 10.27.25.pdf Approval email.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attaches for communication from the Department of Public Health, submitting a notice of a Federal grant line item budget revision in excess of 15%, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 10.170-1(H).

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: Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:56 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Grant Budget Revision - Grant name: ELC Enhancing Detection Expansion

Hello,

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1(H), this memo serves to notify the Board of Supervisors of a Federal grant line item budget revision in excess of 15% requiring funding agency approval.

We have attached a copy of budget revision documentation submitted to the funding agency.

Attachment: Budget revision documentation

Thank you,

Sharon Z.
Fiscal Unit - Grants
San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
1380 Howard St.

San Francisco, CA 94103

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use, or distribution of the information included in this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me by e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

Attachment #2
COVID-19 ELC Enhancing Detection Expansion
Spend Plan

County Name: San Francisco

	Position Title*	Annual Salary	Budgeted Months (1-30.5 Months)	FTE %	Total Salary	Benefit Rate	Total Benefits	Combined Salary and Benefits	REVISED BUDGET 06-17-24	EPO Review Panel: Approval Status	EPO Review Panel: EPO Review Comments	EPO Review Panel: Local Description/Justification
2	Assistant Purchaser (1950) - Amy Kwan (Done)	$ 94,978.00	4.00	6%	$ 31,659.33	35.00%	$ 11,080.77	$ 42,740.10				
3	Lab Operations Coordinator (2593) - Done	$ 147,316.00	21.00	32%	$ 257,803.00	35.00%	$ 90,231.05	$ 348,034.05				
4	(2) Project Manager (2593) - Adiana Argueta; Nancy Yu	$ 261,352.00	24.00	36%	$ 522,704.00	35.00%	$ 182,946.40	$ 705,650.40		CDPH Approved		
5	Training Coordinator (2593) - Hernandez, Berta (Done)	$ 126,022.00	28.00	42%	$ 294,051.33	35.00%	$ 102,917.97	$ 396,969.30				
6	Fiscal Analyst (1824) - Joe, Matthew	$ 140,868.00	15.00	23%	$ 176,085.00	35.00%	$ 61,629.75	$ 237,714.75				
7	Health Program Planner (2818) - Rodriguez, Priscilla	$ 114,556.00	9.00	14%	$ 85,917.00	35.00%	$ 30,070.95	$ 115,987.95				
8	HR Analyst (1244) - Done	$ 110,968.00	15.00	23%	$ 138,710.00	35.00%	$ 48,548.50	$ 187,258.50				
9	(2) Epidemiologist (2803) - Done	$ 212,368.00	22.00	33%	$ 389,341.33	35.00%	$ 136,269.47	$ 525,610.80				
10	Equity Coordinator (2593) - Done	$ 110,890.00	8.00	12%	$ 73,926.67	35.00%	$ 25,874.33	$ 99,801.00				
11	(2) Lab Technician (2416) (1 filled) - Lin, Linda	$ 144,352.00	7.00	11%	$ 84,205.33	35.00%	$ 29,471.87	$ 113,677.20				
12	(5) Microbiologist I (2463) ~~(2 filled)~~ - Shieh, Annie; Jacinto, Monica; Woo, A	$ 775,476.00	27.00	41%	$ 1,744,821.00	35.00%	$ 610,687.35	$ 2,355,508.35				
13	(1) Supervising Physician Specialist (2233) - Han, George	$ 371,150.00	3.00	5%	$ 92,787.50	35.00%	$ 32,475.63	$ 125,263.13				
14	(1) Senior Physician Specialist (2232) - Tobolowsky, Farrell	$ 324,688.00	3.00	5%	$ 81,172.00	35.00%	$ 28,410.20	$ 109,582.20				
15	1314 Public Relations Officer - TBD	$ 120,666.00	9.00	14%	$ 90,499.50	35.00%	$ 31,674.83	$ 122,174.33				
16	1232 Training Officer - ~~TBD~~ Kenkel, Andrea	$ 115,414.00	20.00	30%	$ 192,356.67	35.00%	$ 67,324.83	$ 259,681.50				
17	1840 Junior Management Assistant - TBD	$ 98,046.00	23.00	35%	$ 187,921.50	35.00%	$ 65,772.53	$ 253,694.03		CDPH Approved		
18	(1) Epidemiologist/Informatician(2802) - Done	$ 83,226.00	24.00	36%	$ 166,452.00	35.00%	$ 58,258.20	$ 224,710.20				
19	(1) Nurse Manager (2322) - Clement, Joseph	$ 284,232.00	3.00	5%	$ 71,058.00	35.00%	$ 24,870.30	$ 95,928.30				
20	(2) Business Analyst (1054) - Done	$ 276,796.00	19.50	29%	$ 449,793.50	35.00%	$ 157,427.73	$ 607,221.23				
21	(1) Phamcist (2450) - Yewande Samuel (Done)	$ 188,894.00	6.00	9%	$ 94,447.00	35.00%	$ 33,056.45	$ 127,503.45				
22	(2) Program Coordinator II (2591) - Done	$ 198,276.00	8.00	12%	$ 132,184.00	35.00%	$ 46,264.40	$ 178,448.40				
23	(1) Central Management (0931) (51M9) - Charles Fann	$ 185,146.00	26.00	39%	$ 401,149.67	35.00%	$ 140,402.38	$ 541,552.05				
24	(1) ECE Director (0922) (56M2) - Isela Ford	$ 159,926.00	18.00	27%	$ 239,889.00	35.00%	$ 83,961.15	$ 323,850.15				
25	Health Program Coordinator I (2589) - Dangerfield, Lorren (Done)	$ 87,074.00	9.00	14%	$ 65,305.50	35.00%	$ 22,856.93	$ 88,162.43				
26	(4) (3) Health Program Coordinator I (2591) - Carlos Cortes; Talibah Miller; Vincente Cordero	$ 131,716.00	13.50	20%	$ 148,180.50	35.00%	$ 51,863.18	$ 200,043.68				
27	Project Manager (2593) - Done	$ 110,890.00	4.00	6%	$ 36,963.33	35.00%	$ 12,937.17	$ 49,900.50				
28	(1) Health Worker I/Program Manager Support (2586) - Done	$ 67,758.00	12.00	18%	$ 67,758.00	35.00%	$ 23,715.30	$ 91,473.30				
29	(1) Health Program II Program Manager Support /Project Manager (2591)	$ 99,138.00	12.00	18%	$ 99,138.00	35.00%	$ 34,698.30	$ 133,836.30				
30	(2) Health Worker IV/Site Manager (2588) - Gasca, Elisa (Done)	$ 178,464.00	19.00	29%	$ 282,568.00	35.00%	$ 98,898.80	$ 381,466.80				
31				0%	$ -		$ -	$ -				
49	(4) Health Program Coordinator III/Site Manager (2593) - Done	$ 459,264.00	19.00	29%	$ 727,168.00	35.00%	$ 254,508.80	$ 981,676.80				
45	(3) Health Program Coordinator II/Site Manager (2591) - Done	$ 309,426.00	16.00	24%	$ 412,568.00	35.00%	$ 144,398.80	$ 556,966.80				
46	(1) Health Program Coordinator I (2593) - Randel-schreiber, Hallie	$ 151,034.00	3.00	5%	$ 37,758.50	35.00%	$ 13,215.48	$ 50,973.98				
47	Manager (0922) - Strickland, Colton	$ 150,000.00	20.00	30%	$ 250,000.00	35.00%	$ 87,500.00	$ 337,500.00				
48	Pr. Admin Analyst (1824) - Okakpu, Osinachi	$ 134,134.00	36.00	54%	$ 402,402.00	35.00%	$ 140,840.70	$ 543,242.70				
50				0%	$ -	35.00%	$ -	$ -				
			Total Personnel		**$ 8,528,744.16**		**$ 2,985,060.50**	**$ 11,513,804.66**	$			
	Supplies									**Approval Status**	**EPO Review Comments**	**Local Description/Justification**
1	Testing Reagents for GeneXpert for two-year supply (S2, M1)							$ 106,371.51				9/7/: Please confirm the dates for the two-year supply of GeneXpert Testing Reagents. (LH)
2								$ -				
3	IT equipment (computers/Laptops, webcams, WiFi, privacy screens)							$ 158,889.59				11.20.23: took funds out of line item 62 and added to 116, email comunication with Eddy.(MR)
4	Clear Labs sequencing reagents (S2,M2)							$ 287,798.52				
5	BioFire reagents (S2,M2)							$ 243,082.25				PO request 8-21-23 for $102,964.87 (pending next revision)
6	Other supplies, Emergency Responder Uniforms							$ 3,795.87				
7	~~Perkin Elmer~~ Qiagen reagents (S2, M2)							$ -				
10								$ -				
11								$ -				
12								$ -				
13								$ -				
14								$ -				
15								$ -				
16								$ -				
							Total Supplies	**$ 799,937.74**	$			
	Travel for PHD (S1, M1)									**Approval Status**	**EPO Review Comments**	**Local Description/Justification**
	In-State							$ 248.79				
	Out-of-State							$ 7,794.58				
							Total Travel	**$ 8,043.37**	$			
	Equipment									**Approval Status**	**EPO Review Comments**	**Local Description/Justification**
1								$ -				
2	Cepheid GeneXpert 4-module instrument (S2, M2)							$ 126,807.74				
3	Clear Labs equipment update (S2,M2)							$ 116,289.00				
4	(2) Large pharmaceutical-grade refrigerators 23 cu ft (S1,M4)							$ 15,960.77		CDC Approved	Please note updated Approval Status.	
5	BioFire Equipment and Maintenance (S2,M2)							$ 117,700.19		CDC Approved	Please note updated Approval Status.	
6	Emergency Response Vehicle (S2,M3)							$		CDC Approved		3/21/2024: Approved by CDC/HH (AC) 11.20.23: Not approved yet, Eddy will send updated just letter with reasoning I asked him to add.(MR)
7	~~Perkin Elmer~~ (S2, M2) Roche cobas 5800 system							$ -		CDC Approved	Please note updated Approval Status.	2/17: Total cost of Equipment, Reagents and Maintence were included in CDC request (EY)
8	Fisher Healthcare (3) Centrifuges (S2, M2)							$ 54,635.94		CDC Approved		
9	Cardinal Health ULT -40 Freezer (S2, M2)							$ 14,020.33		CDC Approved		
10								$ -				
11								$ -				
12								$ -				
13								$ -				
14								$ -				
15								$ -				
16								$ -				
							Total Equipment	**$ 445,413.97**	$			
	Other									**Approval Status**	**EPO Review Comments**	**Local Description/Justification**
1	~~(10) Data Loggers ($200 x 10)~~ Data Loggers ($200.85 x 46)Vaccine Storage and Handling Equipment							$ 25,533.52		CDPH Approved		
2	(5) Small Refrigerators 1.8 cu ft ($1,800 x 5)							$ 1,547.90				6/6/22: Per workplan S6, M3; refrigerator is used for vaccination sites. (HK)
3	(5) Medium Refrigerators 5.5 cu ft ($3,500 x 5)							$ -				6/6/22: Per workplan S6, M3; refrigerator is used for vaccination sites. (HK)
4	~~(10) Small Vaccine Transport Units ($780 x 10)~~ Small Vaccine Transport Units ($781.98 x 7 CoolCube 03 and $596.13 x 2 Cube 28L))							$ 6,666.11				
5	(10) Medium Vaccine Transport Units ($800 x 26)							$ 16,930.72				
6	(5) Large Vaccine Transport Units ($1,400 x 3)							$ 4,660.59				
7	Community trainings and PHD staff professional development (staff development fund) (S1, M1) + Wendy & Eric							$ 8,747.51				
8	Registration and lodging for IDWeek2023 Boston, MA October 11-15, 2023 Infectious Disease Symposium - Health Officer (Susan Philip) (S1, M1), travel requested							$ 1,235.00				
9	Books and training supplies for PHD staff development fund (S1, M1)							$ -				
10	Registration and lodging for Catalysis LEAN Healthcare Transformation Summit June 8-9, 2023 registration in Chicago - Radha Rai (S1, M1), travel requested							$ 2,661.92				
11	Digital registration for (6) American Society for Microbiology (ASM) Microbe June 15th-19th, 2023 for Microbiologist I & IIs, Lab Managers, or PHL Lab Director (Jisel Moore, Antonia							$ -				
12	Registration and lodging for American Public Health Lab: APHL 2026 Annual Conference in Milwaukee, June 6-10, 2026 for (4) Microbiologist I & IIs, Lab Managers, or PHL Lab Director							$ 7,543.80				
13	Data Analytic Software Training/Staff Development							$ 82,989.38				11.20.23: took funds out of line item 62 and added here, email comunication with Eddy.(MR)
							Total Other	**$ 158,516.45**	$			
	Subcontracts:									**Approval Status**	**EPO Review Comments**	**Local Description/Justification**
1	Color Health - high volume testing sites (S2, M4)							$ 8,420,499.08		Approved - See EPO Comments		
2	CBO							$ -				
3	Fund SFPHF contract to then fund 9 CBOs at $200,000 each to expand vaccine access in priority neighborhoods plus contract fees. (S5,M3)							$ 724,058.49				
4	Heluna Health- capacity building, performance improvement and evaluation, workforce development, data managers, health care analysts							$ 3,173,720.02				10/22: Local confirmed County will be invoiced directly by HH
5								$ -				
6								$ -				
7	Fund SFPHF contract to then fund community based organizations (CBOs) that are embedded in communities most impacted by COVID-19 in San Francisco to provide COVID19 prevention and care through Community Outreach and Wellness Teams.(S5,M3)							$ 1,200,000.00				
8								$ -				
9	UCSF- community outreach and vaccine pop-up staffing, physician consultant to provide capacity building assistance (S6,M4)							$ 247,698.00				
10	Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA) (S5, M2)							$ 493,340.00				
11	SFPHF- fund Faith based coalition outreach (S6,M4)							$ 499,970.79				
12	Dolores St Community Services - Provide testing and vaccination support in communities most affected by COVID-19 (S6,M1)							$ 197,000.00		Approved - See EPO Comments	Please update name of contractor/consultant	
13	Soliant contract - 6 months Phamacist for COVID vaccination "season"							$ 1,901.12				11.17.23: Spend plan will be approved without this item. Need to know the contractor name and more detail on what this contractor will be doing. Email communication w/Eddy about this on 11.17.23.(MR)
14	~~Perkin Elmer~~ Roche Maintenance (S2, M2)							$0.00		CDC Approved	Please note updated Approval Status.	
15	Dolores Street Community Services (S5, M2)							$ 493,340.08				
							Total Subcontracts	**$ 15,451,527.58**	$	**Approval Status**	**EPO Review Comments**	**Local Description/Justification**
							Total Direct Costs	**$ 28,377,243.77**	$	**Approval Status**	**EPO Review Comments**	**Local Description/Justification**
	Indirect Cost (% of Total Personnel or Total Direct Costs)											
	5% of Total Personnel	$ 11,513,804.66	5%					$ 575,690.23				
							Total Indirect	**$ 575,690.23**	$			
							TOTAL BUDGET	**$ 28,952,934.00**	$			
							TOTAL ALLOCATION	**$ 28,952,934.00**				
							Difference	**$ -**				

**Personnel supported with this funding should not duplicate efforts across other federal grants; exceed 1.0 FTE across all funding sources; and salary is kept below $199,300 as required by the funder.*

From:	Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH
To:	Argueta, Adriana (DPH); Selembo, Taylor@CDPH; CDPH Local Emergency Funding
Cc:	Woo, Win See (DPH); Zeng, Sharon (DPH)
Subject:	RE: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 1:14:22 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png image005.png image006.png image007.png image008.png San Francisco ELC Expansion Budget Revision_10.15.25 APPROVED 10.27.25.xlsx
Importance:	High

Hi Adriana,

I apologize for the delay. The attached revision is now APPROVED. Please make sure to use the attached for future expenditure reports.

Thank you,

Alyssa Rodriguez
Contract Manager
Contract Coordination Unit
Local Coordination Section
Center for Preparedness and Response | California Department of Public Health
W: +1 (279) 667-2273
Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov



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. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privilege.

From: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2025 11:09 AM
To: Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Good morning Taylor,
Thank you for your confirmation. I am confirming that the two Physician Specialists and Nurse Manager do not provide direct medical care.

Best regards,
Adriana

Adriana Argueta, MPH (she/her/ella)
Grants Manager
Population Health Division | San Francisco Department of Public Health

Phone: (628) 217-6051
Office: 1360 Mission, San Francisco, CA, 94103
Email: adriana.argueta@sfdph.org



This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:21 AM
To: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>; Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Hi Adriana,

I am reviewing this now, thank you! I saw you have two Physician Specialists and a Nurse Manager on there. These positions are allowable, but I wanted to remind you that they are not allowed to provide direct medical care under ELC funding.

Best,

Taylor

Taylor Selembo

Health Program Specialist I

Local Coordination Section

Center for Preparedness and Response

California Department of Public Health

W: +1 (279) 217-1155

taylor.selembo@cdph.ca.gov



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

---

From: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2025 2:55 PM
To: Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>; Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Good afternoon, Alyssa and ELC funding team,

Please find attached San Francisco's budget revision for ELC 3. Please let us know if there are any questions.

Thank you for confirming receipt.

Best regards,

Adriana

Adriana Argueta, MPH (she/her/ella)

Grants Manager

Population Health Division | San Francisco Department of Public Health

Phone: (628) 217-6051

Office: 1360 Mission, San Francisco, CA, 94103

Email: adriana.argueta@sfdph.org

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2025 8:25 AM
To: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>; Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Hi Adriana,

Thank you for reaching out. We can accommodate that extension.

Best,

Alyssa Rodriguez

Contract Manager

Contract Coordination Unit

Local Coordination Section

Center for Preparedness and Response | California Department of Public Health

W: +1 (279) 667-2273

Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov

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. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privilege.

From: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 5:03 PM

To: Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>; Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Dear Alyssa and ELC funding team,

I hope this message finds you well.

I'm writing to request a brief extension for submitting our ELC budget revision. While we had initially requested and were granted an extension through October 10, we are still finalizing internal discussions regarding Local Health Jurisdiction (LHJ) needs and require a few additional days to complete our submission.

We respectfully request an extension through October 15 to allow us to finalize these internal alignments and ensure our revision accurately reflects programmatic priorities.

Please let us know if this extension can be accommodated. We appreciate your continued support and flexibility as we work to responsibly manage these important funds.

Warm regards,
Adriana Argueta

Adriana Argueta, MPH (she/her/ella)

Grants Manager

Population Health Division | San Francisco Department of Public Health

Phone: (628) 217-6051

Office: 1360 Mission, San Francisco, CA, 94103

Email: adriana.argueta@sfdph.org



This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 10:35 AM
To: Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>; Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>;

CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Hello Alyssa,

Thank you for the approval confirmation.

Best regards,

Adriana

Adriana Argueta, MPH (she/her/ella)

Grants Manager

Population Health Division | San Francisco Department of Public Health

Phone: (628) 217-6051

Office: 1360 Mission, San Francisco, CA, 94103

Email: adriana.argueta@sfdph.org



This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 10:28 AM
To: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>; Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Sounds good! We can approve the extension.

Thank you Adriana.

Alyssa Rodriguez

Contract Manager

Contract Coordination Unit

Local Coordination Section

Center for Preparedness and Response | California Department of Public Health

W: +1 (279) 667-2273

Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov



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. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privilege.

From: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 9:23 AM
To: Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>; Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Good morning Alyssa,

That is correct, we will still keep the expenditure separate by month. There will be one submission for August and another for September.

Best regards,

Adriana

Adriana Argueta, MPH (she/her/ella)

Grants Manager

Population Health Division | San Francisco Department of Public Health

Phone: (628) 217-6051

Office: 1360 Mission, San Francisco, CA, 94103

Email: adriana.argueta@sfdph.org



This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 8:29 AM
To: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>; Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: RE: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

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

Hi Adriana,

Will your August submission then include September's expenditures since they are due at the end of October?

Alyssa Rodriguez

Contract Manager

Contract Coordination Unit

Local Coordination Section

Center for Preparedness and Response | California Department of Public Health

W: +1 (279) 667-2273

Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov



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. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privilege.

From: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2025 1:27 PM
To: Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <Taylor.Selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <Alyssa.Rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <LocalEmergencyFunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: Re: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Hello Taylor and Alyssa,

Please allow me to clarify the below request. San Francisco would like to request extension for the invoice and expenditure report. Our goal is to submit a budget revision before October 10th. Once the revision is approved, we will need additional time to align the invoice and expenditure details accordingly. We anticipate needing an extension through the end of October to complete and submit the August report accurately.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Adriana

Adriana Argueta, MPH (she/her/ella)

Grants Manager

Population Health Division | San Francisco Department of Public Health

Phone: (628) 217-6051

Office: 1360 Mission, San Francisco, CA, 94103

Email: adriana.argueta@sfdph.org



This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: Argueta, Adriana (DPH) <adriana.argueta@sfdph.org>
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2025 11:32 AM
To: Selembo, Taylor@CDPH <taylor.selembo@cdph.ca.gov>; Rodriguez, Alyssa@CDPH <alyssa.rodriguez@cdph.ca.gov>; CDPH Local Emergency Funding <localemergencyfunding@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Woo, Win See (DPH) <winsee.woo@sfdph.org>; Zeng, Sharon (DPH) <yihong.zeng@sfdph.org>
Subject: San Francisco ELC #3 Invoice and Expenditure Report: August 2025

Good morning ELC funding team,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to respectfully request a brief extension for submitting the Invoice and Expenditure Report for the San Francisco ELC 3 grant for the month of August 2025.

We plan to submit a budget revision and need additional days to finalize and review. We anticipate being able to submit the report no later than October 10th, with the intention to submit as soon as we can.

Thank you for your understanding and continued support.

Best regards,

Adriana

Adriana Argueta, MPH (she/her/ella)

Grants Manager

Population Health Division | San Francisco Department of Public Health

Phone: (628) 217-6051

Office: 1360 Mission, San Francisco, CA, 94103

Email: adriana.argueta@sfdph.org



This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

Item 7

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	2 Notices from the California Fish and Game Commission
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:37:00 AM
Attachments:	2 Notices from the California Fish and Game Commission.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for communication from the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a notice of proposed changes in regulations related to the recreational take of rockfish, cabezon, greenling, and lingcod, and a notice of decision not to proceed with a rulemaking related to recreational striped bass harvest size limits.

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: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Decision Not to Proceed - Recreational Striped Bass Harvest Size Limits
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 11:20:07 AM

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

View as a webpage / share

Muir Woods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Decision Not to Proceed

Greetings,

A notice of decision not to proceed with a rulemaking related to recreational striped bass harvest size limits has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at: https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#5-75

Sincerely,

David Haug
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Fish and Game Commission
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations for Recreational Take of Rockfish, Cabezon, Greenling and Lingcod
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:37:56 AM

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

View as a webpage / share

California Redwoods

California Fish and Game Commission
Wildlife Heritage and Conservation Since 1870

Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

Greetings,

A notice of proposed changes in regulations related to the recreational take of rockfish, cabezon, greenling, and lingcod has been posted to the Commission's website. The notice and associated documents can be accessed at:

https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2025-New-and-Proposed#1-91coc

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
California Fish and Game Commission

Click here to visit our regulations page

Not signed up to receive our informative emails?

Sign Up

Do not reply to this message. FGC@public.govdelivery.com is for outgoing messages only.

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:
Manage Subscriptions | Help

This email was sent to board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org from the California Natural Resources Agency utilizing govDelivery. California Natural Resources Agency, 715 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Item 8

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Objection to Board of Supervisor's File No. 250682 (Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts)
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 8:49:00 AM
Attachments:	THD Letter to BOS File No. 250682.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Telegraph Hill Dwellers regarding File No. 250682, which is Item No. 15 on today's Land Use & Transportation meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250682:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) eliminate the North Beach Special Use District and consolidate certain controls into the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, 2) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 3) expand allowable uses in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, 4) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 5) reduce limitations on Restaurants and Bars in the Jackson Square Special Use District; amending the Zoning Map to reflect removal of the North Beach Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. (Sauter)

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: Nick Ferris <nicholashferris@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 26, 2025 9:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>

Cc: Stuart Watts <stuart@localfriends.co>; christin@booksmith.com; Jackson Square <jacksonsqhda@gmail.com>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; richard@lozeaudrury.com
Subject: Objection to Board of Supervisor's File No. 250682 (Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts)

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

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors,

While we are pleased that Supervisor Sauter has agreed to restore the prohibition on Health Care Uses on the ground floor of the North Beach NCD, Telegraph Hill Dwellers continues to oppose Supervisor Sauter's legislation to substantially modify the existing controls for Non-Residential Uses in North Beach. North Beach is thriving. In a single legislative sweep, this legislation would undo much of forty years of preservation and zoning efforts that have long proven effective.

Most importantly, we join with Jackson Square Historic District Association, Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association, Russian Hill Community Association, and the North Beach Business Association, together with over 50 individual North Beach businesses to request further amendments to the proposed legislation.

Although we wish to retain the existing North Beach Special Use District, we respectfully request that you consider adding the following amendments to the Supervisor Sauter's proposed legislation:

1. Restore the Non-Residential Use Size Caps for North Beach Retail Businesses

We oppose the amendment to Section 121.2 (on page 4) to increase the permitted Non-Residential Use Size Limit from 2,000 to 3,000 square feet. Previously, we opposed the legislation (Ordinance No. 173-25) to eliminate the upper Use Size Limit that has historically been 4,000 square feet.

Please restore the Non-Residential Use Size Limit for North Beach to 2,000 square feet. In addition, we ask that you please restore the Non-Residential Use Size Cap for North Beach to 4,000 square feet as previously set forth in Planning Code Section 121.2(b)(3), which was removed by prior legislation (Ordinance No. 173-25). Since 1986, the North

Beach NCD has permitted a Use Size of 2,000 square feet, with a Conditional Use Authorization for use sizes between 2,000 and 4,000 square feet. This has been instrumental in protecting and maintaining a scale of use and development appropriate to North Beach. We do not believe this proposed change is necessary or warranted and ask you to restore these Use Size limits.

We agree with the North Beach Business Association that:

"The Use Size Cap is a critical tool that has helped North Beach maintain its unique character as a vibrant mixed-use neighborhood. Its removal during recent Land Use and Board of Supervisors meetings occurred without consultation with the very businesses it affects. This cap ensures that no single type of business dominates our streetscape, preserving the diverse ecosystem of shops, services, and dining that makes North Beach a destination for both residents and visitors. We respectfully request this provision be reinstated to protect the economic diversity that has made our neighborhood thrive for generations."

2. Restore Our Long-Standing Restaurant Controls

We strongly oppose the proposal to allow Limited Restaurant Use as principally permitted and urge you to restore the carefully crafted controls that prevented an increase in the number of Limited Restaurants, Restaurants, and Bars. We urge you to keep the original language in Footnote 8 of the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District Zoning Controls (Table 722) on page 17.

The existing legislation was enacted to carefully stem the proliferation of new restaurants and bars that had replaced so many neighborhood-serving businesses in order to achieve a more stable balance of diverse businesses. It has proven a helpful tool in retaining and welcoming non-restaurant uses that make North Beach so special like Biordi's, Jeffrey's, Paparazzi, Knits and Leather, 101 Records, Locali, Macchiarini Creative Designs and so many more.

We agree with the North Beach Business Association that:

"North Beach already has the highest concentration of restaurants and bars per capita of any residential neighborhood in San Francisco. Our existing regulation preventing restaurants from replacing non-restaurant businesses has successfully maintained affordability and diversity. However, with 5 of 8 current vacant storefronts being former restaurants, we risk further concentration. Restaurant spaces require costly

infrastructure that makes conversion difficult and expensive, potentially locking in uses that limit future flexibility. We need measured controls to ensure residents can still access essential services like hardware stores, markets, and specialty shops within walking distance."

3. Restore the Prohibition on Storefront Mergers

We urge you to restore the prohibition on storefront mergers and strongly oppose the amendment to allow mergers **up to 3,000 square feet** with a conditional use authorization. As noted above, 3,000 square feet is larger than 4 combined individual stores on Grant Avenue. This will have the same impacts as the increase in Use Sizes discussed above.

Discouraging storefront mergers has helped preserve our vibrant neighborhood, minimize commercial vacancies and retain small and Legacy Businesses that would have long disappeared without these controls. These provisions have long proven successful in protecting the delicate ecosystem of our celebrated neighborhood-serving businesses by incentivizing landlords to retain existing small business spaces that command lower per square foot rents than larger storefronts. Not only do these small-scale diverse businesses serve our community, but they also attract more small businesses, tourists, and visitors from throughout San Francisco, the region, nationally and internationally.

4. Restore the Exemption of North Beach from So-Called "Priority Processing"

We remain deeply concerned that there is no longer any guarantee that conditional use authorizations will receive advance public notice or even a public hearing. Planning Department staff clearly explained to the Planning Commission on June 13, 2025, that Priority Processing does not require advance public notice and may not even need to appear on the Planning Commission agenda as a consent item if the Commission delegates its authority to Planning Department staff.

In June 2025, THD, along with the North Beach Business Association, and Chinatown CDC, joined by Calle 24, opposed the legislation (Board File No. 250538) to include the North Beach NCD and the Calle 24 Special Use District in Priority Processing, and were able to successfully maintain our exemptions at that time.

But now, once again, Supervisor Sauter is proposing to amend Section 303.2(c)(9) to remove the historic exemption of the North Beach NCD from Priority Processing. We

continue to strongly oppose adding North Beach to Priority Processing and urge you to recommend maintaining the North Beach exemption which was retained for Calle 24.

5. Restore the North Beach Special Use District Definition of Historic Buildings

We urge you to recommend restoring the definition of "Historic Buildings" as set forth in the North Beach Special Use District at Sec. 780.3(b)(3) to include *"buildings and districts identified by surveys adopted by the City, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing on the National or California Registers, and buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts"* to insure that the eligible North Beach National Register Historic District would be subject to the NCD controls. Further, the language in the preamble in Section 722 (on page 14, at line 10 of the legislation) should be changed to read: <u>The protection and enhancement of the unique architectural, cultural, and historic character of North Beach shall be</u> ~~prioritized~~ <u>required.</u>

6. Restore Protections for Nearby Residential District from Inappropriate Uses

We urge you to please recommend amending Section 186(3) of the legislation to restore the former use protections for residential districts within ¼ mile of the boundaries of the North Beach NCD.

Section 186(3) had provided that commercial and industrial nonconforming uses in residential districts (RH and RM) within ¼ mile of the boundaries of the North Beach Special Use District were subject to the limitations and controls of this District. The deletion of North Beach SUD and NCD from SEC. 186(3) at lines 6-7 on page 6 of the legislation will subject nearby residential districts to the much looser controls of NC1 districts, which allows uses not permitted in the North Beach NCD. Perhaps the impact of this amendment was unintentional and must be corrected.

7. Prohibit Ghost Kitchen Use.

Our continued opposition to the proposed amendment to change Walk Up Uses from Conditional Use to Principally Permitted is based on two issues.

First, given the mixed use nature of the North Beach NCD, characterized by dense residential uses above ground floor commercial uses, public input is important, and all Walk-Up uses should be subject to Conditional Use authorization instead of being principally permitted as proposed.

Second, we are concerned about the proliferation of “ghost kitchens” and would urge the Supervisors to introduce an amendment to the Planning Code to define “Ghost Kitchen Use” that could be prohibited in the North Beach NCD and other NCDs, where it is not a beneficial use.

By way of a District 3 example, a “ghost kitchen” is now operating at 1096 Union Street in a residential area within a ¼ mile of the North Beach NCD. Conditionally permitted for a change from a corner grocery store to a Limited Restaurant Use, it is now operating as Walk Up Use with lines of delivery vehicles. It therefore appears necessary to establish a clear definition in the Planning Code for Ghost Kitchen Use in order to control such uses.

* * * * * * * *

Thank you very much for your consideration of our recommendations for amendments to the legislation.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Nick Ferris, President
Stan Hayes, Past President



October 26, 2025
Via Email

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

RE: **Objection to Board of Supervisor's File No. 250682**
Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors,

While we are pleased that Supervisor Sauter has agreed to restore the prohibition on Health Care Uses on the ground floor of the North Beach NCD, Telegraph Hill Dwellers continues to oppose Supervisor Sauter's legislation to substantially modify the existing controls for Non-Residential Uses in North Beach. North Beach is thriving. In a single legislative sweep, this legislation would undo much of forty years of preservation and zoning efforts that have long proven effective.

Most importantly, we join with Jackson Square Historic District Association, Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association, Russian Hill Community Association, and the North Beach Business Association, together with over 50 individual North Beach businesses to request further amendments to the proposed legislation.

Although we wish to retain the existing North Beach Special Use District, we respectfully request that you consider adding the following amendments to the Supervisor Sauter's proposed legislation:

1. Restore the Non-Residential Use Size Caps for North Beach Retail Businesses

We oppose the amendment to Section 121.2 (on page 4) to increase the permitted Non-Residential Use Size Limit from 2,000 to 3,000 square feet. Previously, we opposed the legislation (Ordinance No. 173-25) to eliminate the upper Use Size Limit that has historically been 4,000 square feet.

Please restore the Non-Residential Use Size Limit for North Beach to 2,000 square feet. In addition, we ask that you please restore the Non-Residential Use Size Cap for North Beach to 4,000 square feet as previously set forth in Planning Code Section 121.2(b)(3), which was removed by prior legislation (Ordinance No. 173-25). Since 1986, the North Beach NCD has permitted a Use Size of 2,000 square feet, with a Conditional Use Authorization for use sizes between 2,000 and 4,000 square feet. This has been instrumental in protecting and maintaining a scale of use and development appropriate to North Beach. We do not believe this proposed change is necessary or warranted and ask you to restore these Use Size limits.

We agree with the North Beach Business Association that:

> *"The Use Size Cap is a critical tool that has helped North Beach maintain its unique character as a vibrant mixed-use neighborhood. Its removal during recent Land Use and Board of Supervisors meetings occurred without consultation with the very businesses it affects. This cap ensures that no single type of business dominates our streetscape, preserving the diverse ecosystem of shops, services, and dining that makes North Beach a destination for both residents and visitors. We respectfully request this provision be reinstated to protect the economic diversity that has made our neighborhood thrive for generations."*

2. Restore Our Long-Standing Restaurant Controls

We strongly oppose the proposal to allow Limited Restaurant Use as principally permitted and urge you to restore the carefully crafted controls that prevented an increase in the number of Limited Restaurants, Restaurants, and Bars. We urge you to keep the original language in Footnote 8 of the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District Zoning Controls (Table 722) on page 17.

The existing legislation was enacted to carefully stem the proliferation of new restaurants and bars that had replaced so many neighborhood-serving businesses in order to achieve a more stable balance of diverse businesses. It has proven a helpful tool in retaining and welcoming non-restaurant uses that make North Beach so special like Biordi's, Jeffrey's, Paparazzi, Knits and Leather, 101 Records, Locali, Macchiarini Creative Designs and so many more.

We agree with the North Beach Business Association that:

> *"North Beach already has the highest concentration of restaurants and bars per capita of any residential neighborhood in San Francisco. Our existing regulation preventing restaurants from replacing non-restaurant businesses has successfully maintained affordability and diversity. However, with 5 of 8 current vacant storefronts being former restaurants, we risk further concentration. Restaurant spaces require costly infrastructure that makes conversion difficult and expensive, potentially locking in uses that limit future flexibility. We need measured controls to ensure residents can still access essential services like hardware stores, markets, and specialty shops within walking distance."*

3. Restore the Prohibition on Storefront Mergers

We urge you to restore the prohibition on storefront mergers and strongly oppose the amendment to allow mergers **up to 3,000 square feet** with a conditional use authorization. As noted above,

3,000 square feet is larger than 4 combined individual stores on Grant Avenue. This will have the same impacts as the increase in Use Sizes discussed above.

Discouraging storefront mergers has helped preserve our vibrant neighborhood, minimize commercial vacancies and retain small and Legacy Businesses that would have long disappeared without these controls. These provisions have long proven successful in protecting the delicate ecosystem of our celebrated neighborhood-serving businesses by incentivizing landlords to retain existing small business spaces that command lower per square foot rents than larger storefronts. Not only do these small-scale diverse businesses serve our community, but they also attract more small businesses, tourists, and visitors from throughout San Francisco, the region, nationally and internationally.

4. Restore the Exemption of North Beach from So-Called "Priority Processing"

We remain deeply concerned that there is no longer any guarantee that conditional use authorizations will receive advance public notice or even a public hearing. Planning Department staff clearly explained to the Planning Commission on June 13, 2025, that Priority Processing does not require advance public notice and may not even need to appear on the Planning Commission agenda as a consent item if the Commission delegates its authority to Planning Department staff.

In June 2025, THD, along with the North Beach Business Association, and Chinatown CDC, joined by Calle 24, opposed the legislation (Board File No. 250538) to include the North Beach NCD and the Calle 24 Special Use District in Priority Processing, and were able to successfully maintain our exemptions at that time.

But now, once again, Supervisor Sauter is proposing to amend Section 303.2(c)(9) to remove the historic exemption of the North Beach NCD from Priority Processing. We continue to strongly oppose adding North Beach to Priority Processing and urge you to recommend maintaining the North Beach exemption which was retained for Calle 24.

5. Restore the North Beach Special Use District Definition of Historic Buildings

We urge you to recommend restoring the definition of "Historic Buildings" as set forth in the North Beach Special Use District at Sec. 780.3(b)(3) to include "*buildings and districts identified by surveys adopted by the City, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing on the National or California Registers, and buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts"* to insure that the eligible North Beach National Register Historic District would be subject to the NCD controls. Further, the language in the preamble in Section 722 (on page 14, at line 10 of the legislation) should be changed to

read: The protection and enhancement of the unique architectural, cultural, and historic character of North Beach shall be ~~*prioritized*~~ *required*.

6. Restore Protections for Nearby Residential District from Inappropriate Uses

We urge you to please recommend amending Section 186(3) of the legislation to restore the former use protections for residential districts within ¼ mile of the boundaries of the North Beach NCD.

Section 186(3) had provided that commercial and industrial nonconforming uses in residential districts (RH and RM) within ¼ mile of the boundaries of the North Beach Special Use District were subject to the limitations and controls of this District. The deletion of North Beach SUD and NCD from SEC. 186(3) at lines 6-7 on page 6 of the legislation will subject nearby residential districts to the much looser controls of NC1 districts, which allows uses not permitted in the North Beach NCD. Perhaps the impact of this amendment was unintentional and must be corrected.

7. Prohibit Ghost Kitchen Use.

Our continued opposition to the proposed amendment to change Walk Up Uses from Conditional Use to Principally Permitted is based on two issues.

First, given the mixed use nature of the North Beach NCD, characterized by dense residential uses above ground floor commercial uses, public input is important, and all Walk-Up uses should be subject to Conditional Use authorization instead of being principally permitted as proposed.

Second, we are concerned about the proliferation of "ghost kitchens" and would urge the Supervisors to introduce an amendment to the Planning Code to define "Ghost Kitchen Use" that could be prohibited in the North Beach NCD and other NCDs, where it is not a beneficial use.

By way of a District 3 example, a "ghost kitchen" is now operating at 1096 Union Street in a residential area within a ¼ mile of the North Beach NCD. Conditionally permitted for a change from a corner grocery store to a Limited Restaurant Use, it is now operating as Walk Up Use with lines of delivery vehicles. It therefore appears necessary to establish a clear definition in the Planning Code for Ghost Kitchen Use in order to control such uses.

* * * * * * * *

Thank you very much for your consideration of our recommendations for amendments to the legislation.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

Nick Ferris, President
Stan Hayes, Past President

Stuart Watts, President, North Beach Business Association stuart@localfriends.co
Christin Evans, Small Business Forward christin@booksmith.com
Jackson Square Historic District Association jacksonsqhda@gmail.com
Angela Cavillo, Clerk *Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org*
John Carroll, Clerk - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Richard Drury, Esq. richard@lozeaudrury.com
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Letter and talking points
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 9:16:00 AM
Attachments:	THD Letter to BOS File No. 250682.docx

Hello,

Please see below and attached for additional communication from Telegraph Hill Dwellers regarding File No. 250682, which is Item No. 15 on today's Land Use & Transportation meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250682:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) eliminate the North Beach Special Use District and consolidate certain controls into the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, 2) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 3) expand allowable uses in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, 4) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 5) reduce limitations on Restaurants and Bars in the Jackson Square Special Use District; amending the Zoning Map to reflect removal of the North Beach Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. (Sauter)

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: Lance Carnes <lacarnes@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:07 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>

Subject: Fwd: Letter and talking points

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

From: Lance Carnes <lacarnes@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Oct 26, 2025 at 8:01 PM
Subject: Changes to File No. 250682

Please make changes to File 250682 as outlined in the attached letter.

Sincerely, Lance Carnes

October 26, 2025
Via Email

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org

RE: **Objection to Board of Supervisor's File No. 250682**
Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors,

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers continues to strongly oppose Supervisor Sauter's legislation to substantially modify the existing controls for Non-Residential Uses in North Beach. North Beach is thriving. In a single legislative sweep, this legislation would undo much of forty years of preservation and zoning efforts by a whole community.

Most importantly, we join with the Jackson Square Historic District Association, North Beach Business Association and over 50 individual North Beach businesses to request further amendments to the proposed legislation.

Although we wish to retain the existing North Beach Special Use District, we respectfully request that you please consider the following amendments to the Supervisor Sauter's proposed legislation:

1. Restore the Non-Residential Use Size Caps for North Beach Retail Businesses

We oppose the amendment to Section 121.2 (on page 4) to increase the permitted Non-Residential Use Size Limit from 2,000 to 3,000 square feet. Previously, we opposed the legislation (Ordinance No. 173-25) to eliminate the upper Use Size Limit that has historically been 4,000 square feet.

Please restore the Non-Residential Use Size Limit for North Beach to 2,000 square feet. In addition, we ask that you please restore the Non-Residential Use Size Cap for North Beach to 4,000 square feet as previously set forth in Planning Code Section 121.2(b)(3), which was removed by prior legislation (Ordinance No. 173-25). Since 1986, the North Beach NCD has permitted a Use Size of 2,000 square feet, with a Conditional Use Authorization for use sizes

between 2,000 and 4,000 square feet. This has been instrumental in protecting and maintaining a scale of use and development appropriate to North Beach. We do not believe this proposed change is necessary or warranted and ask you to restore these Use Size limits.

We agree with the North Beach Business Association that:

> *"The Use Size Cap is a critical tool that has helped North Beach maintain its unique character as a vibrant mixed-use neighborhood. Its removal during recent Land Use and Board of Supervisors meetings occurred without consultation with the very businesses it affects. This cap ensures that no single type of business dominates our streetscape, preserving the diverse ecosystem of shops, services, and dining that makes North Beach a destination for both residents and visitors. We respectfully request this provision be reinstated to protect the economic diversity that has made our neighborhood thrive for generations."*

2. Restore Our Long-Standing Restaurant Density Controls

We strongly oppose the proposal to allow Limited Restaurant Use as principally permitted and urge you to restore the carefully crafted controls that prevented an increase in the number of Limited Restaurants, Restaurants, and Bars. We urge you to keep the original language in Footnote 8 of the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District Zoning Controls (Table 722) on page 17.

The existing legislation was enacted to carefully stem the proliferation of new restaurants and bars that had replaced so many neighborhood-serving businesses in order to achieve a more stable balance of diverse businesses. It has proven a helpful tool in retaining and welcoming non-restaurant uses that make North Beach so special like Biordi's, Jeffrey's, Paparazzi, Knits and Leather, 101 Records, Locali, Macchiarini Creative Designs and so many more.

We agree with the North Beach Business Association that:

> *"North Beach already has the highest concentration of restaurants and bars per capita of any residential neighborhood in San Francisco. Our existing regulation preventing restaurants from replacing non-restaurant businesses has successfully maintained affordability and diversity. However, with 5 of 8 current vacant storefronts being former restaurants, we risk further concentration. Restaurant spaces require costly infrastructure that makes conversion difficult and expensive, potentially locking in uses that limit future flexibility. We need measured controls to ensure residents can still access essential services like hardware stores, markets, and specialty shops within walking distance."*

3. Restore the Prohibition on Storefront Mergers

We urge you to restore the prohibition on storefront mergers and strongly oppose the amendment to allow mergers **up to 3,000 square feet** with a conditional use authorization. As noted above, 3,000 square feet is larger than 4 combined individual stores on Grant Avenue. This will have the same impacts as the increase in Use Sizes discussed above.

Discouraging storefront mergers has helped preserve our vibrant neighborhood, minimize commercial vacancies and retain small and Legacy Businesses that would have long disappeared without these controls. These provisions have long proven successful in protecting the delicate ecosystem of our celebrated neighborhood-serving businesses by incentivizing landlords to retain existing small business spaces that command lower per square foot rents than larger storefronts. Not only do these small-scale diverse businesses serve our community, but they also attract more small businesses, tourists, and visitors from throughout San Francisco, the region, nationally and internationally.

4. Restore the Exemption of North Beach from Priority Processing

In June 2025, THD, along with the North Beach Business Association, and Chinatown CDC, joined by Calle 24, strongly opposed the legislation (Board File No. 250538) to include the North Beach NCD and the Calle 24 Special Use District in Priority Processing, and were able to successfully maintain our exemptions at that time.

But now, once again, Supervisor Sauter is proposing to amend Section 303.2(c)(9) to remove the historic exemption of the North Beach NCD from Priority Processing. We continue to strongly oppose adding North Beach to Priority Processing and urge you to recommend maintaining the North Beach exemption along with Calle 24.

We remain deeply concerned that there is no longer any guarantee that conditional use authorizations will receive any advance public notice or even a public hearing. Planning Department staff clearly explained to the Planning Commission on June 13, 2025, that Priority Processing does not require advance public notice and may not even need to appear on the Planning Commission agenda as a consent item if the Commission delegates its authority to Planning Department staff.

5. Restore the North Beach Special Use District Definition of Historic Buildings

We urge you to please recommend restoring the definition of "Historic Buildings" as set forth in the North Beach Special Use District at Sec. 780.3(b)(3) to include "*buildings and districts identified by surveys adopted by the City, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing on the National or California Registers, and buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts"* to insure that the eligible North Beach National Register Historic District would be subject to the NCD controls. Further, the language in the preamble in Section 722 (on page 14, at line 10 of the legislation) should be changed to read: <u>The protection and enhancement of the unique architectural, cultural, and historic character of North Beach shall be</u> ~~*prioritized*~~ <u>*required*</u>.

6. Restore Protections for Nearby Residential District from Inappropriate Uses

We urge you to please recommend amending Section 186(3) of the legislation to restore the former use protections for residential districts within ¼ mile of the boundaries of the North Beach NCD.

Section 186(3) had provided that commercial and industrial nonconforming uses in residential districts (RH and RM) within ¼ mile of the boundaries of the North Beach Special Use District were subject to the limitations and controls of this District. The deletion of North Beach SUD and NCD from SEC. 186(3) at lines 6-7 on page 6 of the legislation will subject nearby residential districts to the much looser controls of NC1 districts, which allows uses not permitted in the North Beach NCD. Perhaps the impact of this amendment was unintentional and must be corrected.

7. Prohibit Ghost Kitchen Use.

Our continued opposition to the proposed amendment to change Walk Up Uses from Conditional Use to Principally Permitted is based on two issues.

First, given the mixed use nature of the North Beach NCD, characterized by dense residential uses above ground floor commercial uses, public input is important, and all Walk-Up uses should be subject to Conditional Use authorization instead of being principally permitted as proposed.

Second, we are concerned about the proliferation of "ghost kitchens" and would urge the Supervisors to introduce an amendment to the Planning Code to define "Ghost Kitchen Use" that could be prohibited in the North Beach NCD and other NCDs, where it is not a beneficial use.

By way of a District 3 example, a "ghost kitchen" is now operating at 1096 Union Street in a residential area within a ¼ mile of the North Beach NCD. Conditionally permitted for Limited Restaurant Use, it is now operating as Walk Up Use with lines of delivery vehicles. It therefore appears necessary to establish a clear definition in the Planning Code for Ghost Kitchen Use in order to control such uses.

8. Restore the Prohibition on Health Care Uses On Ground Floor

We have strongly opposed the Supervisor's proposed legislation to allow new Health Care uses on the ground floor as a Conditional Use **up to 3,000 square feet** and request the deletion of footnote 19 on page 19 of the legislation. 3,000 square feet is larger than 4 combined existing stores on Grant Avenue. Health care uses are currently allowed, and should continue to be allowed, as a Conditional Use above the first floor *provided no residential units or tenants are displaced.*

We agree with the North Beach Business Association that:

"While we value healthcare access, medical facilities operate on fundamentally different economics than retail businesses. With substantially higher funding and revenue per square foot, health services can outbid traditional retailers, driving up rents across the district. Moreover, medical facilities typically restrict public access, creating dead zones in our walkable shopping district. Imagine if beloved community gathering spots became clinical spaces, the character of our neighborhood would fundamentally change. The neighborhood already greatly benefits from the resources of NEMS and UCSF's urgent care clinic."

* * * * * * * *

Thank you very much for your consideration of our recommendations for amendments to the legislation.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

Nick Ferris, President
Stan Hayes, Past President

Stuart Watts, President, North Beach Business Association stuart@localfriends.co
Christin Evans, Small Business Forward christin@booksmith.com
Jackson Square Historic District Association jacksonsqhda@gmail.com
Angela Cavillo, Clerk *Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org*
Clerk John Carroll - *John.Carroll@sfgov.org*
Richard Drury richard@lozeaudrury.com

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Planning Code; Zoning Map - Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts. Objection to CEQA Exemption. Board of Supervisors Agenda Item 31,
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 1:10:00 PM
Attachments:	2025.10.27.SFBOS N Beach SUD ComLtr w exhibit.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication regarding File No. 250682, which is Item No. 15 on today's Land Use & Transportation meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250682:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) eliminate the North Beach Special Use District and consolidate certain controls into the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, 2) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 3) expand allowable uses in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, 4) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 5) reduce limitations on Restaurants and Bars in the Jackson Square Special Use District; amending the Zoning Map to reflect removal of the North Beach Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. (Sauter)

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: Toyer Grear <toyer@lozeaudrury.com>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:54 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff (BOS) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff

<FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Gibson, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.gibson@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>
Cc: Drury, Richard <richard@lozeaudrury.com>
Subject: Planning Code; Zoning Map - Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts. Objection to CEQA Exemption. Board of Supervisors Agenda Item 31, ...

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

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors,

Attached please find comments written on behalf of Small Business Forward, the Jackson Square Historic District Association, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, and Thad Carhart, a San Francisco resident, concerning the proposed action Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning
Districts; Case Number: 2025-005989P CAMAP [Board File No. 250682].

Please note a copy of the attached will follow by overnight mail.

Sincerely,

Toyer Grear
Office Administrator / Paralegal
Lozeau Drury, LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
510-836-4200 ofc
510-607-8237 cell
510-836-4205 fax
email: toyer@lozeaudrury.com

LOZEAU DRURY LLP
T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205
1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612
www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

BY E-MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

October 27, 2025

Board President Rafael Mandelman and
Honorable Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org

RE: Planning Code; Zoning Map - Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts.
Objection to CEQA Exemption.
Board of Supervisors
Agenda Item 31, October 28, 2025, File No. 250682

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors:

I submit this comment on behalf of Small Business Forward, the Jackson Square Historic District Association, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, and Thad Carhart, a San Francisco resident, concerning the proposed action Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts; Case Number: 2025-005989PCAMAP [Board File No. 250682]. Agenda Item 31, October 28, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting. ("Rezone").

The Rezone will entirely eliminate the North Beach Special Use District ("SUD"). In so doing, the Rezone will eliminate important protections for historic resources and displacement of residents and legacy businesses. The Rezone will also allow larger storefronts (up to 3,000 square feet rather than 2,000), will allow storefront mergers, will remove restrictions on restaurants in Jackson Square and North Beach, and will allow uses in North Beach that are currently prohibited,

including walk-up facilities, first floor health services, and flexible retail. On Pacific Avenue, the Rezone would allow first floor health services, and flexible retail, all of which are currently prohibited. All of these changes will have potentially significant environmental impacts that must be analyzed and mitigated under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

We request that the Board decline to act on the proposed Rezone until the City prepares an environmental review document under CEQA to analyze the project's impacts and to consider mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce those impacts. The Staff Report contains a single sentence stating that the Rezone is not a "project" within the meaning of CEQA because it will not have direct environmental impacts. (Planning Commission Staff Report, p. 12; CEQA determination). This is incorrect. The Rezone is a "project" because it is an essential step that may lead to direct or indirect environmental impacts.

The proposed Rezone is legally indistinguishable from the Ordinance addressed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Union of Med. Marijuana Patients, Inc. v. City of San Diego,* 7 Cal. 5th 1171, 1199 (2019) ("*Marijuana Patients*"). In that case, the City of San Diego argued that the rezoning of a certain commercial district to allow marijuana dispensaries was not a "project" under CEQA because any environmental impacts were speculative. The Supreme Court rejected this argument and held that the rezoning was a CEQA "project" because it could result in new construction and additional traffic. As such CEQA review was required. The Supreme Court stated:

> we conclude the City erred in determining that the adoption of the Ordinance was not a project. Prior to the Ordinance, no medical marijuana dispensaries were legally permitted to operate in the City. The Ordinance therefore amended the City's zoning regulations to permit the establishment of a sizable number of retail businesses of an entirely new type. Although inconsistency with prior permissible land uses is not necessary for an activity to constitute a project (see *Muzzy Ranch, supra*, 41 Cal.4th at p. 388), establishment of these new businesses is capable of causing indirect physical changes in the environment. At a minimum, such a policy change could foreseeably result in new retail construction to accommodate the businesses. In addition, as UMMP suggests, the establishment of new stores could cause a citywide change in patterns of vehicle traffic from the businesses' customers, employees, and suppliers. The necessary causal connection between the Ordinance and these effects is present because adoption of the Ordinance was "an essential step culminating in action [the establishment of new businesses] which may affect the environment." (*Fullerton Joint Union High School Dist. v. State Board of Education* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 779, 797 (*Fullerton*).) The theoretical effects mentioned above are sufficiently plausible to raise the possibility that the Ordinance "may cause ... a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment" (§ 21065), warranting its consideration as a project.

(Marijuana Patients, 7 Cal. 5th at 1199)[1].

[1]Similarly, the Supreme Court held in *Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Com.* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 263, 284 n.28) that CEQA review is required for an annexation of land, "at a point in the planning process where genuine flexibility remains." (*Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202

Likewise the proposed Rezone will allow larger commercial operations and new commercial uses that were previously prohibited or allowed only with a Conditional Use Authorization. It will also allow displacement of residents and legacy businesses. As in *Marijuana Patients*, this is likely to result in indirect physical changes to the environment through construction and additional traffic.

The Rezone proposes to entirely eliminate Municipal Code Section 780.3, the North Beach Special Use District. In so doing, the Rezone will eliminate important protections for historic resources, including Section (c)(7):

> Architectural and Cultural Heritage of North Beach. Section 101.1 of the Planning Code includes the priority policy that historic buildings be preserved. The architectural and cultural character and features of existing historic buildings shall be preserved and enhanced. The Historic Preservation Commission or its staff shall review any proposed alterations to historic buildings, as defined in subsection 780.3(b)(3), and must determine that such alterations comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties before the City approves any permits to alter such buildings.

Also, the Rezone will eliminate the broader definition of historic resources contained in the North Beach SUD. Section (b)(3) defines "historic resources" as follows:

> Historic Buildings. "Historic buildings" shall include Planning Code Article 10 Landmarks and buildings located within Article 10 Historic Districts, buildings and districts identified by surveys adopted by the City, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing on the National or California Registers, and buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts. The Planning Department shall also consult materials available through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and Inventory to determine eligibility.

Although the Rezone references the historic resource protections in Planning Code Section 102, those protections are far narrower than in the North Beach SUD. As explained by expert Architectural Historian Bridget Maley:

> The proposed new definition of historic resources references Planning Code Section 102 which does not include eligible National or California Register Historic Districts and their contributors as historic resources or resources identified through survey or inventory.
>
> By eliminating these important protections for historic resources, the Rezone would have adverse impacts on historic resources, including the fully documented, but not yet to be formally designated North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District. These impacts must be analyzed and mitigated through proper CEQA documentation. If mitigation is not feasible, then a statement of overriding considerations would be required.

Cal.App.3d 296, 307). In *Bozung*, the decision to annex property was a CEQA "project" despite the fact that there was no immediate plan to develop the project.

(See, Attachment A).

By eliminating these important protections for historic resources, the Rezone clearly may have adverse impacts on historic resources. This impact must be analyzed and mitigated in a CEQA document.[2]

The most recent publicly available draft of the Rezone would eliminate important protections against displacement contained in the North Beach SUD. We understand that these provisions may be revised. However, if they are not, CEQA review will be required to analyze the impacts of the Rezone on displacement. Section (c)(4) and (6) of the North Beach SUD provides:

> Loss of Residential Units. To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units within the district, the removal, demolition, merger, or conversion of Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited.
>
> Legacy Business. Unless otherwise prohibited by this Section 780.3, Section 722, or any other section of this Code, any new Non-Residential Use proposed where the immediately prior Commercial Use was a Legacy Business shall require Conditional Use authorization pursuant to Section 303 of this Code.

By eliminating the North Beach SUD, the Rezone will eliminate these important protections against displacement. Put simply, as a result of the Rezone, residential units above the first story may be and will be eliminated whereas, such displacement is flatly prohibited under the existing code. A CEQA document is required to analyze and mitigate the Rezone's impacts on displacement of housing and legacy businesses.[3] We urge the Board to remove this provision from the Rezone.

Allowing displacement of residential units with commercial businesses above the first floor runs directly contrary to the City's efforts to increase residential and "Family" zoning in the City and violates the recently enacted Housing Crisis Act (HCA). (Gov. Code §66300). The HCA provides:

---

[2] "The fair argument standard applies to the question whether the proposed project 'may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource' . . .and thereby have a significant effect on the environment." (*Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley* (2015) 60 Cal.4th 1086, 1117, quoting *Valley Advocates v. City of Fresno* (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th 1039, 1072.)

[3] Displacement is a significant impact under CEQA. (*Save Berkeley Neighborhoods v. Regents* (2020) 51 Cal.App.5th 226). CEQA requires the lead agency to determine whether the "environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly," (PRC § 21083(b)(3), (d)), and to "take immediate steps to identify any critical thresholds for the health and safety of the people of the state and take all coordinated actions necessary to prevent such thresholds being reached." (See PRC §21000 et seq.; CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Section XII).

> (b) (1) Notwithstanding any other law except as provided in subdivision (i), with respect to land where housing is an allowable use, an affected county or an affected city shall not enact a development policy, standard, or condition that would have any of the following effects:
> (A) Changing the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reducing the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018, except as otherwise provided in clause (ii) of subparagraph (B). For purposes of this subparagraph, "less intensive use" includes, but is not limited to, reductions to height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, or new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, or maximum lot coverage limitations, ***or anything that would lessen the intensity of housing.***

(Gov. Code §66300(b).) The Rezone would violate the HCA because it would "lessen the intensity of housing" below levels allowed in 2018 by allowing residential units above the first floor to be replaced with commercial units.


Furthermore, the Rezone will have cumulative impacts together with the so-called Family Zoning Plan currently being considered by the Board of Supervisors. The Family Zoning Plan will upzone massive swaths of the City to allow taller buildings and greater density – including allowing 5,200 additional residential units in the North Beach area. The Rezone and the Family Zoning Plan will clearly have cumulatively significant impacts on North Beach.

A CEQA document must discuss significant cumulative impacts. (CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a).) This requirement flows from CEQA section 21083, which requires a finding that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if "the possible effects of a project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. . . . 'Cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects." "Cumulative impacts" are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." CEQA Guidelines section 15355(a). "[I]ndividual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects." CEQA Guidelines section 15355(a). "The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time." (*Communities for a Better Environment v. Cal. Resources Agency ("CBE v. CRA"),* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 117.) A legally adequate cumulative impacts analysis views a particular project over time and in conjunction with other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects whose impacts might compound or interrelate with those of the project at hand. "Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a

period of time." CEQA Guidelines § 15355(b). The City's one-sentence CEQA analysis fails even to mention cumulative impacts.

We urge the Board of Supervisors to refrain from considering this Rezone until a CEQA document is prepared. The Rezone is clearly a "project" within the meaning of CEQA, and CEQA review is therefore required. Also, unless amended, the Rezone would violate the Housing Crisis Act because it allows displacement of residential uses above the first floor with commercial uses.

Sincerely,



Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

Cc: Environmental Review Officer Lisa Gibson, lisa.gibson@sfgov.org

City Attorney David Chiu, cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

ATTACHMENT A

October 27, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk John Carroll
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

BY E-MAIL
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

RE: Planning Code; Zoning Map - Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts. Objection to CEQA Exemption.

Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Item 15, October 27, 2025, Board File No. 250682

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

I submit this comment letter on behalf of Small Business Forward, the Jackson Square Historic District Association, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, and Thad Carhart, a San Francisco resident, and in support of Lozeau Drury's letter of October 6, 2025, concerning the proposed action Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts; Case Number: 2025-005989PCAMAP [Board File No. 250682]. Agenda Item 15, October 27, 2025, Land Use and Transportation ("LUT") Committee. ("Rezone").

As a professional with 32 years of experience in historic preservation and with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), I meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in History and Architectural History. I also have the following credentials: received a Master of Arts Degree in Architectural History from the University of Virginia's School of Architecture; previously served as president of the San Francisco Landmarks Advisory Board (appointed by Mayor Newsom); since 2012 have continuously been on the City of San Francisco Planning Department's approved consultant pool for historic resources consultants; and certified by the San Francsico Contract Monitoring Division (CMD) as a woman-owned Local Business Enterprise (LBE). I have written innumerable historic resource and historic district designation and evaluation reports throughout the course of my career.

a+h 1715 green street san francisco, ca 94123 *phone*: 415.760.4318 bridget@architecture-history.com
www.architecture-history.com

Additionally, I peer reviewed and consulted on the North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District nomination, deemed adequate by the California State Historic Preservation Office staff, but not yet heard by the State Historical Resources Commission (three times continued from agendized meetings).

It is my professional the proposed Rezone constitutes a "Project" as defined by CEQA, as it is an essential step that may lead to direct or indirect environmental impacts. The Rezone would eliminate the North Beach Special Use District ("SUD"). In so doing, the Rezone would also remove important protections for both designated and previously identified historic resources within the Rezone area.

The Rezone, if approved, would have potentially significant environmental impacts that must be analyzed and mitigated under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") as a "Project."

The Rezone proposes to eliminate Municipal Code Section 780.3, the North Beach Special Use District. In so doing, the Rezone will eliminate important protections for historic resources, including Section (c)(7):

> Architectural and Cultural Heritage of North Beach. Section 101.1 of the Planning Code includes the priority policy that historic buildings be preserved. The architectural and cultural character and features of existing historic buildings shall be preserved and enhanced. The Historic Preservation Commission or its staff shall review any proposed alterations to historic buildings, as defined in subsection 780.3(b)(3), and must determine that such alterations comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties before the City approves any permits to alter such buildings.

Also, the Rezone will eliminate the broader definition of historic resources contained in the North Beach SUD Section 780.3 (b)(3), which currently defines "historic resources" as follows:

> Historic Buildings. "Historic buildings" shall include Planning Code Article 10 Landmarks and buildings located within Article 10 Historic Districts, buildings and districts identified by surveys adopted by the City, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing on the National or California Registers, and buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts. The Planning Department shall also consult materials available through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and Inventory to determine eligibility.

The proposed new definition of historic resources references Planning Code Section 102 which does not include eligible National or California Register Historic Districts and their contributors as historic resources or resources identified through survey or inventory.

By eliminating these important protections for historic resources, the Rezone would have adverse impacts on historic resources, including the fully documented, but not yet to be formally designated North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District. These impacts must be analyzed and mitigated through proper CEQA documentation. If mitigation is not feasible, then a statement of overriding considerations would be required.

On behalf of the parties listed above, I urge you to decline to act on the proposed Rezone until the City prepares an environmental review document as required by CEQA to analyze the project's impacts and to consider mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce those impacts.

Sincerely,



Bridget Maley
Principal

Cc:
Environmental Review Officer Lisa Gibson, lisa.gibson@sfgov.org
City Attorney David Chiu, cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
D-1 Supervisor Danny Sauter, SauterStaff@sfgov.org
Richard Drury, Lozeau Drury, richard@lozeaudrury.com
Nick Ferris, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, nicholashferris@gmail.com

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	12 Letters regarding File No. 250682
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:07:00 PM
Attachments:	12 Letters regarding File No. 250682.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 12 letters regarding File No. 250682, which is Item No. 31 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 250682:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) eliminate the North Beach Special Use District and consolidate certain controls into the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, 2) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 3) expand allowable uses in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, 4) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 5) reduce limitations on Restaurants and Bars in the Jackson Square Special Use District; amending the Zoning Map to reflect removal of the North Beach Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. (Sauter)

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

LOZEAU DRURY LLP
T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205
1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612
www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

BY E-MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

October 27, 2025

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2025 OCT 28 AM11:47
PA BOS-11

Board President Rafael Mandelman and
Honorable Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org

RE: Planning Code; Zoning Map - Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts.
Objection to CEQA Exemption.
Board of Supervisors
Agenda Item 31, October 28, 2025, File No. 250682

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors:

I submit this comment on behalf of Small Business Forward, the Jackson Square Historic District Association, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, and Thad Carhart, a San Francisco resident, concerning the proposed action Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts; Case Number: 2025-005989PCAMAP [Board File No. 250682]. Agenda Item 31, October 28, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting. ("Rezone").

The Rezone will entirely eliminate the North Beach Special Use District ("SUD"). In so doing, the Rezone will eliminate important protections for historic resources and displacement of residents and legacy businesses. The Rezone will also allow larger storefronts (up to 3,000 square feet rather than 2,000), will allow storefront mergers, will remove restrictions on restaurants in Jackson Square and North Beach, and will allow uses in North Beach that are currently prohibited,

including walk-up facilities, first floor health services, and flexible retail. On Pacific Avenue, the Rezone would allow first floor health services, and flexible retail, all of which are currently prohibited. All of these changes will have potentially significant environmental impacts that must be analyzed and mitigated under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

We request that the Board decline to act on the proposed Rezone until the City prepares an environmental review document under CEQA to analyze the project's impacts and to consider mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce those impacts. The Staff Report contains a single sentence stating that the Rezone is not a "project" within the meaning of CEQA because it will not have direct environmental impacts. (Planning Commission Staff Report, p. 12; CEQA determination). This is incorrect. The Rezone is a "project" because it is an essential step that may lead to direct or indirect environmental impacts.

The proposed Rezone is legally indistinguishable from the Ordinance addressed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Union of Med. Marijuana Patients, Inc. v. City of San Diego,* 7 Cal. 5th 1171, 1199 (2019) ("*Marijuana Patients*"). In that case, the City of San Diego argued that the rezoning of a certain commercial district to allow marijuana dispensaries was not a "project" under CEQA because any environmental impacts were speculative. The Supreme Court rejected this argument and held that the rezoning was a CEQA "project" because it could result in new construction and additional traffic. As such CEQA review was required. The Supreme Court stated:

> we conclude the City erred in determining that the adoption of the Ordinance was not a project. Prior to the Ordinance, no medical marijuana dispensaries were legally permitted to operate in the City. The Ordinance therefore amended the City's zoning regulations to permit the establishment of a sizable number of retail businesses of an entirely new type. Although inconsistency with prior permissible land uses is not necessary for an activity to constitute a project (see *Muzzy Ranch, supra*, 41 Cal.4th at p. 388), establishment of these new businesses is capable of causing indirect physical changes in the environment. At a minimum, such a policy change could foreseeably result in new retail construction to accommodate the businesses. In addition, as UMMP suggests, the establishment of new stores could cause a citywide change in patterns of vehicle traffic from the businesses' customers, employees, and suppliers. The necessary causal connection between the Ordinance and these effects is present because adoption of the Ordinance was "an essential step culminating in action [the establishment of new businesses] which may affect the environment." (*Fullerton Joint Union High School Dist. v. State Board of Education* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 779, 797 (*Fullerton*).) The theoretical effects mentioned above are sufficiently plausible to raise the possibility that the Ordinance "may cause ... a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment" (§ 21065), warranting its consideration as a project.

(*Marijuana Patients,* 7 Cal. 5th at 1199)[1].

[1]Similarly, the Supreme Court held in *Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Com.* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 263. 284 n.28) that CEQA review is required for an annexation of land, "at a point in the planning process where genuine flexibility remains." (*Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202

Likewise the proposed Rezone will allow larger commercial operations and new commercial uses that were previously prohibited or allowed only with a Conditional Use Authorization. It will also allow displacement of residents and legacy businesses. As in *Marijuana Patients*, this is likely to result in indirect physical changes to the environment through construction and additional traffic.

The Rezone proposes to entirely eliminate Municipal Code Section 780.3, the North Beach Special Use District. In so doing, the Rezone will eliminate important protections for historic resources, including Section (c)(7):

> Architectural and Cultural Heritage of North Beach. Section 101.1 of the Planning Code includes the priority policy that historic buildings be preserved. The architectural and cultural character and features of existing historic buildings shall be preserved and enhanced. The Historic Preservation Commission or its staff shall review any proposed alterations to historic buildings, as defined in subsection 780.3(b)(3), and must determine that such alterations comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties before the City approves any permits to alter such buildings.

Also, the Rezone will eliminate the broader definition of historic resources contained in the North Beach SUD. Section (b)(3) defines "historic resources" as follows:

> Historic Buildings. "Historic buildings" shall include Planning Code Article 10 Landmarks and buildings located within Article 10 Historic Districts, buildings and districts identified by surveys adopted by the City, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing on the National or California Registers, and buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts. The Planning Department shall also consult materials available through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and Inventory to determine eligibility.

Although the Rezone references the historic resource protections in Planning Code Section 102, those protections are far narrower than in the North Beach SUD. As explained by expert Architectural Historian Bridget Maley:

> The proposed new definition of historic resources references Planning Code Section 102 which does not include eligible National or California Register Historic Districts and their contributors as historic resources or resources identified through survey or inventory.
>
> By eliminating these important protections for historic resources, the Rezone would have adverse impacts on historic resources, including the fully documented, but not yet to be formally designated North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District. These impacts must be analyzed and mitigated through proper CEQA documentation. If mitigation is not feasible, then a statement of overriding considerations would be required.

Cal.App.3d 296, 307). In *Bozung*, the decision to annex property was a CEQA "project" despite the fact that there was no immediate plan to develop the project.

(See, Attachment A).

By eliminating these important protections for historic resources, the Rezone clearly may have adverse impacts on historic resources. This impact must be analyzed and mitigated in a CEQA document.[2]

The most recent publicly available draft of the Rezone would eliminate important protections against displacement contained in the North Beach SUD. We understand that these provisions may be revised. However, if they are not, CEQA review will be required to analyze the impacts of the Rezone on displacement. Section (c)(4) and (6) of the North Beach SUD provides:

> Loss of Residential Units. To prevent the loss of existing Residential Units within the district, the removal, demolition, merger, or conversion of Residential Units above the First Story are prohibited.
>
> Legacy Business. Unless otherwise prohibited by this Section 780.3, Section 722, or any other section of this Code, any new Non-Residential Use proposed where the immediately prior Commercial Use was a Legacy Business shall require Conditional Use authorization pursuant to Section 303 of this Code.

By eliminating the North Beach SUD, the Rezone will eliminate these important protections against displacement. Put simply, as a result of the Rezone, residential units above the first story may be and will be eliminated whereas, such displacement is flatly prohibited under the existing code. A CEQA document is required to analyze and mitigate the Rezone's impacts on displacement of housing and legacy businesses.[3] We urge the Board to remove this provision from the Rezone.

Allowing displacement of residential units with commercial businesses above the first floor runs directly contrary to the City's efforts to increase residential and "Family" zoning in the City and violates the recently enacted Housing Crisis Act (HCA). (Gov. Code §66300). The HCA provides:

---

[2] "The fair argument standard applies to the question whether the proposed project 'may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource' . . .and thereby have a significant effect on the environment." (*Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley* (2015) 60 Cal.4th 1086, 1117, quoting *Valley Advocates v. City of Fresno* (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th 1039, 1072.)

[3] Displacement is a significant impact under CEQA. (*Save Berkeley Neighborhoods v. Regents* (2020) 51 Cal.App.5th 226). CEQA requires the lead agency to determine whether the "environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly," (PRC § 21083(b)(3), (d)), and to "take immediate steps to identify any critical thresholds for the health and safety of the people of the state and take all coordinated actions necessary to prevent such thresholds being reached." (See PRC §21000 et seq.; CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Section XII).

> (b) (1) Notwithstanding any other law except as provided in subdivision (i), with respect to land where housing is an allowable use, an affected county or an affected city shall not enact a development policy, standard, or condition that would have any of the following effects:
> (A) Changing the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reducing the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018, except as otherwise provided in clause (ii) of subparagraph (B). For purposes of this subparagraph, "less intensive use" includes, but is not limited to, reductions to height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, or new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, or maximum lot coverage limitations, ***or anything that would lessen the intensity of housing.***

(Gov. Code §66300(b).) The Rezone would violate the HCA because it would "lessen the intensity of housing" below levels allowed in 2018 by allowing residential units above the first floor to be replaced with commercial units.

Furthermore, the Rezone will have cumulative impacts together with the so-called Family Zoning Plan currently being considered by the Board of Supervisors. The Family Zoning Plan will upzone massive swaths of the City to allow taller buildings and greater density – including allowing 5,200 additional residential units in the North Beach area. The Rezone and the Family Zoning Plan will clearly have cumulatively significant impacts on North Beach.

A CEQA document must discuss significant cumulative impacts. (CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a).) This requirement flows from CEQA section 21083, which requires a finding that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if "the possible effects of a project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. . . . 'Cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects." "Cumulative impacts" are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." CEQA Guidelines section 15355(a). "[I]ndividual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects." CEQA Guidelines section 15355(a). "The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time." (*Communities for a Better Environment v. Cal. Resources Agency ("CBE v. CRA"),* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 117.) A legally adequate cumulative impacts analysis views a particular project over time and in conjunction with other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects whose impacts might compound or interrelate with those of the project at hand. "Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a

period of time." CEQA Guidelines § 15355(b). The City's one-sentence CEQA analysis fails even to mention cumulative impacts.

We urge the Board of Supervisors to refrain from considering this Rezone until a CEQA document is prepared. The Rezone is clearly a "project" within the meaning of CEQA, and CEQA review is therefore required. Also, unless amended, the Rezone would violate the Housing Crisis Act because it allows displacement of residential uses above the first floor with commercial uses.

Sincerely,

Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

Cc: Environmental Review Officer Lisa Gibson, lisa.gibson@sfgov.org

City Attorney David Chiu, cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

ATTACHMENT A

October 27, 2025

Chair Myrna Melgar Supervisors Chyanne Chen, Bilal Mahmood
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Clerk John Carroll
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

VIA E-MAIL
[illegible]@sfgov.org
[illegible]Staff@sfgov.org
[illegible]moodStaff@sfgov.org
John.Carroll@sfgov.org

RE: Planning Code; Zoning Map - Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts. Objection to CEQA Exemption.

Land Use and Transportation Committee Agenda Item 15, October 27, 2025, Board File No. 250682

Dear Chair Melgar and Supervisors Chen and Mahmood:

I submit this comment letter on behalf of Small Business Forward, the Jackson Square Historic District Association, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, and Thad Carhart, a San Francisco resident, and in support of Lozeau Drury's letter of October 6, 2025, concerning the proposed action Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts; Case Number: 2025-[illegible]PCAMAP [Board File No. 250682]. Agenda Item 15, October 27, 2025, Land Use and Transportation ("LUT") Committee. ("Rezone").

As a professional with 32 years of experience in historic preservation and with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), I meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in History and Architectural History. I also have the following credentials: received a Master of Arts Degree in Architectural History from the University of Virginia's School of Architecture; previously served as president of the San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Board (appointed by Mayor Newsom); since 2012 have continuously been on the City of San Francisco Planning Department's approved consultant pool for historic resources consultants; was certified by the San Francsico Contract Monitoring Division (CMD) as a woman-owned Local Business Enterprise (LBE). I have written innumerable historic resource and historic district documentation and evaluation reports throughout the course of my career.

1715 green street san francisco, ca 94123 *phone:* 415.760.4318 bridget@architecture-history.com
www.architecture-history.com

Additionally, I peer reviewed and consulted on the North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District nomination, deemed adequate by the California State Historic Preservation Office staff, but not yet heard by the State Historical Resources Commission (three times continued from agendized meetings).

It is my professional the proposed Rezone constitutes a "Project" as defined by CEQA, as it is an essential step that may lead to direct or indirect environmental impacts. The Rezone would eliminate the North Beach Special Use District ("SUD"). In so doing, the Rezone would also remove important protections for both designated and previously identified historic resources within the Rezone area.

The Rezone, if approved, would have potentially significant environmental impacts that must be analyzed and mitigated under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") as a "Project."

The Rezone proposes to eliminate Municipal Code Section 780.3, the North Beach Special Use District. In so doing, the Rezone will eliminate important protections for historic resources, including Section (c)(7):

> Architectural and Cultural Heritage of North Beach. Section 101.1 of the Planning Code includes the priority policy that historic buildings be preserved. The architectural and cultural character and features of existing historic buildings shall be preserved and enhanced. The Historic Preservation Commission or its staff shall review any proposed alterations to historic buildings, as defined in subsection 780.3(b)(3), and must determine that such alterations comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties before the City approves any permits to alter such buildings.

Also, the Rezone will eliminate the broader definition of historic resources contained in the North Beach SUD Section 780.3 (b)(3), which currently defines "historic resources" as follows:

> Historic Buildings. "Historic buildings" shall include Planning Code Article 10 Landmarks and buildings located within Article 10 Historic Districts, buildings and districts identified by surveys adopted by the City, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing on the National or California Registers, and buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts. The Planning Department shall also consult materials available through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and Inventory to determine eligibility.

741 green street san francisco, ca 94123 *phone:* 415.760.4318 bridget@architecture-history.com
www.architecture-history.com

The proposed new definition of historic resources references Planning Code Section 102 which does not include eligible National or California Register Historic Districts and their contributors as historic resources or resources identified through survey or inventory.

By eliminating these important protections for historic resources, the Rezone would have adverse impacts on historic resources, including the fully documented, but not yet to be formally designated North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District. These impacts must be analyzed and mitigated through proper CEQA documentation. If mitigation is not feasible, then a statement of overriding considerations would be required.

On behalf of the parties listed above, I urge you to decline to act on the proposed Rezone until the City prepares an environmental review document as required by CEQA to analyze the project's impacts and to consider mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce those impacts.

Sincerely,

Bridget Maley
Principal

cc:
Environmental Review Officer Lisa Gibson, lisa.gibson@sfgov.org
City Attorney David Chiu, cityattorney@sfcityatty.org
D4 Supervisor Danny Sauter, SauterStaff@sfgov.org
Richard Drury, Lozeau Drury, richard@lozeaudrury.com
Nick Ferris, President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, nicholashferris@gmail.com

1770 green street san francisco, ca 94123 *phone:* 415.760.4318 bridget@architecture-history.com
www.architecture-history.com

From:	Jackson Square
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	Jackson Square Opposition to Board of Supervisor's File No. 250682
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:59:37 AM
Attachments:	BOS File 250682_Pt 1.Jackson Sq Opposition Lttrspdf.pdf BOS File 250682_Pt 2 Jackson Sq Opposition Lttrs.pdf BOS File No. 250682_Pt 3 Jackson Sq Opposition Lttrs.pdf

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

October 27, 2025

RE: BOS File No. 250682 - Letter of Opposition

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors,

The Jackson Square Historic District Association, founded in 1998, is devoted to the success of this tiny one-of-a-kind enclave. As SF's first historic district, it includes the only surviving brick and ornate cast iron buildings from the 1850's-1880's along with lighting and greenscapes funded privately by residential owners and a CBD enacted by same.

For the data-driven reasons summarized below, we oppose changing bar/restaurant use from from the current "no net new", to allowing unlimited bars/restaurants with a Conditional Use permit. This is especially critical for the most oversaturated blocks that are already near or above 50% bar/restaurant use: Hotaling Place (a tiny single historic lane) and the 500 Block of Washington St (north side of Washington within the JSHD). These vulnerable, short blocks contain boutique retail and the majority of Jackson Square residential homes. Why would you support obliterating what's left of other commercial uses and a sustainable residential community on these adjoined blocks, especially given the City's and Mayor Lurie's priority goals of attracting residents and retail to invest in and live Downtown?

There are currently 17 bars and restaurants within our tiny 2 block x 1.5 block historic district and literally dozens more within a 3 minute walk. Many of them generate negative impacts on adjacent historic properties and streetscapes. Retail shops, offices, and residents already contend with bars and restaurants that frequently ignore codes, and inconsistent City enforcement places the compliance burden on neighbors.

Data clearly shows that CU is not a sufficient protection from continuing to oversaturate mixed-use blocks with high densities of bars/restaurants: CU permits are often rubber-stamped, and also place the burden of defending healthy balance on busy neighborhood stakeholders. Once a property converts to bar/restaurant use, it typically stays that way due to the interior build-out and speculative landlords seeking higher rent, even when the space becomes vacant.

Urban planning data and expert research from hundreds of cities consistently shows that high densities (above 25%) of bars/restaurants on a given block increases noise, trash/broken glass, property damage, public urination, and assaults. This further degrades residential livability, tourist and retail environment, and business diversity.

Jackson Square is thriving - and its current success is based on balanced mixed-use supported by leading urban planning research. This un-informed legislation will encourage the continued oversaturation of bar/restaurant use on already oversaturated blocks, destroying the healthy (and fragile) mixed-use balance we've achieved. Our current SUD protections were enacted over a decade ago with support from diverse community stakeholders and was unanimously endorsed by both the City's Small Business Commission and the BOS. These protections underpin our success and have preserved historic buildings while sustaining a healthy neighborhood mix of retail shops, galleries, design firms, bars/restaurants, residential homes & apartments, offices, and services. This stability has encouraged investment from residents and businesses alike, making Jackson Square one of the few Downtown districts to thrive as cited in multiple recent local media articles (like this one and this one).

We also oppose allowing street-level commercial uses of 4,000 sq ft (or larger). Coupled with the removal of bar/restaurant limits, this will destroy Jackson Street's uniquely thriving Boutique Row. 4,000 sq ft is massively out of scale for this tiny historic district's narrow streetscapes, and will obliterate the economics for our small retail and other businesses. Breaking down walls to combine street-level commercial spaces into huge high-rent spaces will create vacancies, and encourage formula chain retail.

This proposed legislation offers no supporting data, and caught businesses and residents by surprise, including 7 key neighborhood groups across North Beach, Russian Hill, Chinatown and Jackson Square who all testified at both the SF Planning Commission and Land Use Committee hearings. Both the Planning Commission and the Land Use Committee acknowledged these problems and urged a slow-down to collect real data and to embrace community input.

When our volunteers asked many of JS's retail businesses and bar/restaurants, nearly all said they'd never heard of this proposed legislation. That's consistent with the 180 pages of letters submitted to the last Land Use Committee hearing: 98% of them expressed either strong concerns or outright opposition to the proposed legislation. If that's any indication (and if we're being realistic), the proposed legislation would fail if it were a referendum.

WE URGE YOU TO EMBRACE DATA (and COMMON SENSE): Would you delete Apple's source code from your iPhone and expect it to still text, email and make calls (eg. to actually *work)*? Of course not. Jackson Square's SUD is its source code. *Maintain the existing data-informed Section 249.25 controls in tiny Jackson Square and EXCLUDE it from this legislation*, or at least enact a "no net new" carve-out on the most oversaturated and vulnerable blocks referenced above. Preserving what's left of residential livability and successful retail on Hotaling Place,

500 block of Washington, and the unique boutique row of 400 block of Jackson is critical. This still leaves enough room in Jackson Square for whatever the unstated goals of this legislation are.

P.S. We've attached a **sampling of the multiple letters** on record from Jackson Square business and residential stakeholders. Please represent our tiny historic district!

Sincerely,
Matthew Stegman
Jackson Square Historic District Association

From: Don du Bain
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc: Sauter, Danny (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: Fwd: BOS File No. 250682
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 6:58:20 AM

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

Dear Supervisors Melgar, Chen and Mahmood:

As a 25-year homeowner in District 3 on the border of Jackson Square, I oppose Supervisor Sauter's legislation pending before your committee without further amendments.

I have already voiced my opposition to this legislation before the Planning Commission, which only narrowly approved its passage for consideration by your committee. I have heard the objections of my neighbors at the hearing, who were comprised mostly of residents and representatives of neighborhood associations, and am convinced that this legislation has not been adequately vetted with the constituents in District 3. Although Supervisor Sauter claims to have met with multiple associations, he has not vetted his legislation with at least seven neighborhood associations in District 3 who also oppose his legislation in its current form, including the following:

* Telegraph Hill Dwellers Association
* North Beach Business Association
* Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
*. Jackson Square Historic District Association
*. Russian Hill Community Association
* Chinatown Neighborhood Association
*. North Beach Tenants Association

I do not claim to be an expert in this matter, but I am alarmed at the rushed process that this proposed legislation has taken through the legislative process. I urge your committee to halt its approval until the residential constituencies of District 3 have had an adequate opportunity to try to work out an agreeable compromise to Supervisor Sauter's proposed changes, especially as they relate to Jackson Square. Jackson Square is a vibrant and beautiful district in our City that does not need more bars, much less 4000 square foot restaurants that would dwarf the existing restaurants and shops and destroy the character of this historic district.

Please do not approve this legislation without granting these seven neighborhood associations an opportunity to participate in crafting a better alternative than what this pending legislation proposes in its current form.

Best regards,
Donald du Bain

From:	Mark Sugarman
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS)
Subject:	BOS File No. 250682 - LETTER OF OPPOSITION
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 7:34:41 PM

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

For the following reasons I oppose this plan:

1) Local resident organizations were not consulted
2) There are already a sufficient number of restaurants and bars in Jackson Square and North Beach
3) Restaurants have a high rate of failure. If spaces are converted for restaurant use and the restaurant closes, the space will not revert to retail
4) 4,000 square feet of space is too large for the Jackson Square neighborhood
5) Both North Beach and Jackson Square have extremely low vacancy rates. Why are we not concentrating on areas with blocks of empty spaces?

At a minimum this plan needs to be put on hold until all potentially affected parties - especially residents of North Beach, Jackson Square and adjacent areas - have been consulted.

Thank you.

Mark Sugarman
440 Davis Court # 911
San Francisco, CA 94111
marksugarman579@gmail.com
Cell 415-710-4226

From: Amy Bekowich
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject: BOS File No. 250682 Letter of Opposition
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:05:39 PM

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

As a Jackson Square resident for twenty years I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed legislation that will dismantle critical elements of Jackson Square's *Special Use District* zoning.

Our long-established organizations have championed legislation over many years that has successfully enabled our commercial corridors to thrive with a balance of business types, low vacancy rates, and residential protections for livability, while maintaining the unique character of our neighborhoods.

Supervisor Daniel Sauter, you proposed this new legislation with no supporting data or community input. Businesses and residents representing North Beach, Russian Hill, Chinatown and Jackson Square testified at both the SF Planning Commission and Land Use Committee hearings and both agencies acknowledged these problems and urged you to slow down your rushed exclusionary process, collect relevant data, and embrace community input. Unfortunately you have continued to push forward and offer only inconsequential amendments that will not mitigate the negative impacts to our neighborhood.

And the negative impacts are substantial:

- Your legislation would allow an unlimited number of bars/restaurants with a Conditional Use permit. There are already SEVENTEEN bars and restaurants within Jackson Square's tiny 2 block x 1.5 block historic district, and dozens more within blocks. **Data consistently shows that higher density of alcohol-serving establishments is correlated with increased noise, property damage, public urination, and assaults.**

- Your legislation would allow street-level commercial uses of 4,000 sq ft (or larger). **This is massively out of scale for this historic district and will obliterate the economics for our small businesses.**

Your determination to follow through on this legislation undermines years of thoughtful, data-informed planning that has made Jackson Square one of San Francisco's few downtown success stories. But your "fire drill" approach to getting this legislation passed indicates that you have ignored this fact, seemingly for monetary reasons. It's all about the money, right? More money...more, more, more, more. I ask you, "When is enough?"

Ironically, this "more" mentality will likely result in less: less revenue for existing businesses due to increased competition, a lesser quality of life for the residents in the neighborhood, less protection and safety due to increased risk of property damage and assaults, less neighborhood charm, less available parking, less peacefulness after hours, less motivation by visitors to frequent the neighborhood, and less balance of historic preservation, small business health and residential livability.

Our neighborhood's future shouldn't be decided by you - behind closed doors or rushed through without data and neighborhood collaboration. **What if this was happening to you and your neighborhood?** Surely, you would not approve.

I implore you to think about the repercussions of your proposed legislation.

Amy Bekowich
Jackson Square
415-407-7933

Get Outlook for Android

From:	Rhoda Schneiderman
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Andrews, Michelle (BOS)
Subject:	RE: BOS File No. 250682 Letter of Opposition
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 2:49:19 PM

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

I want to register my strenuous opposition to the above zoning changes for Jackson Square, but not limited to Jackson Square in the above proposal.
All the proposed changes to the "no net new" for bars and restaurants will be detrimental to current businesses and residents who live in Jackson Square and the adjacent areas. Increased late night noise, trash and crime will be the result of a zoning change that has no basis in data or even common sense. Jackson Square works beautifully within the current zoning framework and will continue to thrive if left without further government meddling.

Street level commercial usage in excess of 4000 sq ft is massively out of scale with a < 4sq block footprint of a neighborhood. North Beach is an adjacent area already successfully brimming with restaurants/bars and sadly not enough retail.

This proposal really doesn't address the actual need that businesses and potential new businesses face. That is a streamlining of the permitting, inspection and approval process. Those are procedural issues that have nothing to do with zoning and can be addressed by making departments more effective and making sure there is sufficient staff to handle the approval process in an expedient manner. Pretend you are Starbucks and have a transaction time frame you have to adhere to.

Once again even after Supervisor Sauter was admonished for not reaching out, we at The Gateway have never received an email or mailing concerning the results of the last meeting or this upcoming meeting. He certainly has all our contact info given we are in his district. That is unforgivable. I can only hope it is an over zealous, rookie mistake.

I hope the members will overwhelmingly vote no on this proposal or table it for at least a 2 week period in order to get real feedback from the entirety of the neighborhoods affected.

Thank you.

Rhoda Schneiderman
550 Battery St. apt. 1520
San Francisco, CA 94111

From:	Terry Kraus
To:	Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject:	BOS File No. 250682 - LETTER OF OPPOSTION
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 2:38:12 PM

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

For the following reasons I oppose this plan:

1) Local resident organizations were not consulted
2) There are already a sufficient number of restaurants and bars in Jackson Square and North Beach
3) Restaurants have a high rate of failure. If spaces are converted for restaurant use and the restaurant closes, the space will not revert to retail
4) 4,000 square feet of space is too large for the Jackson Square neighborhood
5) Both North Beach and Jackson Square have extremely low vacancy rates. Why are we not concentrating on areas with blocks of empty spaces?

At a minimum this plan needs to be put on hold until all potentially affected parties - especially residents of North Beach, Jackson Square and adjacent areas - have been consulted.

Thank you.

Terry Kraus, 24 year resident of The Gateway
440 Davis Court #911
SF 94111
tkraus27@gmail.com

From: V Hines
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS)
Subject: Land Use Committee consideration of BOS File No. 250682
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 4:12:15 PM

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

Dear Committee Members:

As a 17-year resident of Jackson Square I am deeply concerned about the lack of collaboration with those of us who call the area home with respect to the big changes contained in the Jackson Square rezoning proposal. This is a unique and historic part of the city, as evidenced by all the people and businesses that want to call our neighborhood home these days. San Francisco doesn't need another once-distinctive district turned into a cookie cutter by big money. We can afford to be thoughtful, strategic, and inclusive as we plan for the future. Change is happening, no one denies it, but I'm looking to the city for leadership and stewardship over San Francisco's resources, not simply caving to the whim of the deepest pockets.

Unfortunately I'm traveling and can't attend tomorrow's hearing, but I wanted you to hear the point of view of this resident and voter.

Sincerely,
Virginia Hines

SEE NEXT PAGE…

October 6, 2025

Chair Melgar & Members
San Francisco Land Use Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Opposition to BOS File No. 250682

Hello Chair Melgar, Supervisor Chen, Supervisor Mahmood, and Supervisor Sauter:

We respectfully write to you as both residents and HOA of a mixed-use building containing bars/restaurants in Jackson Square, where I also practice law. **We are strongly opposed to Supervisor Sauter's proposal to weaken our existing Section 249.25 framework, which has been essential in maintaining the character and balance of this unique historic neighborhood.**

The current success of Jackson Square is based on balance mixed use. Since 2018, the current land use protections - crafted with broad input and unanimous City support - have preserved historic buildings while sustaining a healthy mix of retail shops, galleries, bars/restaurants, homes, offices, and services. This stability has encouraged investment from residents and businesses alike, making Jackson Square one of the few Downtown districts to thrive even through the pandemic.

We oppose the changing Bar/Restaurant Use from from the current "no net new" on-for-one (new ones limited to occupying one of the existing 17 bar/restaurant spaces already in this tiny historic district) to permitting unlimited bars/restaurants with Conditional Use. This is the key and critically destructive element in this legislation proposal for Jackson Square and undermines the currently successful mixed use balance we've worked hard to achieve. Having worked for many years with the City, we all know that CU is often pure "optics", and puts the burden on the neighborhood to simply maintain existing successful frameworks. We also know that once a property has been converted to bar/restaurant use, it often stays that way in near perpetuity due to several factors. The proposed legislation dismantle the foundation of Jackson Square's success, and data supports that. **Our small district already saturated with bars and restaurants (with several inside and adjacent to our building, and a dozen more within a 90 second walk).** They create serious impacts on retail environment and residential livability: noise, vandalism/property damage, broken windows

and bottles, trash (and *worse)*, and constant enforcement challenges. Allowing additional saturation would tip us over the edge and make this district unlivable. Driving working residents out of an historic district that already enjoys extremely high commercial occupancy seems backwards given the City's priorities.

Process matters, too. None of the Jackson Square business and residential friends we asked said they were aware of this proposal, and were against it once informed. How does oversaturating bar & restaurant vs balanced mixed use strengthen a unique hsitoric district that is already working well?

As neighborhood stakeholders who live and work here, we see daily how much residents and businesses invest in Jackson Square - through the Community Benefit District (enacted only through the effort of *residents*), streetscape and historic building upkeep, and more. Weakening the current zoning protections would undo years of progress and create unnecessary problems for the City to manage.

We respectfully urge you to reject File No. 250682 and keep "no net new" in Section 249.25 intact. The framework is working, and there is no data that supports dismantling it.

Sincerely,
Charles Carbone, Esq.
25 Hotaling & 580 Washington HOA President, Jackson Square

—----------

SEE NEXT PAGE…

---------- Forwarded message ---------

From: **Peter Colby** <peterwcolby@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Oct 25, 2025 at 9:41 AM

Subject: RE: BOS File No. 250682 Letter of Opposition

To: <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>, <Bilal.Mahmood@sfgov.org>, <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>, <John.Carroll@sfgov.org>, <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>, <Michelle.Andrews@sfgov.org>

To the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing in OPPOSITION to this matter as a long-time resident of Jackson Square. I reviewed the attached 170 pages of letters submitted to the Land Use Committee and found only 1 letter, from an individual, supporting the legislation. The scores of other commenters all expressed serious reservations or in most cases outright opposition to the legislation. Notably, in a detailed response to a request for information on support for the measure, Supervisor Sauter claims to have received support from "almost a dozen small business owners"; however, he names no names and oddly, none of those business owners wrote the Committee in support. Please reject it.

Peter Colby

350 Jackson Street #401

SEE NEXT PAGE…

From: Steven Tsang <steven@skylineam.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 5, 2025 11:57 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Cc: Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>
Subject: File No. 250682 – Letter of Opposition

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

Dear Members of the Land Use Committee,

I am writing once again as a concerned Jackson Square residential property manager/owner regarding the proposed deletion of the Jackson Square Special Use District land use controls (Planning Code Section 249.25) contained in Supervisor Sauter's proposed legislation (File No. 250682). Two years ago, with the support of the Jackson Square Historic District Association, I spoke out against a similar effort led by Mayor Breed (File No. 230701), and was relieved when that proposal was ultimately rejected in favor of preserving the existing balance that has made Jackson Square such a vibrant and livable downtown neighborhood. The former Belli Building, currently owned and managed by our group, is a testament to why we should maintain the current controls absent new data or input from the community. These controls have helped make Jackson Square such a great place to live and for small businesses to thrive.

Thus, I am troubled to see the same issue resurface so soon, and I must once again urge you to protect what has been proven to work. Jackson Square is unlike anywhere else in San Francisco, with its rare collection of 1850s–1870s brick and cast-iron buildings, narrow streetscapes, and privately funded lighting and greenscapes supported by residents and stakeholders alike for decades. This historic fabric is fragile. The neighborhood already contains seventeen bars and restaurants within its tiny two-block by one-and-a-half-block area, with many more just steps away. Our residents and retail tenants routinely bear the burden of the excess noise, trash, vandalism, broken bottles, and other side effects of nightlife activity. Allowing new bars and restaurants "as of right" — and even larger venues of over 4,000 square feet by conditional approval — would likely overwhelm the character and charm of this district.

What is most concerning is that this proposal seems to have been brought forth with little or no outreach to residents, businesses or other key stakeholders. Such a narrow consultation process ignores the residents and small businesses who live with the daily consequences of land use decisions in this neighborhood. I would really like to understand the rush to push this change through. I've personally walked the neighborhood numerous times, invested money in the neighborhood, including supporting the extra taxes that fund the Community Benefits District, which helps cover clean-up, tree maintenance, and security. Those services are not luxuries — they have become necessities due to the existing

LETTER CONTINUED NEXT PAGE…

Weakening the controls now would undo years of hard work and investment by those of us who have committed to making Jackson Square a vibrant, functional, and most importantly, a livable neighborhood for both commercial and residential tenants. The current controls in Section 249.25 were created with broad community input, earned unanimous support from the City's Small Business Commission, and were unanimously adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2018. These controls have encouraged a diverse mix of businesses — boutique retail, galleries, services, and cultural institutions — while sustaining a stable residential community. This balance has kept Jackson Square healthy both before and after the pandemic, something that few downtown districts can claim.

Thus, I ask you to please maintain the protections in Section 249.25 as they are until more information has been gathered and more input from the community has been solicited. Let's not rush into anything and start making broad changes without fully thinking things through. This is not about resisting change but about ensuring that any changes are thoughtful, data-driven, and respectful of the delicate balance that has made Jackson Square one of San Francisco's success stories. Thank you for considering the perspective of an owner who cares deeply about the future of Jackson Square.

Sincerely,

Steven Tsang

Manager, San Francisco 722 Montgomery LLC
and a concerned Jackson Square Residential Property Owner

SEE NEXT PAGE

September 4, 2025

Via Email
Lydia So, President & Members
San Francisco Planning Commission
49 S Van Ness Ave., Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: BOS File No. 250682 Letter of Opposition

Dear President So and Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing as a resident of Jackson Square, having lived with my wife at 350 Jackson Street #401 since 2012. Through these many years I have enjoyed the unique character of this neighborhood and have taken advantage of the numerous stores, restaurants, and bars nearby. The recent press coverage of Jackson Square as being the “hot new neighborhood” in San Francisco has only confirmed what I have long known.

The one downside of living in a thriving downtown neighborhood with a mix of uses is the noise and congestion stemming from the commercial activity. We already experience far more noise than other neighborhoods—every night we hear the Recology trucks dumping bottles and cans from dumpsters, while the backup alarms run continuously. It often seems that workers in the neighborhood act as though nobody lives here. In short, while I love the vitality of Jackson Square, my hope for the neighborhood is more housing, not more commerce. Adding more and larger bars and restaurants to the neighborhood will accentuate what I like least about living here and do nothing to improve my quality of life.

I would like to know the basis for the proposed change in the use limits for my neighborhood. Is there a shortage of bars and restaurants? The change seems to assume this is the case, but I am not aware of any study that indicates this. I would like to know how this proposal arose and who is behind it. I wrote to Supervisor Sauter’s office asking these questions, but have received no response.

I strongly oppose this change. I am not aware of a considered rationale for the change but am certain of the negative impacts. And my concern is exacerbated by the lack of transparency as to how this proposal arose in the first place—knowing who is promoting a change can illuminate the underlying rationale. I trust that the Commission will send this proposal to a well-deserved grave. Thank you for considering this comment.

Very truly yours,



Peter Colby

Page 1 / 1

SEE NEXT PAGE

October 6, 2025

Chair Melgar & Members
San Francisco Land Use Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Opposition to BOS File No. 250682

Hello Chair Melgar, Supervisor Chen, Supervisor Mahmood, and Supervisor Sauter:

We respectfully write to you as both residents and HOA of a mixed-use building containing bars/restaurants in Jackson Square, where I also practice law. **We are strongly opposed to Supervisor Sauter's proposal to weaken our existing Section 249.25 framework, which has been essential in maintaining the character and balance of this unique historic neighborhood.**

The current success of Jackson Square is based on balance mixed use. Since 2018, the current land use protections - crafted with broad input and unanimous City support - have preserved historic buildings while sustaining a healthy mix of retail shops, galleries, bars/restaurants, homes, offices, and services. This stability has encouraged investment from residents and businesses alike, making Jackson Square one of the few Downtown districts to thrive even through the pandemic.

We oppose the changing Bar/Restaurant Use from from the current "no net new" on-for-one (new ones limited to occupying one of the existing 17 bar/restaurant spaces already in this tiny historic district) to permitting unlimited bars/restaurants with Conditional Use. This is the key and critically destructive element in this legislation proposal for Jackson Square and undermines the currently successful mixed use balance we've worked hard to achieve. Having worked for many years with the City, we all know that CU is often pure "optics", and puts the burden on the neighborhood to simply maintain existing successful frameworks. We also know that once a property has been converted to bar/restaurant use, it often stays that way in near perpetuity due to several factors. The proposed legislation dismantle the foundation of Jackson Square's success, and data supports that. **Our small district already saturated with bars and restaurants (with several inside and adjacent to our building, and a dozen more within a 90 second walk).** They create serious impacts on retail environment and residential livability: noise, vandalism/property damage, broken windows and bottles, trash (and *worse)*, and constant enforcement challenges. Allowing additional saturation would tip us over the edge and make this district unlivable. Driving working residents out of an historic district that already enjoys extremely high commercial occupancy seems backwards given the City's priorities.

Process matters, too. None of the Jackson Square business and residential friends we asked said they were aware of this proposal, and were against it once informed. How does oversaturating bar & restaurant vs balanced mixed use strengthen a unique hsitoric district that is already working well?

As neighborhood stakeholders who live and work here, we see daily how much residents and businesses invest in Jackson Square - through the Community Benefit District (enacted only through the effort of *residents*), streetscape and historic building upkeep, and more. Weakening the current zoning protections would undo years of progress and create unnecessary problems for the City to manage.

We respectfully urge you to reject File No. 250682 and keep "no net new" in Section 249.25 intact. The framework is working, and there is no data that supports dismantling it.

Sincerely,
Charles Carbone, Esq.
25 Hotaling & 580 Washington HOA President, Jackson Square



Jackson Square
HISTORIC DISTRICT ASSOC.

October 6, 2025

Chair Melgar & Members
San Francisco Land Use Committee
City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: BOS File No. 250682 Letter of Opposition

Dear Chair Melgar, Supervisor Chen, Supervisor Mahmood, and Supervisor Sauter,

The Jackson Square Historic District Association, founded in 1998, is devoted to the success of this tiny, one-of-a-kind enclave. As SF's first historic district, it includes the only surviving brick and ornate cast iron buildings from the 1850's-1880's along with lighting and greenscapes funded privately and a CBD enacted by residential owners. We attract residents, businesses, visitors, and many tour groups that visit our thriving small neighborhood daily.

The current success of Jackson Square is based on balanced mixed use. Our existing land use protections - *crafted with broad input and unanimous City support* - have preserved historic buildings while sustaining a healthy mix of retail shops, galleries, design firms, bars/restaurants, residential homes & apartments, offices, and services. This stability has encouraged investment from residents and businesses alike, making Jackson Square one of the few Downtown districts to thrive, throughout the pandemic and beyond.


For these reasons and the data supporting them, we oppose changing Bar/Restaurant Use from from the current "no net new" (new ones must occupy one of the existing bar/restaurant spaces) **to permitting more bars/restaurants with Conditional Use.** We also oppose allowing uses larger than 4,000 square feet with a Conditional Use Authorization - massively out of scale for this tiny historic district. The data shows that CU is essentially a rubber stamp that puts the burden on the neighborhood to maintain the existing Section 249.25 framework that has been essential in maintaining the character and balance of this unique historic neighborhood. Once a property converts to bar/restaurant use, it typically stays that way (even if it becomes vacant).

There are currently SEVENTEEN bars and restaurants within our tiny 2 block x 1.5 block historic district, five more on adjacent sides of the JSHD borders, and literally dozens more within a 3-5 minute walk. Many of them generate negative impacts on adjacent historic properties and streetscapes including property damage, broken glass, noise and trash. Retail shops, offices, and residents already contend with bars and restaurants that frequently ignore codes, and inconsistent City enforcement places the compliance burden on neighbors.

Our current SUD framework was informed by voluminous data from other cities and planners in Boston, New Orleans (Vieux Carré), New York and Los Angeles, and have proven remarkably successful both pre and post-pandemic, as evidenced by simply walking the district, as well as numerous articles in local media highlighting Jackson Square as a downtown success story. The SUD enhances variety, limits vacancies, and inhibits the type of real estate speculation that often cannibalizes the most unique, community-serving establishments in our neighborhoods. The data shows that we do not need more bars and restaurants adding to the existing saturation. We are thriving with high neighborhood occupancy rates.

The City has real problems to work on in other neighborhoods vs. creating a new one that doesn't currently exist in the Jackson Square Historic District. We urge you to exclude Jackson Square from this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Matthew Stegman, Jackson Square Historic District Association
JacksonSqHDA@gmail.com



The tiny Jackson Square Historic District comprises the City's only remaining historic 1850's-1880's building assets and physical reminders of our beginnings as a great Pacific port.

(Red Areas destroyed in '06 Quake & Fire).



From:	Daniel Ma
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS)
Subject:	Opposition to Board of Supervisor's File No. 250682
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 1:43:12 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org

RE: **Opposition to Board of Supervisor's File No. 250682**
Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors,

I oppose the current Legislation before you because it strikes at the very hart of the culture of what makes North Beach a unique and vibrant commercial district. Fact is that it has not been proposed from needs that really exist inside either the residential nor our businesses of North Beach.
It can only surmised that this legislation, taken in the context of proposed "up-zoning" currently being proposed in our city and particularly aimed at our North Beach commercial district, would serve large corporate interest both in real-estate and formula retail.

There are three elements of this legislation that are particularly disturbing.

First is the removal of non-residential size caps for North Beach retail businesses. Our North Beach Business Association has take a stand calling for maintaining these caps for the following reasons.

> *"The Use Size Cap is a critical tool that has helped North Beach maintain its unique character as a vibrant mixed-use neighborhood. Its removal during recent Land Use and Board of Supervisors meetings occurred without consultation with the very businesses it affects. This cap ensures that no single type of business dominates our streetscape, preserving the diverse ecosystem of shops, services, and dining that makes North Beach a destination for both residents and visitors. We respectfully request this provision be*

reinstated to protect the economic diversity that has made our neighborhood thrive for generations." NBBA

Second is the removal of prohibitions on the proliferation of bars and restaurants. The bars and restaurants we have currently in North Beach are there because they serve the culture and character of the community each in there own unique ways. Adding more would facilitate an invasion of corporate mediocrity trying to take advantage of the amazing reputation, character and world renowned cuisines our North Beach commercial district has built for over a century. Further, it would push our retail shops and stores. As our North Beach Business Association has stated;

"North Beach already has the highest concentration of restaurants and bars per capita of any residential neighborhood in San Francisco. Our existing regulation preventing restaurants from replacing non-restaurant businesses has successfully maintained affordability and diversity. However, with 5 of 8 current vacant storefronts being former restaurants, we risk further concentration. Restaurant spaces require costly infrastructure that makes conversion difficult and expensive, potentially locking in uses that limit future flexibility. We need measured controls to ensure residents can still access essential services like hardware stores, markets, and specialty shops within walking distance." NBBA

Third is the removal of the prohibition on Storefront Mergers. This allows a merger of up to 3,000 square feet of space. To put this in perspective this is larger than combining 4 current storefronts on Upper Grant Ave. at this time! This is crazy and would only serve the establishment of corporate retail at a future time.

Please amend and/or vote down this legislation at this time.

Thank You,
Dan Macchiarini
Macchiarini Creative Design
SF Charter Legacy Business in our 77th year
Board Member and Past President NBBA

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	2 Letters regarding File No. 250682
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:48:00 AM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding File No. 250682.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding File No. 250682.

> **File No. 250682:** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to: 1) eliminate the North Beach Special Use District and consolidate certain controls into the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, 2) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 3) expand allowable uses in the Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District, 4) expand allowable uses and increase use size limits in the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 5) reduce limitations on Restaurants and Bars in the Jackson Square Special Use District; amending the Zoning Map to reflect removal of the North Beach Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. (Sauter)

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:	North Beach Business Association
To:	Sauter, Danny (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS)
Cc:	ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; EngardioStaff (BOS); MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); Waltonstaff (BOS); ChenStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	SUBJECT: URGENT Request to Adopt Compromise Amendments for North Beach NCD Legislation
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:15:57 PM
Attachments:	SUBJECT_ URGENT Request to Adopt Compromise Amendments for North Beach NCD Legislation - 10_28_2025.pdf

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of **over 50 North Beach businesses** regarding the D3 business legislation scheduled for today's Board meeting. We have developed critical compromise amendments that allow new businesses to open while protecting our neighborhood's unique character.

Our amendments address four urgent issues:

1. Preventing unlimited restaurant conversions that would oversaturate our market
2. Restricting storefront mergers that price out small businesses
3. Reinstating the Use Size Cap (removed without business consultation)
4. Creating pathways for vacant retail spaces through SEC. 186.4

These are win-win solutions - every business cited as needing this legislation can still open under our amendments, while protecting existing businesses from displacement.
After months of collaboration with Supervisor Sauter's office, we've crafted surgical fixes using existing frameworks, such as SEC. 781.6 that can be implemented immediately without delaying the legislation or requiring new district maps.

I've attached our detailed letter outlining these amendments. Please review it before today's vote. This is our last opportunity to get this right for North Beach.

The future of our neighborhood's diverse business ecosystem, from flower shops to bookstores to Italian specialty stores, depends on your consideration of these amendments today.

Thank you for your urgent attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Stuart Watts
President, North Beach Business Association
Cell: (415) 309-1925
Email: info@sfnbba.org

Attachment: URGENT Request to Adopt Compromise Amendments for North Beach NCD Legislation.pdf

TO: The Honorable Rafael Mandelman and Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

FROM: Stuart Watts, President, North Beach Business Association
DATE: October 28, 2025

SUBJECT: URGENT Request to Adopt Compromise Amendments for North Beach NCD Legislation

Honorable Members of the Board,

My name is Stuart Watts, President of the North Beach Business Association. As a 10-year small business owner and a San Franciscan whose family has operated businesses here since the 1850s, I write to you today on a matter of urgent importance for the future of North Beach. Our association has been working for months with Supervisor Sauter's office to find a balanced solution for the new North Beach business legislation. While we are in full support of helping new businesses open, the legislation as currently written, though well-intentioned, will have devastating, unintended consequences for the unique retail ecosystem we all cherish.

Executive Summary

The current legislation, which was approved by the Land Use Committee, endangers this ecosystem with three primary concerns:

1. **Unlimited Restaurants:** North Beach already has the highest concentration of restaurants per capita in the city. Removing all controls will saturate the market, increase rent, and create a one-way street of conversions (as kitchens are too expensive to remove), permanently eliminating spaces for non-food retail.
2. **Limiting Storefront Mergers:** Allowing storefront mergers will inevitably drive up commercial rents and displace the small retailers that define our neighborhood.
3. **Removal of the Use Size Cap:** The bill's removal of the 4,000 sq. ft. size cap, which was done without business consultation, opens the door for large, out-of-character storefronts, threatening the intimate scale of the neighborhood and the affordability for small businesses.
4. **Vacant non-conforming spaces:** Provide a path for non-conforming retail spaces outside of commercial districts to seek conditional use authorization.

The Stakes: Preserving a Unique Business Ecosystem

North Beach maintains a diverse collection of businesses unlike any other neighborhood in America. Within a single block, you'll find a jewelry shop, gift shop, record store, flower shop, candle shop, soufflé shop, flute store, and Italian bookstore. This diversity exists because of carefully crafted legislation developed over decades to preserve our balanced ecosystem.

The proposed legislation affects North Beach in nine different ways. While we support several provisions and have compromised on others, three issues require your immediate attention.

A “Win-Win” Compromise Solution

After months of negotiation, we have a "surgical" compromise that solves these problems **without delaying the legislation or requiring new district maps.** This solution supports the *specific* businesses the legislation was intended to help, while protecting the over 50 local North Beach businesses that have concerns.

Critical Issue #1: Restaurant Saturation/Business Diversity

Current Situation: North Beach already has the highest per-capita concentration of restaurants and bars of any residential neighborhood in San Francisco. In Central North Beach, five of eight vacant storefronts are former restaurants.

The Problem: Unlimited restaurant conversions will:

- Increase square footage costs neighborhood-wide
- Make non-restaurant retail spaces economically unviable
- Eliminate unique retail diversity on streets like Grant Avenue

Our Solution: Use the *existing* **"North Beach Financial Service Subdistrict" (SEC. 781.6)** as a boundary for "Central North Beach" (Broadway to Greenwich). We propose adding language to this subdistrict that **(a)** prohibits storefront mergers and **(b)** prohibits *new* restaurant conversions, with specific "carve-out" exceptions for three long-vacant parcels to become restaurants via Conditional Use.

Critical Issue #2: Storefront Mergers

Current Situation: North Beach's small storefronts create an ecosystem where independent businesses can afford entry-level commercial rents and compete fairly.

The Problem: Allowing storefront mergers will inevitably drive up commercial rents and displace the small retailers that define our neighborhood. When multiple storefronts combine, only well-funded chains and franchises can afford the resulting premium spaces, pushing out the independent shops that give North Beach its character.

Our Solution: Maintain restrictions on storefront mergers in Central North Beach while allowing limited flexibility in Northern North Beach where vacancy rates are higher. This preserves the economic diversity that allows flower shops, bookstores, and specialty retailers to thrive alongside restaurants.

Critical Issue #3: Use Size Cap Removal

Current Situation: North Beach historically maintained a 4,000 square foot Use Size Cap, ensuring an intimate neighborhood character and affordable leases for small businesses.

The Problem: D3's office has eliminated the Use Size Cap entirely, allowing unlimited-size storefronts in new buildings. This change was made without consulting affected businesses, not a single business owner we surveyed was aware of this removal.

Our Solution: Reinstate a reasonable Use Size Cap that prevents outsized establishments while allowing flexibility for appropriate development.

Critical Issue #4: Vacant Non-Conforming Retail Spaces

Current Situation: Numerous retail spaces exist within residential zones near our commercial district, but outdated zoning restrictions keep them vacant rather than allowing community-serving businesses to operate.

The Problem: Non-conforming retail spaces in residential areas remain empty because they're controlled by commercial district regulations, even though they're located outside the NCD. This creates dead zones in otherwise vibrant residential streets and denies neighbors the opportunity to welcome appropriate businesses into their community.

Our Solution: Create SEC. 186.4 to establish a pathway for vacant, non-conforming retail spaces outside commercial districts to become limited-service restaurants through Conditional Use authorization. This empowers residents, not distant commercial districts, to decide which businesses serve their immediate community, ensuring sensitive activation of spaces that would otherwise remain vacant.

Conclusion

This compromise is a true win-win. It allows flexibility for new businesses in "Northern North Beach" (north of Greenwich) where vacancies are higher, while protecting the fragile retail core. It helps every business the legislation was meant to support while safeguarding the future for all others.

We respectfully urge you to adopt these common-sense, community-vetted amendments. Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

Stuart Watts

Stuart Watts
President, North Beach Business Association

From:	Toyer Grear
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); SherrillStaff; SauterStaff; MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; DorseyStaff (BOS); FielderStaff; Waltonstaff (BOS)
Cc:	Drury, Richard; Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Cityattorney
Subject:	SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSION
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:13:05 PM
Attachments:	2025.10.28.SFBOS NBeach SUD Supp ComLtr-w exhibits.pdf

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

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors,

Attached please find comments submitted on behalf of Small Business Forward, the Jackson Square Historic District Association, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, and Thad Carhart, a San Francisco resident, concerning Case Number: 2025-005989PCAMAP [Board File No. 250682]. Agenda Item 31, October 28, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting ("Rezone"). This letter supplements the letter
submitted yesterday.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Toyer Grear
Office Administrator / Paralegal
Lozeau Drury, LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
510-836-4200 ofc
510-607-8237 cell
510-836-4205 fax
email: toyer@lozeaudrury.com

LOZEAU DRURY LLP
T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205
1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612
www.lozeaudrury.com
richard@lozeaudrury.com

BY E-MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

October 28, 2025

Board President Rafael Mandelman and
Honorable Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Attn: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org
ChanStaff@sfgov.org
SherrillStaff@sfgov.org
SauterStaff@sfgov.org
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org
ChenStaff@sfgov.org
MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org
DorseyStaff@sfgov.org
FielderStaff@sfgov.org
waltonstaff@sfgov.org

RE: Planning Code; Zoning Map - Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts.
Objection to CEQA Exemption.
Board of Supervisors
Agenda Item 31, October 28, 2025, File No. 250682
SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSION

Dear President Mandelman and Honorable Supervisors:

I submit this comment on behalf of Small Business Forward, the Jackson Square Historic District Association, Telegraph Hill Dwellers, and Thad Carhart, a San Francisco resident, concerning the proposed action Consolidating the North Beach Special Use and Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Expanding Allowable Uses and Use Size Limits in Certain Zoning Districts; Case Number: 2025-005989PCAMAP [Board File No. 250682]. Agenda Item 31, October 28, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting. ("Rezone"). This letter supplements the letter submitted yesterday.

As discussed earlier, the Rezone will entirely eliminate the North Beach Special Use District ("SUD"). In so doing, the Rezone will eliminate important protections for historic resources and displacement of residents and legacy businesses. The Rezone will eliminate historic

resource protecitons for hundreds of properties in North Beach, and retain protection only for one property – the Gusto Building at 535 Green Street, which is on the National Register of Historic Resources.

The Rezone will eliminate the broader definition of historic resources contained in the North Beach SUD. Section (b)(3) defines "historic resources" as follows:

> Historic Buildings. "Historic buildings" shall include Planning Code Article 10 Landmarks and buildings located within Article 10 Historic Districts, buildings and districts identified by surveys adopted by the City, buildings listed or potentially eligible for individual listing on the National or California Registers, and buildings located within listed or potentially eligible National Register or California Register historic districts. The Planning Department shall also consult materials available through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and Inventory to determine eligibility.

Although the Rezone references the historic resource protections in Planning Code Section 102, those protections are far narrower than in the North Beach SUD. As explained by expert Architectural Historian Bridget Maley:

> The proposed new definition of historic resources references Planning Code Section 102 which does not include eligible National or California Register Historic Districts and their contributors as historic resources or resources identified through survey or inventory.
>
> By eliminating these important protections for historic resources, the Rezone would have adverse impacts on historic resources, including the fully documented, but not yet to be formally designated North Beach National Register of Historic Places Historic District. These impacts must be analyzed and mitigated through proper CEQA documentation. If mitigation is not feasible, then a statement of overriding considerations would be required.


The attached spreadsheets show 157 parcels within the North Beach NCD are also within the proposed NR Historic District (137 are contributors to the NR Historic District). 259 storefronts in the NBNCD are within the proposed NR Historic District. If the Rezone is adopted, these properties would lose their protection as historic resources. The attached spreadsheets demonstrate this as follows:

A. All buildings and storefronts.
B. All of the overlapping lots (157) of buildings in both the nominated National Register district and the North Beach NCD.
C. Overlapping storefronts (259).
D. All the contributing lots (137, with the 20 Non-Contributors filtered out).

Only one building – the Gusto Building at 535 Green Street, which is on the National Register of Historic Resources, will retain protection as a historic resource of the proposed Rezone is adopted.

We urge the Board of Supervisors to refrain from considering this Rezone until a CEQA document is prepared. The Rezone is clearly a "project" within the meaning of CEQA, and CEQA review is therefore required.

Sincerely,



Richard Toshiyuki Drury
LOZEAU DRURY LLP

Cc: Environmental Review Officer Lisa Gibson, lisa.gibson@sfgov.org

City Attorney David Chiu, cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

EXHIBIT A

NBNCD	NBNCD	NBNCD	NBHD	NBHD	NBHD	YR BUILT	2025 Occupant
331	Columbus Ave.	146/4	319-29 Columbus Ave	C	0146004	1906	Restaurant)
333	Columbus Ave.	146/27	331-47 Columbus Ave	C	0146027	1906	KO Company & Dry Cleaners
353	Columbus Ave.	146/26	353-55 Columbus Ave	C	0146026	1910	Mona Lisa Restaurant
373	Columbus Ave.	146/25	371-73 Columbus Ave	C	0146025	1912	Molinari Delicatessen
342	Columbus Ave.	146/1	601-11 Vallejo St	C	0146001	1908	Nick's Liquor
401	Columbus Ave.	131/26	401-05 Columbus Ave	C	0131026	1906	Steps of Rome Trattoria
411	Columbus Ave.	131/26	411-53 Columbus	C	0131026	1906	Hi-Way Burgers (formerly Puchini)
412	Columbus Ave.	131/15	408-14 Columbus Ave	C	0131015	1922	Biordi Art Imports
430	Columbus Ave.	131/16	420-30 Columbus Ave	C	0131016	1925	The Stinking Rose Italian Restaurant
446	Columbus Ave.	131/17	444-54 Columbus Ave	C	0131017	1906	Stella Pasty and Caf
468	Columbus Ave.	131/19	460-68 Columbus Ave	C	0131019	1911	CBC International Bank
500	Columbus Ave.	117/4	500-24 Columbus Ave	C	0117004	1907	Red Window Restaurant
526	Columbus Ave.	117/3	526 Columbus Ave	C	0117003	1906	Vacant - was Cafe Roma
532	Columbus Ave.	117/2	532-44 Columbus Ave	C	0117002	1915	Flour + Water Pizzeria
552	Columbus Ave.	117/20	552-66 Columbus Ave	C	0117020	1909	Vacant - formerly Proper Fox and Sauter's Campaign HQ
501	Columbus Ave.	117/5	501-47 Columbus Ave	C	0117005	1906	Cafe Angolo
555	Columbus Ave.	117/19	549-55 Columbus Ave	C	0117019	1909	Il Pollaio
561	Columbus Ave.	117/18	559-65 Columbus Ave	C	0117018	1906	North Beach Gyros
577	Columbus Ave.	117/17	575-79 Columbus Ave	C	0117017	1912	Vacant - was Jack Lee Fong Insurance Agency
716	Columbus Ave.	90/27	716-22 Columbus Ave	C	0090027	1906	The Italian Homemade Company
752	Columbus Ave.	90/28	752-60 Columbus Ave	C	0090028	1909	Le Sandwich
782	Columbus Ave.	90/29	780-82 Columbus Ave	C	0090029	1907	Dylan's Tours
501	Filbert Street	103/1	501 Filbert St	C	0103001	1924	Grant Avenue Garage Auto Repair
700	Filbert Street	90/8	700-04 Filbert St	C	0090008	1907	Victoria Pastry
721	Filbert Street	101/31	721 Filbert St	C	0101031	1906	Hildebrand Stable - Public Parking
1228	Grant Avenue	145/15	1226-30 Grant Ave	C	0145015	1907	Vacant (Formerly Sin Cherry clothing store)
1232	Grant Avenue	145/30	1232 Grant Ave	C	0145030	1906	Saloon
1234	Grant Avenue	145/31	1234 Grant Ave	C	0145044	1906	The Showdown (Pantera sign)
1268	Grant Avenue	145/32	1268 Grant Ave	C	0145044	1906	The Showdown
1300	Grant Avenue	132/28	1300-26 Grant Ave	C	0132028	1907	Al's Attire
1336	Grant Avenue	132/29	1336-48 Grant Ave	C	0132029	1906	Nature Stop Grocery Store

1350	Grant Avenue	132/51	1350-58 Grant Ave	C	0132051	1906	May Lee Laundry
1309	Grant Avenue	131/7	1309-15 Grant Ave	C	0131007	1907	Ideale Restaurant
1315	Grant Avenue	131/7	1317-21 Grant Ave	C	0131006	1908	Ideale Restaurant
1327	Grant Avenue	131/5	1325-29 Grant Ave	C	0131005	1906	Vacant/ earthquake retrofit
1331	Grant Avenue	131/4	1331-35 Grant Ave	C	0131004	1907	Fishtank Art Gallery (jeremy Fish)
1337	Grant Avenue	131/3	1337-39 Grant Ave	C	0131003	1912	Tupelo Bar
1349	Grant Avenue	131/2	1345-61 Grant Ave	C	0131002	1910	Live Worms Gallery
1363	Grant Avenue	131/1	1363-71 Grant Ave	C	0131001	1906	April Jeans Bar
1400	Grant Avenue	115/19	1400-24 Grant Ave	C	0115019	1909	Mashka (Jewelry Store)
1434	Grant Avenue	115/20	1434-38 Grant Ave	C	0115020	1913	Savoy Tivoli Bar
1450	Grant Avenue	115/21	1446-62 Grant Ave	C	0115021	1909	Used for Stroage for NB Pizza/not permitted in NBNCD
1401	Grant Avenue	116/11	1401-11 Grant Ave	C	0116011	1907	Grant & Green Market
1415	Grant Avenue	116/10	1415-19 Grant Ave	C	0116010	1906	Cantina Records
1425	Grant Avenue	116/9	1421-25 Grant Ave	C	0116009	1906	Vacant/under construction
1429	Grant Avenue	116/8	1427-31 Grant Ave	C	0116008	1906	Vacant
1435	Grant Avenue	116/7	1435-39 Grant Ave	C	0116007	1906	Fisher Weisman Brugioni - Interior design
1441	Grant Avenue	116/5	1441-43 Grant Ave	C	0116005	1915	Jenneration Fit
1445/47	Grant Avenue	116/4	1445-51 Grant Ave	C	0116004	1913	Vacation 2 aka Needles and Pens
1453	Grant Avenue	116/3	1453-59 Grant Ave	C	0116003	1907	Knitz & Leather
1461	Grant Avenue	116/2	1461-65 Grant Ave	C	0116002	1906	S & S Grocery
1499	Grant Avenue	116/1	1467-99 Grant Ave	C	0116001	1906	Vacation Vintage Clothing
1500	Grant Avenue	104/24	1500-02 Grant Ave	C	0104024	1909	Flute World
1514	Grant Avenue	104/23	1508-12 Grant Ave	C	0104023	1912	Stanley's Laundry Wash and Dry
1522	Grant Avenue	104/27	1522-26 Grant Ave	C	0104027	1906	A-B Fits Clothing
1528	Grant Avenue	104/29	1528-32 Grant Ave	C	0104029	1909	Public Barber Salon
1534	Grant Avenue	104/30	1534-38 Grant Ave	C	0104030	1906	VACANT - last known use was gallary
1544	Grant Avenue	104/31	1540-44 Grant Ave	C	0104081-085	1907	Macchiarini Creative Designs
1546	Grant Avenue	104/32	1546-50 Grant Ave	C	0104032	c. 1906	Pink Blossom Clothing for Children
1556	Grant Avenue	104/33	1552-56 Grant Ave	C	0104033	1906	Vacant since at least 1986 prior to NBNCD
1562	Grant Avenue	104/34	1558-62 Grant Ave	C	0104034	1907	Barbery Coast Barber Shop
1501	Grant Avenue	103/7	1501-03 Grant Ave	C	0103007	1917	Telegraph Hill Books
1519	Grant Avenue	103/5	1519-23 Grant Ave	C	0103005	1912	A-B Fits Clothing

1525	Grant Avenue	103/4	1525-27 Grant Ave	C	0103004	1911	Vacant formerly CCDC - being retrofitted
1541	Grant Avenue	103/39	1539-45 Grant Ave	C	0103039	1906	Little Vine
468	Green Street	115/19	466-78 Green St	C	0115019	1912	Crown Fortune Properties
510	Green Street	116/12	510-12 Green St	C	0116012	1910	Sodini'sTattoria Restaurant
516	Green Street	116/13	518-22 Green St	C	0116013	1907	Bocconcino Restaurant
528	Green Street	116/14	526-28 Green St	C	0116014	1906	Tattoo Boogaloo (tattoos and piercings)
532	Green Street	116/15	532-36 Green St	C	0116015	1907	Tagines Restaurant
542	Green Street	116/16	538-42 Green St	C	0116016	1913	Golden Boy Pizza
548	Green Street	116/17	544-48 Green St	C	0116017	1906	Gino & Carlo
550	Green Street	116/18	550-56 Green St	C	0116018	1906	California Fish Market Restaurant
562	Green Street	116/19	558-62 Green St	C	0116019	1907	Columbus Café
570	Green Street	116/20	570-76 Green St	C	0116020	1925	Next Door, food, droinks, games
580	Green Street	116/20A	580-84 Green St	C	0116020A	1962	Luke's Local
511	Green Street	131/25	509-13 Green St	C	0131025	1906	**Vacant** - last use was Foreign Lens gallery
523	Green Street	131/2A	517-23 Green St	C	0131024	1907	World CPS - Misc Supplies
535	Green Street	131/21	535 Green St	C	0131021	1946	**Vacant** -"Buon Gusto"
641	Green Street	130/37	635-41 Green St	C	0130037	1906	Doggy Day Spaw
649	Green Street	130/39	649 Green St	C	0130034 & 039	1907	Green Street Morturary
653-55	Green Street	130/34	649 Green St	C	0130034 & 039	1907	Green Street Morturary
678	Green Street	117/10	678 Green St	C	0117010	1912	Club Fugazi
2	Nobles Alley	104/26	2 Nobles Alley	C	0104026	c. 1906	vacant lot
1526	Powell Street	130/25	1526 Powell St	C	0130025	1921	approved for massive condo project - De Lucchi Sheet Metal Works Building
1560	Powell Street	130/29	1560 Powell St	C	0130029	c. 1908	NorthStar Cafe (bar)
1555	Powell Street	129/1	1557-77 Powell St	C	0129001	1907	88 Club Fontane Beauty Salon
1600	Powell Street	117/11	1600-04 Powell St	C	0117011	1912	The Boardroom Sports Bar
1624	Powell Street	117/14	1620-24 Powell St	C	0117014	1911	La Mediterranee Catering (not permited)
1630	Powell Street	117/15	1626-32 Powell St	C	0117015	1912	Pena Pacha Mama
1636	Powell Street	117/16	1636 Powell St	C	0117016	1915	Powell Street Parking Garage
1601	Powell Street	118/9	1601-07 Powell St	C	0118009	1907	Clean X-Press Coin-Op & Dry Cleaning

1625	Powell Street	118/6	1621-23 Powell St	C	0118006	1907	The Original Powell Street Garage
1641	Powell Street	118/4 & 5	1643 Powell St	C	0118004	1917	Awake / Brand, Digital Product, Ui/UX Design Studio (now 1643 Powell)
1661	Powell Street	118/2	1655-59 Powell St	C	0118002	1907	Coit Liquors
1701	Powell Street	101/5A	1701-11 Powell St	C	0101005A	1908	Noren Izakaya Japanese Restaurant
1717-19	Powell Street	101/5	1717 Powell St	C	0101005		Washington Square Dental
1827	Powell Street	90/7	1823-27 Powell St	C	0090007	1906	The Darkside Initiative - clothing
1831	Powell Street	90/6	1831 Powell St	C	0090006	1925	TannerHect Architecture
1833	Powell Street	90/5	1833-37 Powell St	C	0090005	1924	Dr. Chong - Optometrist
1841	Powell Street	90/4	1841-45 Powell St	C	0090004	1906	Jeffrey's Pet Food
1851	Powell Street	90/3	1847-51 Powell St	C	0090003	1906	SF Rock Posters
1853	Powell Street	90/2	1853-55 Powell St	C	0090002	1906	Spazi Italiana
1859	Powell Street	90/1	1859-69 Powell St	C	0090001	1906	Doo Wash Cleaners
2041	Powell Street	64/5	2035-41 Powell St	C	0064005	1909	Vacant no sign
2054	Powell Street	63/23	2050-64 Powell St	C	0063023	1907	Vintage and Records
1415	Stockton	130/9	1411-33 Stockton St	C	0130009	1906	Napeleon Super Bakery (!?!)
1455	Stockton	130/1	1455 Stockton St	C	0130001	1928	Bank of America
1512	Stockton	116/20C	1512 Stockton St	C	0116020C	1925	North Beach Restaurant
1534	Stockton	116/21	1534-38 Stockton St	C	0116021	1906	Tony Nik's Bar
1554	Stockton	116/54	1556-60 Stockton St	C	0116054	1906	Angel's Flowers by Amy
1570	Stockton	116/26	1566-70 Stockton St	C	0116026	1906	Tony's Pizza
1600	Stockton	103/14	1600-10 Stockton St	C	0103014	1927	Aqualina
1630	Stockton	103/14A	1630 Stockton St	C	0103014A	1935	Italian Athletic Club
1640	Stockton	103/15	1640 Stockton St	C	0103015	1941	Post Office
1660	Stockton	103/18	1720-24 Stockton St	C	0088018	1909	Washington Square Hotel
1700	Stockton	88/16	1700-04 Stockton St	C	0088016	1915	Liguria Bakery
1706	Stockton	88/15	1706-10 Stockton St	C	0088015	1914	Fisher Weismann collection
1734-1736	Stockton	88/20	1736 Stockton St	C	0088020	1907	Maybeck Building - Offices
1756	Stockton	88/21	1748-56 Stockton St	C	0088021	1907	Napoli Market
1768	Stockton	88/22	1768 Stockton St	C	0088022	1925	Converted to residential (from office to DB)
1701	Stockton	89/10	1701-15 Stockton St	C	0089010	1906	Mama's Restaurant
1757	Stockton	89/2	1757-61 Stockton St	C	0089002	1908	North Beach Cyclery
1767	Stockton	89/1	1763-69 Stockton St	C	0089001	1908	Missing Audrey vintage

444	Union Street		444-50 Union St	C	0104016	1906	Residential Use - Under construction to change store to ADU (Was Alma's Tailor Shop)
463	Union Street		453-63 Union St	C	0115024	1910	Residental Use - looks like conversion from storefront
478	Union Street	104/22	478-82 Union St	C	0104022	1923	Savvy Nursery
484	Union Street	104/23	484-88 Union St	C	0104023	1912	Frenzy Faire -Handcrafted Vintage Goods
524	Union Street	103/9	524 Union St	C	0103009	1906	Event Space - Paper Doll SF Landmark
548	Union Street	103/11	544-48 Union St	C	0103011	1909	residential use (was italian book store)
601-621	Union Street	117/1	601-21 Union St	C	0117001	1906	Original Joe's
629	Union Street	117/21	629-31 Union St	C	0117021	c. 1906	Giovanni's Italian Speciatles
655	Union Street	117/16	651-73 Union St	C	0117016	1914	Verde Building was Ferry Plaza Seafood
701	Union Street	118/1	701-09 Union St	C	0118001	1924	Hilda and Jesse Restaurant
601	Vallejo Street	146/1	601-11 Vallejo St	C	0146001	1908	Caffe Trieste
625-629	Vallejo Street	146/17-21	627 Vallejo St	C	0146017-021	1932	Cole Hardware

EXHIBIT B

NBNCD	NBNCD	NBNCD	NBHD	NBHD	NBHD	YR BUILT	2025 Occupant
317	Columbus Ave.	146/28	309-11 Columbus Ave	NC	0146029	1906	Vacant (formally The Stinking Rose Restaurant)
331	Columbus Ave.	146/4	319-29 Columbus Ave	C	0146004	1906	Vacant (formally The Stinking Rose Restaurant)
333	Columbus Ave.	146/27	331-47 Columbus Ave	C	0146027	1906	KO Company & Dry Cleaners
353	Columbus Ave.	146/26	353-55 Columbus Ave	C	0146026	1910	Mona Lisa Restaurant
373	Columbus Ave.	146/25	371-73 Columbus Ave	C	0146025	1912	Molinari Delicatessen
342	Columbus Ave.	146/1	601-11 Vallejo St	C	0146001	1908	Nick's Liquor
401	Columbus Ave.	131/26	401-05 Columbus Ave	C	0131026	1906	Steps of Rome Trattoria
411	Columbus Ave.	131/26	411-53 Columbus	C	0131026	1906	Hi-Way Burgers (formerly Puchini)
412	Columbus Ave.	131/15	408-14 Columbus Ave	C	0131015	1922	Biordi Art Imports
430	Columbus Ave.	131/16	420-30 Columbus Ave	C	0131016	1925	The Stinking Rose Italian Restaurant
446	Columbus Ave.	131/17	444-54 Columbus Ave	C	0131017	1906	Stella Pasty and Caf
468	Columbus Ave.	131/19	460-68 Columbus Ave	C	0131019	1911	CBC International Bank
500	Columbus Ave.	117/4	500-24 Columbus Ave	C	0117004	1907	Red Window Restaurant
526	Columbus Ave.	117/3	526 Columbus Ave	C	0117003	1906	Vacant - was Cafe Roma
532	Columbus Ave.	117/2	532-44 Columbus Ave	C	0117002	1915	Flour + Water Pizzeria
552	Columbus Ave.	117/20	552-66 Columbus Ave	C	0117020	1909	Vacant - formerly Proper Fox and Sauter's Campaign HQ
501	Columbus Ave.	117/5	501-47 Columbus Ave	C	0117005	1906	Cafe Angolo
555	Columbus Ave.	117/19	549-55 Columbus Ave	C	0117019	1909	Il Pollaio
561	Columbus Ave.	117/18	559-65 Columbus Ave	C	0117018	1906	North Beach Gyros
577	Columbus Ave.	117/17	575-79 Columbus Ave	C	0117017	1912	Vacant - was Jack Lee Fong Insurance Agency
659	Columbus Ave.	101/3	659 Columbus Ave	NC	0101045	1908	Piazza Pellegrini
706	Columbus Ave.	90/26	706 Columbus Ave	NC	0090026	c 1956	Bob's Auto Services
716	Columbus Ave.	90/27	716-22 Columbus Ave	C	0090027	1906	The Italian Homemade Company
752	Columbus Ave.	90/28	752-60 Columbus Ave	C	0090028	1909	Le Sandwich
782	Columbus Ave.	90/29	780-82 Columbus Ave	C	0090029	1907	Dylan's Tours
501	Filbert Street	103/1	501 Filbert St	C	0103001	1924	Grant Avenue Garage Auto Repair
700	Filbert Street	90/8	700-04 Filbert St	C	0090008	1907	Victoria Pastry
724	Filbert Street	90/35	724-30 Filbert St	NC	0090035	1962	Richard & Ryan Choi DMD - Dental Offices
721	Filbert Street	101/31	721 Filbert St	C	0101031	1906	Hildebrand Stable - Public Parking
729	Filbert Street	101/30	729 Filbert St	NC	0101030	c. 1982	Chinatown North Beach Mental Health Services
733-735	Filbert Street	101/29	733 Filbert St	NC	0101039-044	c. 1993	Apartment Building (733 Filbert, Apts 1-6)
1224	Grant Avenue	145/14	1224 Grant Ave	NC	0145014	1906	The Cheese Boat

1228	Grant Avenue	145/15	1226-30 Grant Ave	C	0145015	1907	Vacant (Formerly Sin Cherry clothing store)
1232	Grant Avenue	145/30	1232 Grant Ave	C	0145030	1906	Saloon
1234	Grant Avenue	145/31	1234 Grant Ave	C	0145044	1906	The Showdown (Pantera sign)
1268	Grant Avenue	145/32	1268 Grant Ave	C	0145044	1906	The Showdown
1300	Grant Avenue	132/28	1300-26 Grant Ave	C	0132028	1907	Al's Attire
1336	Grant Avenue	132/29	1336-48 Grant Ave	C	0132029	1906	Nature Stop Grocery Store
1350	Grant Avenue	132/51	1350-58 Grant Ave	C	0132051	1906	May Lee Laundry
1309	Grant Avenue	131/7	1309-15 Grant Ave	C	0131007	1907	Ideale Restaurant
1315	Grant Avenue	131/7	1317-21 Grant Ave	C	0131006	1908	Ideale Restaurant
1327	Grant Avenue	131/5	1325-29 Grant Ave	C	0131005	1906	Vacant/ earthquake retrofit
1331	Grant Avenue	131/4	1331-35 Grant Ave	C	0131004	1907	Fishtank Art Gallery (jeremy Fish)
1337	Grant Avenue	131/3	1337-39 Grant Ave	C	0131003	1912	Tupelo Bar
1349	Grant Avenue	131/2	1345-61 Grant Ave	C	0131002	1910	Live Worms Gallery
1363	Grant Avenue	131/1	1363-71 Grant Ave	C	0131001	1906	April Jeans Bar
1400	Grant Avenue	115/19	1400-24 Grant Ave	C	0115019	1909	Mashka (Jewelry Store)
1434	Grant Avenue	115/20	1434-38 Grant Ave	C	0115020	1913	Savoy Tivoli Bar
1450	Grant Avenue	115/21	1446-62 Grant Ave	C	0115021	1909	Used for Stroage for NB Pizza/not permitted in NBNCD
1401	Grant Avenue	116/11	1401-11 Grant Ave	C	0116011	1907	Grant & Green Market
1415	Grant Avenue	116/10	1415-19 Grant Ave	C	0116010	1906	Cantina Records
1425	Grant Avenue	116/9	1421-25 Grant Ave	C	0116009	1906	Vacant/under construction
1429	Grant Avenue	116/8	1427-31 Grant Ave	C	0116008	1906	Vacant
1435	Grant Avenue	116/7	1435-39 Grant Ave	C	0116007	1906	Fisher Weisman Brugioni - Interior design
1441	Grant Avenue	116/5	1441-43 Grant Ave	C	0116005	1915	Jenneration Fit
1445/47	Grant Avenue	116/4	1445-51 Grant Ave	C	0116004	1913	Vacation 2 aka Needles and Pens
1453	Grant Avenue	116/3	1453-59 Grant Ave	C	0116003	1907	Knitz & Leather
1461	Grant Avenue	116/2	1461-65 Grant Ave	C	0116002	1906	S & S Grocery
1499	Grant Avenue	116/1	1467-99 Grant Ave	C	0116001	1906	Vacation Vintage Clothing
1500	Grant Avenue	104/24	1500-02 Grant Ave	C	0104024	1909	Flute World
1514	Grant Avenue	104/23	1508-12 Grant Ave	C	0104023	1912	Stanley's Laundry Wash and Dry
1522	Grant Avenue	104/27	1522-26 Grant Ave	C	0104027	1906	A-B Fits Clothing
1528	Grant Avenue	104/29	1528-32 Grant Ave	C	0104029	1909	Public Barber Salon
1534	Grant Avenue	104/30	1534-38 Grant Ave	C	0104030	1906	VACANT - last known use was gallary
1544	Grant Avenue	104/31	1540-44 Grant Ave	C	0104081-085	1907	Macchiarini Creative Designs
1546	Grant Avenue	104/32	1546-50 Grant Ave	C	0104032	c. 1906	Pink Blossom Clothing for Children

1556	Grant Avenue	104/33	1552-56 Grant Ave	C	0104033	1906	Vacant since at least 1986 prior to NBNCD
1562	Grant Avenue	104/34	1558-62 Grant Ave	C	0104034	1907	Barbery Coast Barber Shop
1501	Grant Avenue	103/7	1501-03 Grant Ave	C	0103007	1917	Telegraph Hill Books
1507-1509	Grant Avenue	103/6	1507-11 Grant Ave	NC	0103006	c. 1912	Color Me Beauty Spa
1519	Grant Avenue	103/5	1519-23 Grant Ave	C	0103005	1912	A-B Fits Clothing
1525	Grant Avenue	103/4	1525-27 Grant Ave	C	0103004	1911	Vacant formerly CCDC - being retrofitted
1535	Grant Avenue	103/3	1535 Grant Ave	NC	0103003	1914	Little Bubble Coin Wash
1541	Grant Avenue	103/39	1539-45 Grant Ave	C	0103039	1906	Little Vine
468	Green Street	115/19	466-78 Green St	C	0115019	1912	Crown Fortune Properties
510	Green Street	116/12	510-12 Green St	C	0116012	1910	Sodini'sTattoria Restaurant
516	Green Street	116/13	518-22 Green St	C	0116013	1907	Bocconcino Restaurant
528	Green Street	116/14	526-28 Green St	C	0116014	1906	Tattoo Boogaloo (tattoos and piercings)
532	Green Street	116/15	532-36 Green St	C	0116015	1907	Tagines Restaurant
542	Green Street	116/16	538-42 Green St	C	0116016	1913	Golden Boy Pizza
548	Green Street	116/17	544-48 Green St	C	0116017	1906	Gino & Carlo
550	Green Street	116/18	550-56 Green St	C	0116018	1906	California Fish Market Restaurant
562	Green Street	116/19	558-62 Green St	C	0116019	1907	Columbus Café
570	Green Street	116/20	570-76 Green St	C	0116020	1925	Next Door, food, droinks, games
580	Green Street	116/20A	580-84 Green St	C	0116020A	1962	Luke's Local
511	Green Street	131/25	509-13 Green St	C	0131025	1906	**Vacant** - last use was Foreign Lens gallery
523	Green Street	131/2A	517-23 Green St	C	0131024	1907	World CPS - Misc Supplies
535	Green Street	131/21	535 Green St	C	0131021	1946	**Vacant** -"Buon Gusto"
627-633	Green Street	130/40	625 Green St	NC	0130040	n/a	Bank of America drive through and parking lot
641	Green Street	130/37	635-41 Green St	C	0130037	1906	Doggy Day Spaw
649	Green Street	130/39	649 Green St	C	0130034 & 039	1907	Green Street Morturary
661-665	Green Street	130/33	661-65 Green St	NC	0130033	n/a	Parking Lot for Green Street Mortuary
683-687	Green Street	130/30	683 Green St	NC	0130030	n/a	Parking Lot for Green Street Mortuary
626	Green Street	117/6	626 Green St	NC	0117006	n/a	Parking lot
653-55	Green Street	130/34	649 Green St	C	0130034 & 039	1907	Green Street Morturary
678	Green Street	117/10	678 Green St	C	0117010	1912	Club Fugazi
725	Greenwich Street	90/30	725 Greenwich St	NC	0090030	1983	Office Building
2	Nobles Alley	104/26	2 Nobles Alley	C	0104026	c. 1906	vacant lot

1526	Powell Street	130/25	1526 Powell St	C	0130025	1921	approved for massive condo project - De Lucchi Sheet Metal Works Building
1558	Powell Street	130/28	1558 Powell St	NC	0130028	1987	Luminno GlowaSwitch - National Chain
1560	Powell Street	130/29	1560 Powell St	C	0130029	c. 1908	NorthStar Cafe (bar)
1555	Powell Street	129/1	1557-77 Powell St	C	0129001	1907	88 Club Fontane Beauty Salon
1600	Powell Street	117/11	1600-04 Powell St	C	0117011	1912	The Boardroom Sports Bar
1624	Powell Street	117/14	1620-24 Powell St	C	0117014	1911	La Mediterranee Catering (not permited)
1630	Powell Street	117/15	1626-32 Powell St	C	0117015	1912	Pena Pacha Mama
1636	Powell Street	117/16	1636 Powell St	C	0117016	1915	Powell Street Parking Garage
1601	Powell Street	118/9	1601-07 Powell St	C	0118009	1907	Clean X-Press Coin-Op & Dry Cleaning
1609	Powell Street	118/8	1609-11 Powell St	NC	0118008	1906	Waystone Wine Bar
1625	Powell Street	118/6	1621-23 Powell St	C	0118006	1907	The Original Powell Street Garage
1641	Powell Street	118/4 & 5	1643 Powell St	C	0118004	1917	Awake / Brand, Digital Product, Ui/UX Design Studio (now 1643 Powell)
1661	Powell Street	118/2	1655-59 Powell St	C	0118002	1907	Coit Liquors
1701	Powell Street	101/5A	1701-11 Powell St	C	0101005A	1908	Noren Izakaya Japanese Restaurant
1731	Powell Street	101/4	1731-41 Powell St	NC	0101051-070	2015	Vacant - large space in Pagoda Condos
1827	Powell Street	90/7	1823-27 Powell St	C	0090007	1906	The Darkside Initiative - clothing
1831	Powell Street	90/6	1831 Powell St	C	0090006	1925	TannerHect Architecture
1833	Powell Street	90/5	1833-37 Powell St	C	0090005	1924	Dr. Chong - Optometrist
1841	Powell Street	90/4	1841-45 Powell St	C	0090004	1906	Jeffrey's Pet Food
1851	Powell Street	90/3	1847-51 Powell St	C	0090003	1906	SF Rock Posters
1853	Powell Street	90/2	1853-55 Powell St	C	0090002	1906	Spazi Italiana
1859	Powell Street	90/1	1859-69 Powell St	C	0090001	1906	Doo Wash Cleaners
2041	Powell Street	64/5	2035-41 Powell St	C	0064005	1909	Vacant no sign
2054	Powell Street	63/23	2050-64 Powell St	C	0063023	1907	Vintage and Records
1415	Stockton	130/9	1411-33 Stockton St	C	0130009	1906	Napeleon Super Bakery (!?!)
1455	Stockton	130/1	1455 Stockton St	C	0130001	1928	Bank of America
1512	Stockton	116/20C	1512 Stockton St	C	0116020C	1925	North Beach Restaurant
1520	Stockton	116/20B	1520 Stockton St	NC	0116020B	1926	Northeast Medical Services
1534	Stockton	116/21	1534-38 Stockton St	C	0116021	1906	Tony Nik's Bar
1548	Stockton	116/23	1548 Stockton St	NC	0116023	1906	North Beach Cantina Restaurant
1554	Stockton	116/54	1556-60 Stockton St	C	0116054	1906	Angel's Flowers by Amy
1570	Stockton	116/26	1566-70 Stockton St	C	0116026	1906	Tony's Pizza

1600	Stockton	103/14	1600-10 Stockton St	C	0103014	1927	Aqualina
1630	Stockton	103/14A	1630 Stockton St	C	0103014A	1935	Italian Athletic Club
1640	Stockton	103/15	1640 Stockton St	C	0103015	1941	Post Office
1652	Stockton	103/17	1714 Stockton St	NC	0088017	1906	Park Tavern
1660	Stockton	103/18	1720-24 Stockton St	C	0088018	1909	Washington Square Hotel
1700	Stockton	88/16	1700-04 Stockton St	C	0088016	1915	Liguria Bakery
1706	Stockton	88/15	1706-10 Stockton St	C	0088015	1914	Fisher Weismann collection
1714	Stockton	88/17	1714 Stockton St	NC	0088017	1906	Architects office
1734-1736	Stockton	88/20	1736 Stockton St	C	0088020	1907	Maybeck Building - Offices
1756	Stockton	88/21	1748-56 Stockton St	C	0088021	1907	Napoli Market
1768	Stockton	88/22	1768 Stockton St	C	0088022	1925	Converted to residential (from office to DB)
1701	Stockton	89/10	1701-15 Stockton St	C	0089010	1906	Mama's Restaurant
1757	Stockton	89/2	1757-61 Stockton St	C	0089002	1908	North Beach Cyclery
1767	Stockton	89/1	1763-69 Stockton St	C	0089001	1908	Missing Audrey vintage
444	Union Street		444-50 Union St	C	0104016	1906	Residential Use - Under construction to change store to ADU (Was Alma's Tailor Shop)
451	Union Street		451 Union St	NC	0115063-065	c. 1986	Residential Use - Converted storefront to ADU
463	Union Street		453-63 Union St	C	0115024	1910	Residental Use - looks like conversion from storefront
478	Union Street	104/22	478-82 Union St	C	0104022	1923	Savvy Nursery
484	Union Street	104/23	484-88 Union St	C	0104023	1912	Frenzy Faire -Handcrafted Vintage Goods
524	Union Street	103/9	524 Union St	C	0103009	1906	Event Space - Paper Doll SF Landmark
548	Union Street	103/11	544-48 Union St	C	0103011	1909	residential use (was italian book store)
601-621	Union Street	117/1	601-21 Union St	C	0117001	1906	Original Joe's
629	Union Street	117/21	629-31 Union St	C	0117021	c. 1906	Giovanni's Italian Speciatles
655	Union Street	117/16	651-73 Union St	C	0117016	1914	Verde Building was Ferry Plaza Seafood
701	Union Street	118/1	701-09 Union St	C	0118001	1924	Hilda and Jesse Restaurant
601	Vallejo Street	146/1	601-11 Vallejo St	C	0146001	1908	Caffe Trieste
625-629	Vallejo Street	146/17-21	627 Vallejo St	C	0146017-021	1932	Cole Hardware

EXHIBIT C

NBNCD	NBNCD	NBNCD	NBHD	NBHD	NBHD	YR BUILT	2025 Occupant
Address	Street Name	Block/Lot	Address	Status	Block/Lot		
317	Columbus Ave.	146/28	309-11 Columbus Ave	NC	0146029	1906	Vacant (formally The Stinking Rose Restaurant)
331	Columbus Ave.	146/4	319-29 Columbus Ave	C	0146004	1906	Vacant (formally The Stinking Rose Restaurant)
333	Columbus Ave.	146/27	331-47 Columbus Ave	C	0146027	1906	KO Company & Dry Cleaners
347	Columbus Ave.	146/27	" "				Elena Bakery
353	Columbus Ave.	146/26	353-55 Columbus Ave	C	0146026	1910	Mona Lisa Restaurant
373	Columbus Ave.	146/25	371-73 Columbus Ave	C	0146025	1912	Molinari Delicatessen
342	Columbus Ave.	146/1	601-11 Vallejo St	C	0146001	1908	Nick's Liquor
348	Columbus Ave.	146/1	" "				Il Casaro Pizzeria
358	Columbus Ave.	146/1	" "				Vacant - formerly Columbus Cutlery
362	Columbus Ave.	146/1	" "				Golden Sardine Wine Bar
366	Columbus Ave.	146/1	" "				Buster's Cheese Steak
401	Columbus Ave.	131/26	401-05 Columbus Ave	C	0131026	1906	Steps of Rome Trattoria
411	Columbus Ave.	131/26	411-53 Columbus	C	0131026	1906	Hi-Way Burgers (formerly Puchini)
419	Columbus Ave.	131/26	" "				Caffe Greco
423	Columbus Ave.	131/26	" "				Caffe Greco
427	Columbus Ave.	131/26	" "				Barbara Pinseria & Cocktail Bar
431-453	Columbus Ave.	131/26	" "				Barbara Pinseria & Cocktail Bar
412	Columbus Ave.	131/15	408-14 Columbus Ave	C	0131015	1922	Biordi Art Imports
414	Columbus Ave.	131/15	" "				Mona Lisa Mare E Monti
430	Columbus Ave.	131/16	420-30 Columbus Ave	C	0131016	1925	The Stinking Rose Italian Restaurant
446	Columbus Ave.	131/17	444-54 Columbus Ave	C	0131017	1906	Stella Pasty and Caf
450	Columbus Ave.	131/17	" "				Locali Visitors Center, Art, Tours, Info
454	Columbus Ave.	131/17	" "				Locali Visitors Center, Art, Tours, Info (fromerly Lola)
468	Columbus Ave.	131/19	460-68 Columbus Ave	C	0131019	1911	CBC International Bank
474	Columbus Ave.	131/19	" "				Z Cioccolato Fudge and Candy
480	Columbus Ave.	131/19	" "				BMO Banking Center
500	Columbus Ave.	117/4	500-24 Columbus Ave	C	0117004	1907	Red Window Restaurant
520	Columbus Ave.	117/4	" "				Lush Gelato

522	Columbus Ave.	117/4	" "				Crepes A Go Go
526	Columbus Ave.	117/3	526 Columbus Ave	C	0117003	1906	Vacant - was Cafe Roma
532	Columbus Ave.	117/2	532-44 Columbus Ave	C	0117002	1915	Flour + Water Pizzeria
546	Columbus Ave.	117/21	629-31 Union St*				Jessi's Nail & Spa
552	Columbus Ave.	117/20	552-66 Columbus Ave	C	0117020	1909	Vacant - formerly Proper Fox and Sauter's Campaign HQ
554	Columbus Ave.	117/20	" "				Kim's Precision Haircuts
566	Columbus Ave.	117/20	" "				Mario's Bohemian Cigar Store Cafe
501	Columbus Ave.	117/5	501-47 Columbus Ave	C	0117005	1906	Cafe Angolo
503	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				Mara's Italian Pastries
507	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				Alimento Italian Deli
509	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				Vacant
515	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				Vacant (For Lease - Blatteis Realty)
519	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				Faíruz Eatery, Middle Eastern
521	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				Rasoio Barbershop
527	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				North Beach Psychic
537	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				Our Childhood - toy store
543	Columbus Ave.	117/5	" "				Compton’s Coffee House
555	Columbus Ave.	117/19	549-55 Columbus Ave	C	0117019	1909	Il Pollaio
561	Columbus Ave.	117/18	559-65 Columbus Ave	C	0117018	1906	North Beach Gyros
571	Columbus Ave.	117/18	" "				Patricia's Fowers
577	Columbus Ave.	117/17	575-79 Columbus Ave	C	0117017	1912	Vacant - was Jack Lee Fong Insurance Agency
579	Columbus Ave.	117/17	" "				Il cilentano Pasta Bar
585	Columbus Ave.	117/16	1636 Powell St*				Vacant - former home of Coit Liquor
659	Columbus Ave.	101/3	659 Columbus Ave	NC	0101045	1908	Piazza Pellegrini
700	Columbus Ave.	90/8	700-04 Filbert St*				Bodega Bistro
706	Columbus Ave.	90/26	706 Columbus Ave	NC	0090026	c 1956	Bob's Auto Services
716	Columbus Ave.	90/27	716-22 Columbus Ave	C	0090027	1906	The Italian Homemade Company
718	Columbus Ave.	90/27	" "				The Italian Homemade Company
720	Columbus Ave.	90/27	" "				Vacant - not for rent
722	Columbus Ave.	90/27	" "				Vacant - not for rent
752	Columbus Ave.	90/28	752-60 Columbus Ave	C	0090028	1909	Le Sandwich

754	Columbus Ave.	90/28	" "				XOX Truffles
756	Columbus Ave.	90/28	" "				Ann's For Hair
782	Columbus Ave.	90/29	780-82 Columbus Ave	C	0090029	1907	Dylan's Tours
501	Filbert Street	103/1	501 Filbert St	C	0103001	1924	Grant Avenue Garage Auto Repair
700	Filbert Street	90/8	700-04 Filbert St	C	0090008	1907	Victoria Pastry
704	Filbert Street	90/8	" "				Next Village
724	Filbert Street	90/35	724-30 Filbert St	NC	0090035	1962	Richard & Ryan Choi DMD - Dental Offices
721	Filbert Street	101/31	721 Filbert St	C	0101031	1906	Hildebrand Stable - Public Parking
729	Filbert Street	101/30	729 Filbert St	NC	0101030	c. 1982	Chinatown North Beach Mental Health Services
733-735	Filbert Street	101/29	733 Filbert St	NC	0101039-044	c. 1993	Apartment Building (733 Filbert, Apts 1-6)
1224	Grant Avenue	145/14	1224 Grant Ave	NC	0145014	1906	The Cheese Boat
1228	Grant Avenue	145/15	1226-30 Grant Ave	C	0145015	1907	Vacant (Formerly Sin Cherry clothing store)
1230	Grant Avenue	145/15	" "				El Farolito
1232	Grant Avenue	145/30	1232 Grant Ave	C	0145030	1906	Saloon
1234	Grant Avenue	145/31	1234 Grant Ave	C	0145044	1906	The Showdown (Pantera sign)
1268	Grant Avenue	145/32	1268 Grant Ave	C	0145044	1906	The Showdown
1300	Grant Avenue	132/28	1300-26 Grant Ave	C	0132028	1907	Al's Attire
1310	Grant Avenue	132/28	" "				Yarsa Nepalese & Indian Cuisine
1314	Grant Avenue	132/28	" "				SFOG North Beach (t-shirts, hoodies, headgear)
1318	Grant Avenue	132/28	" "				Vacant (formerly Portifino Seafood Restaurant)
1322	Grant Avenue	132/28	" "				Moe's Restaurant
1326	Grant Avenue	132/28	" "				Royale Bar
1336	Grant Avenue	132/29	1336-48 Grant Ave	C	0132029	1906	Nature Stop Grocery Store
1348	Grant Avenue	132/29	" "				Nature Stop Grocery Store
1350	Grant Avenue	132/51	1350-58 Grant Ave	C	0132051	1906	May Lee Laundry
1356	Grant Avenue	132/51	" "				Used as storage - violation for leaving vacant
1358	Grant Avenue	132/51	" "				Tasty Pot Restaurant
1398	Grant Avenue	132/51	" "				Tasty Pot Restaurant

1309	Grant Avenue	131/7	1309-15 Grant Ave	C	0131007	1907	Ideale Restaurant
1315	Grant Avenue	131/7	1317-21 Grant Ave	C	0131006	1908	Ideale Restaurant
1327	Grant Avenue	131/5	1325-29 Grant Ave	C	0131005	1906	Vacant/ earthquake retrofit
1331	Grant Avenue	131/4	1331-35 Grant Ave	C	0131004	1907	Fishtank Art Gallery (jeremy Fish)
1335	Grant Avenue	131/4	" "				North Beach Pipeline Dispensary
1337	Grant Avenue	131/3	1337-39 Grant Ave	C	0131003	1912	Tupelo Bar
1339	Grant Avenue	131/3	" "				Tupelo Bar
1349	Grant Avenue	131/2	1345-61 Grant Ave	C	0131002	1910	Live Worms Gallery
1351	Grant Avenue	131/2	" "				Professor Seagul's Smartshop and Gallery
1353	Grant Avenue	131/2	" "				Maggie McGarry's Bar
1363	Grant Avenue	131/1	1363-71 Grant Ave	C	0131001	1906	April Jeans Bar
1371	Grant Avenue	131/1	" "				April Jeans Bar
1400	Grant Avenue	115/19	1400-24 Grant Ave	C	0115019	1909	Mashka (Jewelry Store)
1402	Grant Avenue	115/19	" "				Otherwise Brewing Bar
1412	Grant Avenue	115/19	" "				Happy House Gift Store
1414	Grant Avenue	115/19	" "				Music 101 Used Records
1418	Grant Avenue	115/19	" "				Flowwers by Coley
1420	Grant Avenue	115/19	" "				Flowwers by Coley
1422	Grant Avenue	115/19	" "				P. F. Candle Company
1424	Grant Avenue	115/19	" "				Paparazzi
1434	Grant Avenue	115/20	1434-38 Grant Ave	C	0115020	1913	Savoy Tivoli Bar
1450	Grant Avenue	115/21	1446-62 Grant Ave	C	0115021	1909	Used for Stroage for NB Pizza/not permitted in NBNCD
1454	Grant Avenue	115/21	" "				Café Jacqueline
1458	Grant Avenue	115/21	" "				North Beach Pizza
1462	Grant Avenue	115/21	" "				North Beach Pizza
1401	Grant Avenue	116/11	1401-11 Grant Ave	C	0116011	1907	Grant & Green Market
1411	Grant Avenue	116/11	" "				seaplane (men's clothes)
1415	Grant Avenue	116/10	1415-19 Grant Ave	C	0116010	1906	Cantina Records
1425	Grant Avenue	116/9	1421-25 Grant Ave	C	0116009	1906	Vacant/under construction
1429	Grant Avenue	116/8	1427-31 Grant Ave	C	0116008	1906	Vacant
1435	Grant Avenue	116/7	1435-39 Grant Ave	C	0116007	1906	Fisher Weisman Brugioni - Interior design
1441	Grant Avenue	116/5	1441-43 Grant Ave	C	0116005	1915	Jenneration Fit

1445/47	Grant Avenue	116/4	1445-51 Grant Ave	C	0116004	1913	Vacation 2 aka Needles and Pens
1453	Grant Avenue	116/3	1453-59 Grant Ave	C	0116003	1907	Knitz & Leather
1455	Grant Avenue	116/3	" "				Via Margutta Vintage Clothing
1461	Grant Avenue	116/2	1461-65 Grant Ave	C	0116002	1906	S & S Grocery
1499	Grant Avenue	116/1	1467-99 Grant Ave	C	0116001	1906	Vacation Vintage Clothing
1500	Grant Avenue	104/24	1500-02 Grant Ave	C	0104024	1909	Flute World
1514	Grant Avenue	104/23	1508-12 Grant Ave	C	0104023	1912	Stanley's Laundry Wash and Dry
1522	Grant Avenue	104/27	1522-26 Grant Ave	C	0104027	1906	A-B Fits Clothing
1528	Grant Avenue	104/29	1528-32 Grant Ave	C	0104029	1909	Public Barber Salon
1534	Grant Avenue	104/30	1534-38 Grant Ave	C	0104030	1906	VACANT - last known use was gallary
1544	Grant Avenue	104/31	1540-44 Grant Ave	C	0104081-085	1907	Macchiarini Creative Designs
1546	Grant Avenue	104/32	1546-50 Grant Ave	C	0104032	c. 1906	Pink Blossom Clothing for Children
1556	Grant Avenue	104/33	1552-56 Grant Ave	C	0104033	1906	Vacant since at least 1986 prior to NBNCD
1562	Grant Avenue	104/34	1558-62 Grant Ave	C	0104034	1907	Barbery Coast Barber Shop
1501	Grant Avenue	103/7	1501-03 Grant Ave	C	0103007	1917	Telegraph Hill Books
1507-1509	Grant Avenue	103/6	1507-11 Grant Ave	NC	0103006	c. 1912	Color Me Beauty Spa
1519	Grant Avenue	103/5	1519-23 Grant Ave	C	0103005	1912	A-B Fits Clothing
1525	Grant Avenue	103/4	1525-27 Grant Ave	C	0103004	1911	Vacant formerly CCDC - being retrofitted
1527	Grant Avenue	103/4	" "				Vacant formerly CCDC - being retrofitted
1529	Grant Avenue	103/4	" "				Vacant formerly CCDC - being retrofitted
1535	Grant Avenue	103/3	1535 Grant Ave	NC	0103003	1914	Little Bubble Coin Wash
1541	Grant Avenue	103/39	1539-45 Grant Ave	C	0103039	1906	Little Vine
1543	Grant Avenue	103/39	" "				New Age Nails
468	Green Street	115/19	466-78 Green St	C	0115019	1912	Crown Fortune Properties
470	Green Street	115/19	" "				Maykadeh Persian Restaurant
478	Green Street	115/19	" "				The Persion Room Patio Dining
510	Green Street	116/12	510-12 Green St	C	0116012	1910	Sodini'sTattoria Restaurant

516	Green Street	116/13	518-22 Green St	C	0116013	1907	Bocconcino Restaurant
524	Green Street	116/13	" "				Bocconcino Restaurant
528	Green Street	116/14	526-28 Green St	C	0116014	1906	Tattoo Boogaloo (tattoos and piercings)
532	Green Street	116/15	532-36 Green St	C	0116015	1907	Tagines Restaurant
542	Green Street	116/16	538-42 Green St	C	0116016	1913	Golden Boy Pizza
548	Green Street	116/17	544-48 Green St	C	0116017	1906	Gino & Carlo
550	Green Street	116/18	550-56 Green St	C	0116018	1906	California Fish Market Restaurant
552	Green Street	116/18	" "				Soto Mare Oysteria and Seafood Restaurant
562	Green Street	116/19	558-62 Green St	C	0116019	1907	Columbus Café
570	Green Street	116/20	570-76 Green St	C	0116020	1925	Next Door, food, droinks, games
580	Green Street	116/20A	580-84 Green St	C	0116020A	1962	Luke's Local
511	Green Street	131/25	509-13 Green St	C	0131025	1906	**Vacant** - last use was Foreign Lens gallery
523	Green Street	131/2A	517-23 Green St	C	0131024	1907	World CPS - Misc Supplies
535	Green Street	131/21	535 Green St	C	0131021	1946	**Vacant** -"Buon Gusto"
541	Green Street	131/21	" "				parking lot
565	Green Street	131/19	460-68 Columbus Ave*				Belle Cora Wine Bar
627-633	Green Street	130/40	625 Green St	NC	0130040	n/a	Bank of America drive through and parking lot
641	Green Street	130/37	635-41 Green St	C	0130037	1906	Doggy Day Spaw
649	Green Street	130/39	649 Green St	C	0130034 & 039	1907	Green Street Morturary
661-665	Green Street	130/33	661-65 Green St	NC	0130033	n/a	Parking Lot for Green Street Mortuary
683-687	Green Street	130/30	683 Green St	NC	0130030	n/a	Parking Lot for Green Street Mortuary
622	Green Street	117/5	501-47 Columbus Ave*				Chief Sullivan's Irish Pub
626	Green Street	117/6	626 Green St	NC	0117006	n/a	Parking lot
653-55	Green Street	130/34	649 Green St	C	0130034 & 039	1907	Green Street Morturary
678	Green Street	117/10	678 Green St	C	0117010	1912	Club Fugazi
701	Greenwich Street	90/1	1859-69 Powell St				Tom's Beautiful Hair
725	Greenwich Street	90/30	725 Greenwich St	NC	0090030	1983	Office Building

2	Nobles Alley	104/26	2 Nobles Alley	C	0104026	c. 1906	vacant lot
1526	Powell Street	130/25	1526 Powell St	C	0130025	1921	approved for massive condo project - De Lucchi Sheet Metal Works Building
1558	Powell Street	130/28	1558 Powell St	NC	0130028	1987	Luminno GlowaSwitch - National Chain
1560	Powell Street	130/29	1560 Powell St	C	0130029	c. 1908	NorthStar Cafe (bar)
1555	Powell Street	129/1	1557-77 Powell St	C	0129001	1907	88 Club Fontane Beauty Salon
1561	Powell Street	129/1	" "				Vacant - For Lease (Maven)
1567	Powell Street	129/1	" "				Joseph C. Ng, Lac / Acupuncturist
1573	Powell Street	129/1	" "				Salon Picaso
1600	Powell Street	117/11	1600-04 Powell St	C	0117011	1912	The Boardroom Sports Bar
1624	Powell Street	117/14	1620-24 Powell St	C	0117014	1911	La Mediterranee Catering (not permited)
1630	Powell Street	117/15	1626-32 Powell St	C	0117015	1912	Pena Pacha Mama
1636	Powell Street	117/16	1636 Powell St	C	0117016	1915	Powell Street Parking Garage
1601	Powell Street	118/9	1601-07 Powell St	C	0118009	1907	Clean X-Press Coin-Op & Dry Cleaning
1609	Powell Street	118/8	1609-11 Powell St	NC	0118008	1906	Waystone Wine Bar
1611	Powell Street	118/8	" "				residential units above Waystone
1625	Powell Street	118/6	1621-23 Powell St	C	0118006	1907	The Original Powell Street Garage
1641	Powell Street	118/4 & 5	1643 Powell St	C	0118004	1917	Awake / Brand, Digital Product, Ui/UX Design Studio (now 1643 Powell)
1661	Powell Street	118/2	1655-59 Powell St	C	0118002	1907	Coit Liquors
1701	Powell Street	101/5A	1701-11 Powell St	C	0101005A	1908	Noren Izakaya Japanese Restaurant
1707	Powell Street	101/5A	" "				Lillie Coit's Restaurant
1717-19	Powell Street	101/5	1717 Powell St	C	0101005		Washington Square Dental
1731	Powell Street	101/4	1731-41 Powell St	NC	0101051-070	2015	Vacant - large space in Pagoda Condos
1741	Powell Street	101/4	" "				Cafe Francisco
1811	Powell Street	90/8	700-04 Filbert St				Vacant - For rent
1817	Powell Street	90/8	" "				Pet Time Spa Grooming

1821	Powell Street	90/8	" "				Kauno Physical Therapy
1827	Powell Street	90/7	1823-27 Powell St	C	0090007	1906	The Darkside Initiative - clothing
1831	Powell Street	90/6	1831 Powell St	C	0090006	1925	TannerHect Architecture
1833	Powell Street	90/5	1833-37 Powell St	C	0090005	1924	Dr. Chong - Optometrist
1841	Powell Street	90/4	1841-45 Powell St	C	0090004	1906	Jeffrey's Pet Food
1851	Powell Street	90/3	1847-51 Powell St	C	0090003	1906	SF Rock Posters
1853	Powell Street	90/2	1853-55 Powell St	C	0090002	1906	Spazi Italiana
1859	Powell Street	90/1	1859-69 Powell St	C	0090001	1906	Doo Wash Cleaners
2041	Powell Street	64/5	2035-41 Powell St	C	0064005	1909	Vacant no sign
2054	Powell Street	63/23	2050-64 Powell St	C	0063023	1907	Vintage and Records
2064	Powell Street	63/23	" "				Studio Heinrich's
1415	Stockton	130/9	1411-33 Stockton St	C	0130009	1906	Napeleon Super Bakery (!?!)
1419	Stockton	130/9	" "				Gypsy Rosalie & Wigs
1421	Stockton	130/9	" "				Firenze By Night Restaurant
1431	Stockton	130/9	" "				Vieni Vieni (bar)
1455	Stockton	130/1	1455 Stockton St	C	0130001	1928	Bank of America
1512	Stockton	116/20C	1512 Stockton St	C	0116020C	1925	North Beach Restaurant
1520	Stockton	116/20B	1520 Stockton St	NC	0116020B	1926	Northeast Medical Services
1534	Stockton	116/21	1534-38 Stockton St	C	0116021	1906	Tony Nik's Bar
1548	Stockton	116/23	1548 Stockton St	NC	0116023	1906	North Beach Cantina Restaurant
1554	Stockton	116/54	1556-60 Stockton St	C	0116054	1906	Angel's Flowers by Amy
1570	Stockton	116/26	1566-70 Stockton St	C	0116026	1906	Tony's Pizza
1600	Stockton	103/14	1600-10 Stockton St	C	0103014	1927	Aqualina
1606	Stockton	103/14	" "				Dante Building
1610	Stockton	103/14	" "				Goorin Bros Hats
1612	Stockton	103/14	" "				Goorin Bros Hats
1630	Stockton	103/14A	1630 Stockton St	C	0103014A	1935	Italian Athletic Club
1640	Stockton	103/15	1640 Stockton St	C	0103015	1941	Post Office
1652	Stockton	103/17	1714 Stockton St	NC	0088017	1906	Park Tavern
1660	Stockton	103/18	1720-24 Stockton St	C	0088018	1909	Washington Square Hotel
1700	Stockton	88/16	1700-04 Stockton St	C	0088016	1915	Liguria Bakery
1706	Stockton	88/15	1706-10 Stockton St	C	0088015	1914	Fisher Weismann collection
1714	Stockton	88/17	1714 Stockton St	NC	0088017	1906	Architects office

1734-1736	Stockton	88/20	1736 Stockton St	C	0088020	1907	Maybeck Building - Offices
1756	Stockton	88/21	1748-56 Stockton St	C	0088021	1907	Napoli Market
1768	Stockton	88/22	1768 Stockton St	C	0088022	1925	Converted to residential (from office to DB)
1701	Stockton	89/10	1701-15 Stockton St	C	0089010	1906	Mama's Restaurant
1715	Stockton	89/10	" "				William J Raffetto and Sons Insurance
1757	Stockton	89/2	1757-61 Stockton St	C	0089002	1908	North Beach Cyclery
1767	Stockton	89/1	1763-69 Stockton St	C	0089001	1908	Missing Audrey vintage
444	Union Street		444-50 Union St	C	0104016	1906	Residential Use - Under construction to change store to ADU (Was Alma's Tailor Shop)
451	Union Street		451 Union St	NC	0115063-065	c. 1986	Residential Use - Converted storefront to ADU
463	Union Street		453-63 Union St	C	0115024	1910	Residental Use - looks like conversion from storefront
478	Union Street	104/22	478-82 Union St	C	0104022	1923	Savvy Nursery
484	Union Street	104/23	484-88 Union St	C	0104023	1912	Frenzy Faire -Handcrafted Vintage Goods
512	Union Street	103/7	1501-03 Grant Ave*				Vacant - formerly Don Pisto's the Chubby Noodle
524	Union Street	103/9	524 Union St	C	0103009	1906	Event Space - Paper Doll SF Landmark
548	Union Street	103/11	544-48 Union St	C	0103011	1909	residential use (was italian book store)
576	Union Street	103/14	1600-10 Stockton St*				Entropy Creamery
580	Union Street	103/14	" "				San Zen Nails
601-621	Union Street	117/1	601-21 Union St	C	0117001	1906	Original Joe's
629	Union Street	117/21	629-31 Union St	C	0117021	c. 1906	Giovanni's Italian Speciatles
655	Union Street	117/16	651-73 Union St	C	0117016	1914	Verde Building was Ferry Plaza Seafood
659	Union Street	117/16	" "				Verde Building was Tuk Tuk Thai Cafe
663	Union Street	117/16	" "				Verde Building was The Salzburg
673	Union Street	117/16	" "				Verde Building was Rogue Ales Public House
701	Union Street	118/1	701-09 Union St	C	0118001	1924	Hilda and Jesse Restaurant

601	Vallejo Street	146/1	601-11 Vallejo St	C	0146001	1908	Caffe Trieste
609	Vallejo Street	146/1	" "				Trieste Annex Retail
611	Vallejo Street	146/1	" "				Trieste Annex Retail
625-629	Vallejo Street	146/17-21	627 Vallejo St	C	0146017-021	1932	Cole Hardware

EXHIBIT D

NBNCD	NBNCD	NBNCD	NBHD	NBHD	NBHD	YR BUILT	2025 Occupant
331	Columbus Ave.	146/4	319-29 Columbus Ave	C	0146004	1906	Vacant (formally The Stinking Rose Restaurant)
333	Columbus Ave.	146/27	331-47 Columbus Ave	C	0146027	1906	KO Company & Dry Cleaners
353	Columbus Ave.	146/26	353-55 Columbus Ave	C	0146026	1910	Mona Lisa Restaurant
373	Columbus Ave.	146/25	371-73 Columbus Ave	C	0146025	1912	Molinari Delicatessen
342	Columbus Ave.	146/1	601-11 Vallejo St	C	0146001	1908	Nick's Liquor
401	Columbus Ave.	131/26	401-05 Columbus Ave	C	0131026	1906	Steps of Rome Trattoria
411	Columbus Ave.	131/26	411-53 Columbus	C	0131026	1906	Hi-Way Burgers (formerly Puchini)
412	Columbus Ave.	131/15	408-14 Columbus Ave	C	0131015	1922	Biordi Art Imports
430	Columbus Ave.	131/16	420-30 Columbus Ave	C	0131016	1925	The Stinking Rose Italian Restaurant
446	Columbus Ave.	131/17	444-54 Columbus Ave	C	0131017	1906	Stella Pasty and Caf
468	Columbus Ave.	131/19	460-68 Columbus Ave	C	0131019	1911	CBC International Bank
500	Columbus Ave.	117/4	500-24 Columbus Ave	C	0117004	1907	Red Window Restaurant
526	Columbus Ave.	117/3	526 Columbus Ave	C	0117003	1906	Vacant - was Cafe Roma
532	Columbus Ave.	117/2	532-44 Columbus Ave	C	0117002	1915	Flour + Water Pizzeria
552	Columbus Ave.	117/20	552-66 Columbus Ave	C	0117020	1909	Vacant - formerly Proper Fox and Sauter's Campaign HQ
501	Columbus Ave.	117/5	501-47 Columbus Ave	C	0117005	1906	Cafe Angolo
555	Columbus Ave.	117/19	549-55 Columbus Ave	C	0117019	1909	Il Pollaio
561	Columbus Ave.	117/18	559-65 Columbus Ave	C	0117018	1906	North Beach Gyros
577	Columbus Ave.	117/17	575-79 Columbus Ave	C	0117017	1912	Vacant - was Jack Lee Fong Insurance Agency
716	Columbus Ave.	90/27	716-22 Columbus Ave	C	0090027	1906	The Italian Homemade Company
752	Columbus Ave.	90/28	752-60 Columbus Ave	C	0090028	1909	Le Sandwich
782	Columbus Ave.	90/29	780-82 Columbus Ave	C	0090029	1907	Dylan's Tours
501	Filbert Street	103/1	501 Filbert St	C	0103001	1924	Grant Avenue Garage Auto Repair
700	Filbert Street	90/8	700-04 Filbert St	C	0090008	1907	Victoria Pastry
721	Filbert Street	101/31	721 Filbert St	C	0101031	1906	Hildebrand Stable - Public Parking
1228	Grant Avenue	145/15	1226-30 Grant Ave	C	0145015	1907	Vacant (Formerly Sin Cherry clothing store)
1232	Grant Avenue	145/30	1232 Grant Ave	C	0145030	1906	Saloon
1234	Grant Avenue	145/31	1234 Grant Ave	C	0145044	1906	The Showdown (Pantera sign)

1268	Grant Avenue	145/32	1268 Grant Ave	C	0145044	1906	The Showdown
1300	Grant Avenue	132/28	1300-26 Grant Ave	C	0132028	1907	Al's Attire
1336	Grant Avenue	132/29	1336-48 Grant Ave	C	0132029	1906	Nature Stop Grocery Store
1350	Grant Avenue	132/51	1350-58 Grant Ave	C	0132051	1906	May Lee Laundry
1309	Grant Avenue	131/7	1309-15 Grant Ave	C	0131007	1907	Ideale Restaurant
1315	Grant Avenue	131/7	1317-21 Grant Ave	C	0131006	1908	Ideale Restaurant
1327	Grant Avenue	131/5	1325-29 Grant Ave	C	0131005	1906	Vacant/ earthquake retrofit
1331	Grant Avenue	131/4	1331-35 Grant Ave	C	0131004	1907	Fishtank Art Gallery (jeremy Fish)
1337	Grant Avenue	131/3	1337-39 Grant Ave	C	0131003	1912	Tupelo Bar
1349	Grant Avenue	131/2	1345-61 Grant Ave	C	0131002	1910	Live Worms Gallery
1363	Grant Avenue	131/1	1363-71 Grant Ave	C	0131001	1906	April Jeans Bar
1400	Grant Avenue	115/19	1400-24 Grant Ave	C	0115019	1909	Mashka (Jewelry Store)
1434	Grant Avenue	115/20	1434-38 Grant Ave	C	0115020	1913	Savoy Tivoli Bar
1450	Grant Avenue	115/21	1446-62 Grant Ave	C	0115021	1909	Used for Stroage for NB Pizza/not permitted in NBNCD
1401	Grant Avenue	116/11	1401-11 Grant Ave	C	0116011	1907	Grant & Green Market
1415	Grant Avenue	116/10	1415-19 Grant Ave	C	0116010	1906	Cantina Records
1425	Grant Avenue	116/9	1421-25 Grant Ave	C	0116009	1906	Vacant/under construction
1429	Grant Avenue	116/8	1427-31 Grant Ave	C	0116008	1906	Vacant
1435	Grant Avenue	116/7	1435-39 Grant Ave	C	0116007	1906	Fisher Weisman Brugioni - Interior design
1441	Grant Avenue	116/5	1441-43 Grant Ave	C	0116005	1915	Jenneration Fit
1445/47	Grant Avenue	116/4	1445-51 Grant Ave	C	0116004	1913	Vacation 2 aka Needles and Pens
1453	Grant Avenue	116/3	1453-59 Grant Ave	C	0116003	1907	Knitz & Leather
1461	Grant Avenue	116/2	1461-65 Grant Ave	C	0116002	1906	S & S Grocery
1499	Grant Avenue	116/1	1467-99 Grant Ave	C	0116001	1906	Vacation Vintage Clothing
1500	Grant Avenue	104/24	1500-02 Grant Ave	C	0104024	1909	Flute World
1514	Grant Avenue	104/23	1508-12 Grant Ave	C	0104023	1912	Stanley's Laundry Wash and Dry
1522	Grant Avenue	104/27	1522-26 Grant Ave	C	0104027	1906	A-B Fits Clothing
1528	Grant Avenue	104/29	1528-32 Grant Ave	C	0104029	1909	Public Barber Salon
1534	Grant Avenue	104/30	1534-38 Grant Ave	C	0104030	1906	VACANT - last known use was gallary
1544	Grant Avenue	104/31	1540-44 Grant Ave	C	0104081-085	1907	Macchiarini Creative Designs

1546	Grant Avenue	104/32	1546-50 Grant Ave	C	0104032	c. 1906	Pink Blossom Clothing for Children
1556	Grant Avenue	104/33	1552-56 Grant Ave	C	0104033	1906	Vacant since at least 1986 prior to NBNCD
1562	Grant Avenue	104/34	1558-62 Grant Ave	C	0104034	1907	Barbery Coast Barber Shop
1501	Grant Avenue	103/7	1501-03 Grant Ave	C	0103007	1917	Telegraph Hill Books
1519	Grant Avenue	103/5	1519-23 Grant Ave	C	0103005	1912	A-B Fits Clothing
1525	Grant Avenue	103/4	1525-27 Grant Ave	C	0103004	1911	Vacant formerly CCDC - being retrofitted
1541	Grant Avenue	103/39	1539-45 Grant Ave	C	0103039	1906	Little Vine
468	Green Street	115/19	466-78 Green St	C	0115019	1912	Crown Fortune Properties
510	Green Street	116/12	510-12 Green St	C	0116012	1910	Sodini'sTattoria Restaurant
516	Green Street	116/13	518-22 Green St	C	0116013	1907	Bocconcino Restaurant
528	Green Street	116/14	526-28 Green St	C	0116014	1906	Tattoo Boogaloo (tattoos and piercings)
532	Green Street	116/15	532-36 Green St	C	0116015	1907	Tagines Restaurant
542	Green Street	116/16	538-42 Green St	C	0116016	1913	Golden Boy Pizza
548	Green Street	116/17	544-48 Green St	C	0116017	1906	Gino & Carlo
550	Green Street	116/18	550-56 Green St	C	0116018	1906	California Fish Market Restaurant
562	Green Street	116/19	558-62 Green St	C	0116019	1907	Columbus Café
570	Green Street	116/20	570-76 Green St	C	0116020	1925	Next Door, food, droinks, games
580	Green Street	116/20A	580-84 Green St	C	0116020A	1962	Luke's Local
511	Green Street	131/25	509-13 Green St	C	0131025	1906	**Vacant** - last use was Foreign Lens gallery
523	Green Street	131/2A	517-23 Green St	C	0131024	1907	World CPS - Misc Supplies
535	Green Street	131/21	535 Green St	C	0131021	1946	**Vacant** -"Buon Gusto"
641	Green Street	130/37	635-41 Green St	C	0130037	1906	Doggy Day Spaw
649	Green Street	130/39	649 Green St	C	0130034 & 039	1907	Green Street Morturary
653-55	Green Street	130/34	649 Green St	C	0130034 & 039	1907	Green Street Morturary
678	Green Street	117/10	678 Green St	C	0117010	1912	Club Fugazi
2	Nobles Alley	104/26	2 Nobles Alley	C	0104026	c. 1906	vacant lot

1526	Powell Street	130/25	1526 Powell St	C	0130025	1921	approved for massive condo project - De Lucchi Sheet Metal Works Building
1560	Powell Street	130/29	1560 Powell St	C	0130029	c. 1908	NorthStar Cafe (bar)
1555	Powell Street	129/1	1557-77 Powell St	C	0129001	1907	88 Club Fontane Beauty Salon
1600	Powell Street	117/11	1600-04 Powell St	C	0117011	1912	The Boardroom Sports Bar
1624	Powell Street	117/14	1620-24 Powell St	C	0117014	1911	La Mediterranee Catering (not permited)
1630	Powell Street	117/15	1626-32 Powell St	C	0117015	1912	Pena Pacha Mama
1636	Powell Street	117/16	1636 Powell St	C	0117016	1915	Powell Street Parking Garage
1601	Powell Street	118/9	1601-07 Powell St	C	0118009	1907	Clean X-Press Coin-Op & Dry Cleaning
1625	Powell Street	118/6	1621-23 Powell St	C	0118006	1907	The Original Powell Street Garage
1641	Powell Street	118/4 & 5	1643 Powell St	C	0118004	1917	Awake / Brand, Digital Product, Ui/UX Design Studio (now 1643 Powell)
1661	Powell Street	118/2	1655-59 Powell St	C	0118002	1907	Coit Liquors
1701	Powell Street	101/5A	1701-11 Powell St	C	0101005A	1908	Noren Izakaya Japanese Restaurant
1717-19	Powell Street	101/5	1717 Powell St	C	0101005		Washington Square Dental
1827	Powell Street	90/7	1823-27 Powell St	C	0090007	1906	The Darkside Initiative - clothing
1831	Powell Street	90/6	1831 Powell St	C	0090006	1925	TannerHect Architecture
1833	Powell Street	90/5	1833-37 Powell St	C	0090005	1924	Dr. Chong - Optometrist
1841	Powell Street	90/4	1841-45 Powell St	C	0090004	1906	Jeffrey's Pet Food
1851	Powell Street	90/3	1847-51 Powell St	C	0090003	1906	SF Rock Posters
1853	Powell Street	90/2	1853-55 Powell St	C	0090002	1906	Spazi Italiana
1859	Powell Street	90/1	1859-69 Powell St	C	0090001	1906	Doo Wash Cleaners
2041	Powell Street	64/5	2035-41 Powell St	C	0064005	1909	Vacant no sign
2054	Powell Street	63/23	2050-64 Powell St	C	0063023	1907	Vintage and Records
1415	Stockton	130/9	1411-33 Stockton St	C	0130009	1906	Napeleon Super Bakery (!?!)
1455	Stockton	130/1	1455 Stockton St	C	0130001	1928	Bank of America
1512	Stockton	116/20C	1512 Stockton St	C	0116020C	1925	North Beach Restaurant
1534	Stockton	116/21	1534-38 Stockton St	C	0116021	1906	Tony Nik's Bar
1554	Stockton	116/54	1556-60 Stockton St	C	0116054	1906	Angel's Flowers by Amy
1570	Stockton	116/26	1566-70 Stockton St	C	0116026	1906	Tony's Pizza

1600	Stockton	103/14	1600-10 Stockton St	C	0103014	1927	Aqualina
1630	Stockton	103/14A	1630 Stockton St	C	0103014A	1935	Italian Athletic Club
1640	Stockton	103/15	1640 Stockton St	C	0103015	1941	Post Office
1660	Stockton	103/18	1720-24 Stockton St	C	0088018	1909	Washington Square Hotel
1700	Stockton	88/16	1700-04 Stockton St	C	0088016	1915	Liguria Bakery
1706	Stockton	88/15	1706-10 Stockton St	C	0088015	1914	Fisher Weismann collection
1734-1736	Stockton	88/20	1736 Stockton St	C	0088020	1907	Maybeck Building - Offices
1756	Stockton	88/21	1748-56 Stockton St	C	0088021	1907	Napoli Market
1768	Stockton	88/22	1768 Stockton St	C	0088022	1925	Converted to residential (from office to DB)
1701	Stockton	89/10	1701-15 Stockton St	C	0089010	1906	Mama's Restaurant
1757	Stockton	89/2	1757-61 Stockton St	C	0089002	1908	North Beach Cyclery
1767	Stockton	89/1	1763-69 Stockton St	C	0089001	1908	Missing Audrey vintage
444	Union Street		444-50 Union St	C	0104016	1906	Residential Use - Under construction to change store to ADU (Was Alma's Tailor Shop)
463	Union Street		453-63 Union St	C	0115024	1910	Residental Use - looks like conversion from storefront
478	Union Street	104/22	478-82 Union St	C	0104022	1923	Savvy Nursery
484	Union Street	104/23	484-88 Union St	C	0104023	1912	Frenzy Faire -Handcrafted Vintage Goods
524	Union Street	103/9	524 Union St	C	0103009	1906	Event Space - Paper Doll SF Landmark
548	Union Street	103/11	544-48 Union St	C	0103011	1909	residential use (was italian book store)
601-621	Union Street	117/1	601-21 Union St	C	0117001	1906	Original Joe's
629	Union Street	117/21	629-31 Union St	C	0117021	c. 1906	Giovanni's Italian Speciatles
655	Union Street	117/16	651-73 Union St	C	0117016	1914	Verde Building was Ferry Plaza Seafood
701	Union Street	118/1	701-09 Union St	C	0118001	1924	Hilda and Jesse Restaurant
601	Vallejo Street	146/1	601-11 Vallejo St	C	0146001	1908	Caffe Trieste
625-629	Vallejo Street	146/17-21	627 Vallejo St	C	0146017-021	1932	Cole Hardware

Item 9

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Support the reappointment of Ms. Jennifer Friedenbach to Our City Our Home Commission Seat 8
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 11:36:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Alliance for A Better District 6 regarding File No. 251023.

> **File No. 251023:** Hearing to consider appointing four members, terms ending April 22, 2027, to the Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee.

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: Michael Nulty <sf_district6@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:30 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <stephen.sherrill@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support the reappointment of Ms. Jennifer Friedenbach to Our City Our Home Commission Seat 8

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

Dear Supervisor,

Alliance for a Better District 6 is reaching out to express our unwavering support for the reappointment of Ms. Jennifer Friedenbach, who presently occupies Seat 8 on the Our City Our Home Commission. As you are undoubtedly aware, Jennifer was not only instrumental in the creation of Prop C, Our City Our Home, but she has also consistently proven to be one of the most effective and engaged members of the commission, dedicating countless hours to the betterment of our city.

Her tireless efforts have resulted in over 5,000 individuals being housed, which includes an impressive 1,700 children who now have a stable place to call home. Additionally, she has made significant strides in diversifying the shelter system, thereby allowing for the accommodation of an additional 4,000 people who previously lacked access to essential services. Furthermore, she has greatly enhanced behavioral health services, successfully benefiting over 16,000 new clients who are in dire need of support.

Ms. Friedenbach's influence through the Prop C Committee has also been nothing short of remarkable. She has a keen ability to pinpoint deficiencies within the system and has successfully enacted meaningful changes to address these issues. For instance, there has been a notable lack of treatment options available for women, Spanish-speaking individuals, and members of the transgender community. With her leadership, she has garnered critical support from the Department of Public Health, leading to the establishment of new programs that directly address these treatment gaps and provide necessary resources for these underserved populations.

Her dedication to this cause is evident as she diligently analyzes data, incorporates diverse viewpoints, and fosters consensus on effective solutions that truly reflect the needs of our community. Ms. Friedenbach has cultivated positive relationships with a wide array of stakeholders, including community members, service providers, legislators, and city officials. She actively listens to and addresses their needs and concerns, ensuring that every voice is heard and considered in the decision-making process. She uniquely combines insights gained from her interactions with unhoused individuals and maintains ongoing communication with frontline homeless service providers, creating a feedback loop that enhances the effectiveness of our programs.

Her efforts have significantly shifted the landscape of homelessness in San Francisco; without her invaluable contributions, our city would be facing an alarming increase of 30-50% in homelessness. It is essential to recognize that Prop C would not have been possible without her unwavering involvement and steadfast commitment to this critical issue.

The greatness of San Francisco is attributable to the hard work and dedication of passionate individuals like Ms. Friedenbach, who embody the spirit of civic engagement and public service. It is crucial to acknowledge and act upon such exemplary civic participation that has a profound impact on the lives of so many. The Board of Supervisors should reconsider the removal of citizen participants who are making a substantial difference in our community. Ms. Friedenbach deserves not only recognition but also the opportunity to continue her vital work through reappointment.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Michael Nulty
Executive Director
Alliance for A Better District 6

Co-President
Central City Democrats

Co-Ordinator
North of Market Business Association

Co-Ordinator
Tenderloin Futures Collaborative

Board of Directors
Veterans Alley Mural Project, Inc.

Michael Nulty

P.O. Box 420782
San Francisco, CA 94142-0782
(415) 339-8327 - Direct
(415) 339-8779 - Alliance for a Better District 6
(415) 339-8683 - Central City Democrats
(415) 937-1289 - North of Market Business Association
(415) 820-1412 - Tenderloin Futures Collaborative
http://abd6.cfsites.org/

Item 10

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Crayton, Monique (BOS)
Subject:	150 Letters regarding File No. 250639
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:10:00 PM
Attachments:	150 Letters regarding File No. 250639.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 150 letters regarding File No. 250639.

> File No. 250639: Resolution urging the Police Department and the Department of Emergency Management to designate all 911 calls reporting drug use or suspected drug activity within 1,500 feet of parks, playgrounds, and schools as “Priority A” calls requiring swift and immediate response. (Sherrill, Sauter)

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: David Lin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 12:34:39 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, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	David Lin
Email	was95123@yahoo.com
District	other
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Rebecca Saroyan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:06:27 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Rebecca Saroyan
Email	saroyan.rebecca@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Francesca Pastine
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:35:40 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Francesca Pastine
Email	francesca@pastineart.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

I want San Francisco's law enforcement to fully enforce existing laws to end the open-air drug use and drug markets that are devastating our neighborhoods and diminishing the quality of everyday life in our city.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution

does not create new laws or criminal justice policies, but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you,
Francesca Pastine

From: Stephen Martin-Pinto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:06:33 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Stephen Martin-Pinto
Email	stephen@stephenmartinpinto.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Frances Eubanks
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:37:39 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Frances Eubanks
Email	eutravel@earthlink.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: JeNeal. Granieri
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:35:09 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	JeNeal. Granieri
Email	jenealann@att.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Martha Ehmann Conte
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:00:36 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Martha Ehmann Conte
Email	martha@ehmannconte.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Jamie Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:37:27 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Jamie Wong
Email	jamielee6@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: J. Barry Gurdin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:53:38 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	J. Barry Gurdin
Email	gurdin@hotmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Francine Lofrano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:02:38 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Francine Lofrano
Email	ftblote@sbcglobal.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws to protect ALL San Franciscans NOT just children as ALL of us are "vulnerable"!!

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". Additionally, I urge a vote to prioritize public safety response to ANY drug activity regardless of where its occuring!

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to

ensure that ALL public areas including parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies, but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

San Franciscans want drug laws enforced!! It is the City's obligation to enforce the existing laws that are on the books. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children, families and ALL San Franciscans at risk in spaces that belong to law the abiding public.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting ALL residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Ty Coleman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 2:28:31 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Ty Coleman
Email	tcoleman1257@comcast.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: David Cuadro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 2:06:38 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	David Cuadro
Email	david.s.cuadro@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Karen Breslin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 1:45:41 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Karen Breslin
Email	kbsmail@sbcglobal.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Hatun Noguera
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 1:45:40 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Hatun Noguera
Email	noguera@changes.world
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Carlos Longa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 12:32:34 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Carlos Longa
Email	clonga02@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Brian Delahunty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 12:29:30 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Brian Delahunty

Email Bdelahunty@aol.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Adrienne Hoyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 12:19:46 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Adrienne Hoyer
Email	amhoyer@sbcglobal.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Iris Bucchioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 12:00:53 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Iris Bucchioni
Email	irismvbucchioni@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

Iris Bucchioni

From: Edward Reidy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:45:38 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Edward Reidy
Email	edwardreidy@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Cornell Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:44:37 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Cornell Lee
Email	corny1215@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Marisa Alfieri
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:44:28 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Marisa Alfieri
Email	marisa1115@sbcglobal.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Denise Foley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:37:35 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Denise Foley
Email	denisemrf79@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Amy Murphy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:33:41 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Amy Murphy
Email	ammurphy1@dons.usfca.edu
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Jay Elliott
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:32:33 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Jay Elliott
Email	jayelliott415@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Tom Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:31:38 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Tom Lee
Email	thl001@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Charles Farrugia
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:19:41 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Charles Farrugia
Email	Helpmlpark@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

Charles Farrugia
283 Gambier St.

From: Jane Perry
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 8:35:27 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Jane Perry

Email janesjoint5@comcast.net

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Teresa Kres
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 7:53:26 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Teresa Kres
Email	teresakres@hotmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Aisling Ferguson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 5:27:29 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Aisling Ferguson
Email	aferguson@gmwest.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: lucy junus
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 5:24:20 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	lucy junus
Email	lujunus@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Karina Velásquez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 1:15:34 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Karina Velásquez
Email	Karinawinder@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Dennis Tsai dtsai6277@aol.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 2:17:28 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Dennis Tsai dtsai6277@aol.com
Email	dtsai6277@aol.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Luciana Ragoni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 10:56:32 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Luciana Ragoni
Email	luragoni@sbcglobal.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Esfir Shrayberr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 8:14:25 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Esfir Shrayberr
Email	to_fira@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Edward Sullivan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 8:06:24 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Edward Sullivan
Email	efsullyjr@aol.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Alison Gardner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 11:50:35 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Alison Gardner
Email	agardner331@comcast.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Dennis Shea
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 8:28:39 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Dennis Shea
Email	dshea1743@aol.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Laurie Samuelson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 7:48:28 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, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	Laurie Samuelson
Email	lauriesam1@gmail.com
District	other
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Scott Brown
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 6:35:32 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Scott Brown
Email	scott@lisbyrne.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Naeemah Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 3:12:25 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, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent: Naeemah Hall

Email: naeemahhall@outlook.com

District: D5

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Pat Stanton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 2:12:26 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Pat Stanton
Email	pstanton1224@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: LuAnn McVicker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 7:39:29 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	LuAnn McVicker
Email	mcvickerlc@gmail.com
District	D5
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Diana Kaytun
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 6:54:45 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Diana Kaytun
Email	corex123@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Noelle Poole
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 1:39:22 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Noelle Poole

Email lnpoole@yahoo.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Tony Villa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 11:32:29 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Tony Villa
Email	tvobsf@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Robin McMillan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 11:28:29 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Robin McMillan
Email	rkmcmillan@viselect.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Gary Kendall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:34:42 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Gary Kendall
Email	gary_k@pacbell.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Jim Mackey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:30:36 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Jim Mackey
Email	jim@wineappreciation.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Kevin Wallace
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 9:39:33 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Kevin Wallace
Email	kevinwallace415@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Nathan Lang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 9:21:36 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Nathan Lang
Email	nathanlang@comcast.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Emily Bassolino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:52:28 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Emily Bassolino
Email	emilyb143@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Senta Tsantilis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:40:46 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Senta Tsantilis
Email	sptsantilis@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Ashley Dalzell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 7:49:22 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Ashley Dalzell
Email	ashleydalzell@mindspring.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Ilia Skhvitaridze
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 7:20:42 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Ilia Skhvitaridze
Email	iliasound@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Lauren Meredith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 6:47:33 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Lauren Meredith
Email	soaring_leap@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Lauren Larsson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 3:30:43 AM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Lauren Larsson
Email	laurenj@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Danric Vargas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:54:32 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, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent: Danric Vargas

Email: danric.vargas@gmail.com

District: D10

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: David Knapp
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:45:17 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	David Knapp
Email	knappdavid@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Dennis Tsai
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:33:35 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Dennis Tsai
Email	2237st@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:08:26 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	John Nulty
Email	john33sf@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Lesley Stansfield
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:33:31 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Lesley Stansfield
Email	lesleys460@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Erika Kim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:30:32 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Erika Kim
Email	e_kimch@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Liubov Kovaleva
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:21:24 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Liubov Kovaleva
Email	jobliub@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Carmen Woo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:57:33 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Carmen Woo
Email	carmenwoo68@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

Carmen Woo

From: John Bitoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:28:35 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	John Bitoff
Email	bitoffj@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Rick Pospisil
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:05:33 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Rick Pospisil
Email	rpospisilmd@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Dan Pergiel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:56:27 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Dan Pergiel
Email	dpergiel@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	[Note: edit subject line to "Jail Time for Public Illicit Drug Use"]

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

I believe, in general, San Francisco should end policies which attract degenerates and drug addicts to our city, and focus instead on providing a quality living environment for our responsible, law-abiding residents who lead productive lives. It is so galling to work hard in a difficult environment, and pay exorbitant taxes, only to see your government actively encourage and sponsor derelicts to ruin life for the rest of us.

Specifically, I believe supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to pursue a plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step in the right direction, and I urge you to support this effort.

And as you know, citations are useless -- an effective response means jail time. Jails are a cheap and effective deterrent to crime.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

From: Philip Healy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:34:35 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Philip Healy
Email	Lfchere@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Robert Benkeser
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:20:34 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Robert Benkeser
Email	robert.benkeser@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Bianca Molgora
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:19:36 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent: Bianca Molgora

Email: biancamsf@yahoo.com

Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: pamela smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:13:38 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent: pamela smith

Email: pamontherun@yahoo.com

District: D5

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Jackie Holen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:03:28 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Jackie Holen
Email	jackie.holen@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn, Start enforcing the law and end practices proven to hurt our city. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies, but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site

health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: deborah chew
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:55:17 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	deborah chew
Email	chewchewicu@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Joe Cioni
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:51:37 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Joe Cioni
Email	joecioni@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Sue Dudum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:45:24 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Sue Dudum
Email	suedudum@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: jim connelly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:40:20 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	jim connelly
Email	jim-connelly@comcast.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Neville Morcom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:33:28 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Neville Morcom
Email	nmorcom@comcast.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Randa Dudum
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:28:37 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Randa Dudum
Email	randadudum@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Nancy Federico
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:57:34 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Nancy Federico
Email	nlfederico@msn.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Michael Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:35:30 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Michael Nulty
Email	sf_district6@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

Michael Nulty
Executive Director
Alliance for a Better District 6

From: Charles Sheinin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:30:37 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Charles Sheinin
Email	mausolos@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Christina Orth
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:16:35 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Christina Orth
Email	cmorth.90@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Gnarity Burke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:15:38 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	Gnarity Burke
Email	urban42n81@gmail.com
District	D5
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support the resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized as it was during Covid in the Haight. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Qiang Zeng
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:14:31 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Qiang Zeng
Email	johnzeng@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: David Nolley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:06:29 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	David Nolley
Email	danolley@aol.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Richard Hansen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:05:30 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Richard Hansen
Email	richhansen@aol.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Kristen Fenech
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:57:36 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Kristen Fenech
Email	fenechkristen@hotmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

I live at Gough and Geary - we have repeated drug users passing out in the bushes between and bordering properties between Starr King, Gough, Franklin and Ellis. High schoolers walk these sidewalks every day, as well as the many seniors living in the neighborhood. Last week their leashless dogs were running around the dog run next to Saint Mark's, then threatened our doorman when he asked them to get out of our gardens. Until recently they did drugs and passed out feet from kids in the playground at the Montessori Nursery School, seemingly with impunity.

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug

use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies, but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Barbara Conwell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:32:37 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Barbara Conwell
Email	barbara.conwell@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: marcello t
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:30:47 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	marcello t
Email	tribute-cloche.2l@icloud.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Marlen Bekirov
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:16:37 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Marlen Bekirov
Email	marlen.bekirov63@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Christopher Aycock
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:15:36 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent: Christopher Aycock

Email: charity@aycock.org

District: D4

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: James McAndrew
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:00:33 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent James McAndrew

Email mcandrewrocks@yahoo.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Samuel Hom
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:47:29 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Samuel Hom
Email	bolo1@comcast.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Anna Bockris
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:23:32 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Anna Bockris

Email abockris@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Stewart Wilber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:18:43 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Stewart Wilber
Email	s.wilber@mindspring.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Charlotte Worcester
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:16:45 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Charlotte Worcester
Email	beaubarlotte@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Charlotte Worcester

From: Ramsey Jammal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:12:43 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Ramsey Jammal
Email	rmsejammal@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Mark Varney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:07:43 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Mark Varney
Email	markvarney@hotmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Vivien MacDonald
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:05:40 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Vivien MacDonald
Email	bebemacd@aol.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Karen Davison
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:03:37 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Karen Davison
Email	dr-karen-davison@dr-davison.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

Please help us! We can't walk on our sidewalks or open our windows without encountering drugs and drug related pollution and noise. The air is full of smoke, stench, screams and moaning. The sidewalks are covered with urine, feces, drug related waste and bodies.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies, but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: DAVID DRIVER
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:56:29 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	DAVID DRIVER
Email	davidrandolphdriver@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: John Motlow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:56:27 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	John Motlow
Email	geoff.motlow@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Calum MacKay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:48:42 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Calum MacKay
Email	calumlmackay@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Frances Hochschild
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:42:39 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Frances Hochschild
Email	fhochschild@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Please also start implementing the law that people aren't allowed to just lie wherever they want on the sidewalks!!!

Thank you.

From: Scott Jacques
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:41:38 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Scott Jacques
Email	scottjacques@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Todd DeLong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:41:31 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Todd DeLong
Email	tmdelong@mac.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: David Ferguson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:40:47 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	David Ferguson
Email	ddferg@sbcglobal.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Ella Brittingham
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:29:39 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Ella Brittingham
Email	ellabrittingham@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Sean Millis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:22:32 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Sean Millis
Email	seanmillis@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Daphne Alden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:18:27 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Daphne Alden
Email	daphnealden.sf@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Usha and John Burns
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:16:36 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Usha and John Burns
Email	Johnmburns48@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Manuel Torres
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:15:38 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Manuel Torres
Email	manueltorres2001@hotmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Christine Peterson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:13:35 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Christine Peterson
Email	christinepeterson194@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Andrea Galvin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:13:25 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Andrea Galvin
Email	andreacgalvin@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Jane Day
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:11:38 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Jane Day
Email	janeday@earthlink.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But particular now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Beverly Rockabrand
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:08:30 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	Beverly Rockabrand
Email	bjrockabrand@gmail.com
District	D11
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Kate english
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 1:01:32 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Kate english
Email	kenglish1775@comcast.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: John Grauel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:57:37 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	John Grauel
Email	john@carbonrose.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Bill Owens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:57:25 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Bill Owens
Email	bowens4631@aol.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Richard Adhikari
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:56:36 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Richard Adhikari
Email	rawriter@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Jennifer Z Yan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:55:32 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Jennifer Z Yan
Email	popcorn-kidder.3s@icloud.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Stephen Ravel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:55:22 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Stephen Ravel
Email	ravelsteve@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Helen Hughes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:54:17 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Helen Hughes
Email	hfmhughes@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Christina Tucker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:53:35 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	Christina Tucker
Email	ctucker.0306@gmail.com
District	D5
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Mike Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:52:37 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Mike Jones
Email	mj357@comcast.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Julie Paul
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:52:34 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Julie Paul
Email	juliepaul164@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Sunny Evans
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:52:25 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Sunny Evans
Email	sunny.evans23@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Jane Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:52:20 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Jane Lee
Email	jwlee888@aol.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Rohit Goel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:47:34 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent: Rohit Goel

Email: 04_rubber.dot@icloud.com

Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: CAROLINE MATTHEWS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:45:40 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	CAROLINE MATTHEWS
Email	carolinem_matthews@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you!

From: Keith Wetmore
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:42:26 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Keith Wetmore
Email	kcwetmore@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Christine Varon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:38:35 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Christine Varon
Email	covaron@icloud.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Karen Knuth
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:36:39 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Karen Knuth
Email	kpuechner@msn.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Neil Wahlgren
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:35:43 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Neil Wahlgren
Email	NEILWAHLGREN17@GMAIL.COM
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Joseph McFadden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:34:36 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Joseph McFadden
Email	fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: MARY THOMAS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:32:40 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	MARY THOMAS
Email	mary@redhula.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces. also after the 5th violation i think it would be ok to force them to get detoxed and mandatory help

Thank you.

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:29:39 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Justin Truong
Email	justintruong56@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: MichaeL Arredondo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:28:39 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	MichaeL Arredondo
Email	marredondo@attglobal.net
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Michelle Wing
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:28:33 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Michelle Wing
Email	mcorleywing@hotmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.
Michelle Wing

From: Rita Fahrner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:26:36 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent: Rita Fahrner

Email: ritakell@comcast.net

Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Hieu Pham
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:26:33 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent: Hieu Pham

Email: hphamsf@gmail.com

District: D5

Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A

Message:

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A."

This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized.

While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play.

I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it.

Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: Ronald Albucher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:25:38 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Ronald Albucher

Email ronalbucher@gmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: James Wall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:24:49 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	James Wall
Email	jimwallsf@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Nathan Vogel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:24:35 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent Nathan Vogel

Email doctorspook@hotmail.com

Subject Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use

Message:

FIRST... DRUG DEALING IS ILLEGAL IN ALL OF SF, right? WHAT ABOUT SHOOTING HEROIN AND FENTANYL??? IS THAT ILLEGAL OR DOES SF STILL GIVE OUT FREE SYRINGES AND PROVIDE DRUG USE FACILITIES THAT WILL SHOOT PEOPLE UP FOR FREE????? COME ON!!!!

Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can’t agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill’s resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks,

Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies, but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Gerald Kangelaris
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:21:44 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Gerald Kangelaris
Email	gkangelaris@yahoo.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Sidhardha Lakireddy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:21:30 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Sidhardha Lakireddy
Email	sid@anchorvalley.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn:

San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action.

Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws.

Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step.

We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution".

This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Mike Lin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:19:51 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	Mike Lin
Email	votemikelin@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Remi Tan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:19:32 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, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	Remi Tan
Email	remitan@sbcglobal.net
District	other
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

From: john lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:18:39 PM

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

to MemberMessages of the Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Police Commission, Ralph Anderson & Associates Executive Search Firm

From your constituent	john lee
Email	john.ele81946@gmail.com
Subject	Issue Citations for Public Illicit Drug Use
Message:	Dear Supervisors, Commissioners, Ms. Heather Renschler and Chief Daniel Hahn: San Francisco can't agree on much, but we can agree that we have a drug crisis. That acknowledgment alone is progress. But now, we must match it with action. Nearly 30% of our members identified open-air drug markets and overdoses as the top public safety issue the next Chief of Police must address. The mandate is clear: we need a top-down approach to eliminate drugs from our streets, starting with enforcement of existing laws. Supervisor Sherrill's resolution, which urges the San Francisco Police Department to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to respond to drug use, visible narcotics activity, or suspected drug trafficking within 250 feet of any park, playground, or school, is a necessary and urgent step. We urge you to vote yes on the "Prioritize Public Safety Response to Drug Activity Near Parks, Playgrounds, and Schools Resolution". This resolution protects our most vulnerable residents: children. It reaffirms the City's duty to ensure that parks, playgrounds, and schools remain safe, drug-free spaces. Importantly, the resolution does not create new laws or criminal justice policies,

but instead directs the City to use the legal tools already available - to issue citations, conduct on-site health assessments, and when appropriate, remove individuals for detoxification or treatment services.

If San Franciscans no longer want drug laws enforced, then the proper process is to change those laws. But until then, it is the City's obligation to enforce them. The lack of enforcement has eroded public trust and put children and families at risk in spaces that should be sanctuaries.

We now have a new beginning and a fresh opportunity to create a culture of support for the police to carry out the will of the people by enforcing the laws San Franciscans have collectively agreed to live under. This is an all-hands-on-deck moment. We need alignment among our elected officials and the recruitment services tasked with selecting the next Chief of Police, so that the City's leadership is united in carrying out the will of the people.

We call on the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the recruitment agency tasked with finding San Francisco's next Chief of Police to stand together in support of this resolution. The people of San Francisco have spoken clearly: we want safe parks, safe playgrounds, and safe schools. This is not a moment for hesitation or division - it is an opportunity for leadership and alignment. By adopting this resolution and ensuring the next Chief is empowered to enforce existing laws, our City's leaders can send a powerful message: San Francisco is committed to protecting its most vulnerable residents and restoring public confidence in our shared public spaces.

Thank you.

From: Joe Maloney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); FielderStaff; ChenStaff; MahmoodStaff; SauterStaff
Subject: Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 12:17:03 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, Mayor, and the Chief of Police

From your constituent	Joe Maloney
Email	joemaloneyjoe@gmail.com
District	D5
Subject	Make Drug Calls Near Parks and Schools Priority A
Message:	Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, and Board of Supervisors: I'm writing to urge you to support Supervisor Sherrill's resolution calling on SFPD to classify every 911 call about illegal drug activity near schools, parks, and playgrounds as "Priority A." This is not about politics. It is about protecting children and families. Parents should not have to walk their kids past open drug use to get to school. Playgrounds should not feel unsafe. Open drug use should not be normalized. While this resolution does not change SFPD policy directly, it sends a clear message: San Franciscans expect urgent response when drugs are being used or sold where kids learn and play. I strongly urge you to vote YES when this resolution comes before the full Board and to keep urging SFPD to act on it. Thank you for your leadership on public safety.

Item 11

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	60 Letters regarding File No. 250655
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:18:00 PM
Attachments:	60 Letters regarding File No. 250655.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 60 letters regarding File No. 250655.

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

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: Charlie Musoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:11:41 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Charlie Musoff
charliemusoff@gmail.com
507 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Charlie Musoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:11:40 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Charlie Musoff
charliemusoff@gmail.com
507 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Nick DeRenzi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:32:51 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Nick D

Nick DeRenzi
nickderenziphoto@gmail.com
2808 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Nick DeRenzi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:32:49 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Nick D

Nick DeRenzi
nickderenziphoto@gmail.com
2808 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Alejandra Rubio
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:52:19 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Alejandra Rubio
alexrubio1244@gmail.com
505 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Alejandra Rubio
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:52:01 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Alejandra Rubio
alexrubio1244@gmail.com
505 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Alejandra Rubio
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:52:00 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Alejandra Rubio
alexrubio1244@gmail.com
505 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jordan O"Brien
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MandelmanStaff (BOS)
Cc: Katie O"Brien
Subject: Arbitrary Vehicle Discrimination
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:00:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am a 20-year San Francisco resident and parent of three writing to request **an immediate amendment to Ordinance 250655**. The law's current definition of "Large Vehicle" is arbitrary and is having severe, unintended consequences on housed, tax-paying families like mine.

My message is not about the ordinance's goal of addressing vehicular homelessness, which I'm in agreement with. My message is that the 7-foot height limit is a flawed, arbitrary metric that is unfairly penalizing long-term residents.

My Situation:

- I am a housed resident with three children. We have owned our 19-foot-long passenger van since 2021 and continue to pay annual parking permit fees & it is NOT registered as an RV and fully DMV-legal.
- We regularly use this vehicle for our daily lives & increasing family logistics. **We do not live in this vehicle.**
- Because our van is over 7 feet tall, it is now subject to the 24/7 two-hour parking limit, with enforcement beginning November 1.

The Ordinance's Flaws:

- **The 7-Foot Height Limit is Arbitrary:** My 19-foot van fits in a standard parking space. The relevant metric for parking availability is **length** (over 22 feet), not an arbitrary 7-foot **height** limit that serves only as a proxy for vehicle dwelling (I have seen plenty of vehicles in my neighborhood with residents living in shorter vehicles...**it is not a proxy**). This height limit does **nothing** to increase parking supply nor improve public safety, both of which were explicit goals of this ordinance. Frankly, it makes me question **why** height was included at all.
- **It Unfairly Penalizes Housed Residents:** The law's only exemption, the Large Vehicle Refuge Permit (LVRP), is available *only* to those "experiencing vehicular homelessness." This creates an absurd situation where housed residents have no path to compliance and are treated more punitively than the group the law targets.
- **It Creates an Unfair Financial Burden:** As an unintended target of this law, I am now facing a new, unexpected cost of $3,180 per year for a private parking lot, or I will be forced to sell my family's vehicle.

I am asking you to amend the ordinance to create a residential parking exemption for housed residents whose vehicles are **under the 22-foot length limit**, regardless of their height.

Thank you for your immediate attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jordan O'Brien
67 Carl Street (Cole Valley/District 8), 415-867-6709

PS In my 20+ years in San Francisco, I have never felt so targeted by illogical legislation. This reeks of caving to a "squeaky wheel" minority, as opposed to common sense. As such, I may consider legal action...I really do not want to become a NIMBY.

From: Liliana Ocegueda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:37:25 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Liliana Ocegueda
lily.ocegueda@gmail.com
1000 Girard St
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Liliana Ocegueda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:34:18 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Liliana Ocegueda
lily.ocegueda@gmail.com
1000 Girard St
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Liliana Ocegueda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:33:45 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Liliana Ocegueda
lily.ocegueda@gmail.com
1000 Girard St
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Guadalupe Velez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:12:09 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Guadalupe Velez
lupe417@gmail.com
411 Bartlett St.
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Guadalupe Velez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:12:08 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Guadalupe Velez
lupe417@gmail.com
411 Bartlett St.
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Kristian Mitchell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 11:10:25 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Kristian Mitchell
cassiusk@me.com
1913 Broderick St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Kristian Mitchell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 11:10:24 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Kristian Mitchell
cassiusk@me.com
1913 Broderick St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Antoinette Payne
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 4:29:37 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely, Antoinette Payne

Antoinette Payne
antoinetty@aol.com
1776a Page St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Antoinette Payne
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 4:29:13 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely, Antoinette Payne

Antoinette Payne
antoinetty@aol.com
1776a Page St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Candy Smallwood
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:43:45 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly oppose the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Candy Smallwood

Candy Smallwood
candymsmallwood@gmail.com
Laguna
SF, California 94115

From: Candy Smallwood
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:43:36 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly oppose the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Candy Smallwood

Candy Smallwood
candymsmallwood@gmail.com
Laguna
SF, California 94115

From: Jason Munderloh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:01:54 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Jason Munderloh
whiteyonthemoon@gmail.com
1910 page street, apt 6
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Jason Munderloh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:01:54 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Jason Munderloh
whiteyonthemoon@gmail.com
1910 page street, apt 6
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Brandon Archbold
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 11:01:26 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Brandon Archbold
brandon-pro@protonmail.com
720 2nd Ave Apt 306
San Francisco, CA United States

From: Brandon Archbold
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 11:01:17 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Brandon Archbold
brandon-pro@protonmail.com
720 2nd Ave Apt 306
San Francisco, CA United States

From: yax montano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 5:57:04 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Yax Montano

yax montano
salmon6@outlook.com
623 edinburgh st
san francisco , California 94112

From: yax montano
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 5:57:00 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Yax Montano

yax montano
salmon6@outlook.com
623 edinburgh st
san francisco , California 94112

From: Justice Dumlao
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 3:50:48 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Justice Dumlao
jdumlao@sfaf.org
940 Howard Street
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Justice Dumlao
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 3:50:44 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Justice Dumlao
jdumlao@sfaf.org
940 Howard Street
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Shiba Bandeeba
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 2:08:37 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,

I'm a District 4 San Francisco resident writing to strongly oppose the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, coercive and inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Shiba Bandeeba
shibabandeeba@gmail.com
1968 Great Highway Apt. A
San Francisco , California 94116

From: Shiba Bandeeba
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 2:08:34 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a District 4 San Francisco resident writing to strongly oppose the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, coercive and inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are

receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Shiba Bandeeba
shibabandeeba@gmail.com
1968 Great Highway Apt. A
San Francisco , California 94116

From: Allison Sponseller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:47:19 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Allison Sponseller
asponseller@gmail.com
573 7th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Allison Sponseller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:47:17 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Allison Sponseller
asponseller@gmail.com
573 7th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Sayuri Falconer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:27:56 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Sayuri Falconer

Sayuri Falconer
sayuri.anya@gmail.com
38 Tacoma St.
San Francisco, California 94118-2819

From: Sayuri Falconer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:27:44 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Sayuri Falconer

Sayuri Falconer
sayuri.anya@gmail.com
38 Tacoma St.
San Francisco, California 94118-2819

From: highandlow@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 7:37:15 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

highandlow@gmail.com
344 Willard St N
San Francisco, California 94118

From: highandlow@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 7:37:08 AM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

highandlow@gmail.com
344 Willard St N
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Jeremy Llewellyn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:24:39 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Llewellyn
jeremy.llewellyn@gmail.com
1445 waller st #2
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Jeremy Llewellyn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:24:39 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Llewellyn
jeremy.llewellyn@gmail.com
1445 waller st #2
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Walter A Iraheta Reyes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:58:04 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Walter A Iraheta Reyes
walterirahetar@gmail.com
2101 Jerrold av
San Francisco , California 94124

From: Walter A Iraheta Reyes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:57:54 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Walter A Iraheta Reyes
walterirahetar@gmail.com
2101 Jerrold av
San Francisco , California 94124

From: alanasf@aol.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:43:37 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Alana O'Brien
District 5

alanasf@aol.com
550 Baker St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: alanasf@aol.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:43:31 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Alana O'Brien
District 5

alanasf@aol.com
550 Baker St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Catherine Madden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:20:27 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco District 8 resident and RV owner writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are

receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Catherine Madden

Catherine Madden
catherine.muehleib@gmail.com
1533 diamond st
san francisco, California 94131

From: Catherine Madden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:20:24 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,

I'm a San Francisco District 8 resident and RV owner writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Catherine Madden

Catherine Madden
catherine.muehleib@gmail.com
1533 diamond st
san francisco, California 94131

From: Luc Bouchard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 7:35:18 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Luc Bouchard
lbouchard010@gmail.com
1215 Greenwich St. Apt 1A
San Francisco , California 94109

From: Lara Klemens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 7:12:56 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,

President Mandelman,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are

receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Lara Klemens

Lara Klemens
lalasfo@me.com
785 Corbett Avenue Apt. 5
San Francisco, California 94131-1364

From: Lara Klemens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 7:12:48 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

President Mandelman,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or

Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Lara Klemens

Lara Klemens
lalasfo@me.com
785 Corbett Avenue Apt. 5
San Francisco, California 94131-1364

From: Joel VanderWerf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:16:17 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident (of 45 years!) writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

As I write this, the City is also under attack by federal agencies. Now is not the time to be unleashing strife and terror of our own making. We can live with RVs parked on our street until we can come up with a better solution while we are not pressured by national fascism.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Joel VanderWerf
44B Rausch St.

Joel VanderWerf
joelvanderwerf@gmail.com
44B Rausch St.
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Joel VanderWerf
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:15:58 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident (of 45 years!) writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

As I write this, the City is also under attack by federal agencies. Now is not the time to be unleashing strife and terror of our own making. We can live with RVs parked on our street until we can come up with a better solution while we are not pressured by national fascism.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Joel VanderWerf
44B Rausch St.

Joel VanderWerf
joelvanderwerf@gmail.com
44B Rausch St.
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Mary Burk
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:12:37 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,

Please delay this towing plan.

My name is Mary Burk and I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must

include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Mary Burk
mary@mess.net
1226 18th Avenue
San Francisco , California 94112

From: Gillian Hughes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:04:14 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Gillian Hughes

Gillian Hughes
gillian@sfsafehouse.org
1663 Mission
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Gillian Hughes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:04:09 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Gillian Hughes

Gillian Hughes
gillian@sfsafehouse.org
1663 Mission
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Carol Brownson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:44:19 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,

I'm a long-time San Francisco resident. I am writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Carol Brownson
cdbrownson@gmail.com
2309 California Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Carol Brownson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:44:11 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,

I'm a long-time San Francisco resident. I am writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Carol Brownson
cdbrownson@gmail.com
2309 California Street
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Evan Owski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:23:52 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 San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Evan Owski

Evan Owski
eowski@gmail.com
1162 Fell St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Evan Owski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:23:34 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Evan Owski

Evan Owski
eowski@gmail.com
1162 Fell St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Scott Feeney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: Please delay RV Ban towing deadline
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:39:58 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 am a Mission (District 9) resident writing to ask that you delay the RV Ban enforcement deadline of November 1. With SNAP benefits expiring on the same day, and now a surge of federal agents arriving to terrorize immigrants and people of color, including many of the very same people who are living in our streets, it is important this deadline be extended to avoid doing irreparable harm to our RV dwelling neighbors.

Furthermore, there are serious operational problems with the processes that were supposed to mitigate the displacement caused by this policy. Many longtime RV residents in San Francisco were omitted from the May vehicle count that was used to create the eligibility list for refuge permits. With large amounts of documentation required to appeal, and a five-day wait, the City has not provided enough time for RV dwellers to engage with this process successfully.

Outreach has also been patchy and inadequate. Community groups including DSA SF, of which I am a member, and the Coalition on Homelessness have helped reach out to RV residents to ensure they get permits, but we can't do it on our own against this arbitrary November 1st deadline, especially with the need now to defend our immigrant and people of color neighbors from federal agents as well.

In addition to asking you to extend the towing deadline, I agree with and echo the following requests that DSA SF is making, copied below:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are

receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

RV residents are our neighbors, and as much as it may annoy some folks to see RVs parked on their street, we really need to do better by our neighbors than the chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach they've had to deal with so far. We need to give them a real chance to work with the system to gain shelter and ensure that this process doesn't look like the cruelty and incompetence we see from the federal government right now. Thanks for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Scott Feeney
scott@oceanbase.org
370 Shotwell St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jamaica Glenn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:34:41 PM

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

BOS Clerk BOS Clerk,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025. There are also quite a few vehicles that are well above 7' tall that are not rvs -vans modified for wheelchair lifts, larger trucks, cargo vans.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or

Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Jamaica

Jamaica Glenn
jamaicaglenn@gmail.com
105 marview way
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Jamaica Glenn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:34:37 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025. There are also quite a few vehicles that are well above 7' tall that are not rvs -vans modified for wheelchair lifts, larger trucks, cargo vans.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are

receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,
Jamaica

Jamaica Glenn
jamaicaglenn@gmail.com
105 marview way
San Francisco , California 94131

From: Eric Sutter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 5:57:23 PM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a fourth generation San Francisco resident of district 8 writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g.

Google Maps streetview).
5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions. Many individuals struggle to maintain phone service so web portals do not adequately meet the needs of this population.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Eric Sutter
ericyuensutter@gmail.com
25 Elgin Park #2
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Dave Madden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 10:54:05 AM

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

BOS Supervisors & Legislative Aides Supervisors & Legislative Aides,

I'm a resident in District 8, Glen Park, writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. In addition, the City has arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements—going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st. To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, the City should:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.

2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list.

3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline.

4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City.

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Dave Madden
gmail@davemadden.org
164 Everson St
San Francisco, California 94131

Item 12

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	8 Letters regarding File No. 251059
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:22:00 PM
Attachments:	8 Letters regarding File No. 251059.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 8 letters regarding File No. 251059.

> File No. 251059: Resolution urging the Treasurer and Tax Collector to design and establish a non-depository municipal finance corporation, to be known as the San Francisco Green Bank, subject to the appropriation of funds for such work. (Fielder, Chan, Chen, Mahmood, Walton, Melgar)

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: Jordan Whiteley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 11:42:21 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Jordan Whiteley
thejordanwhiteley@gmail.com
25 Joost Ave
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Nishchal Agrawal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:51:34 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Nishchal Agrawal
nishchalagrawal123@gmail.com
1441 Taylor Street
San Francisco, California 94133

From: IZZY K-A
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:49:47 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

IZZY K-A
izzykrom@gmail.com
433 Fillmore
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Kate Agathos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:48:47 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Kate Agathos
kate.agathos@gmail.com
830 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA United States

From: Molly Livingston
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support Jackie Fielder"s Green Bank!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:21:17 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Molly Livingston
mad.as.birds@gmail.com
1683 Turk St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Dave Madden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:48:09 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Dave Madden
gmail@davemadden.org
164 Everson St
San Francisco, CA United States

From: Dana Valois
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:09:33 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Dana Valois
valoisdanar@gmail.com
670 9th Ave, #4
San Francisco, California 94118

From:	Susan Green
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); publicbanksf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please vote YES on the resolution to pursue funding and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 1:00:04 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to ask you to support the proposed resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

To achieve the City's official Climate Action Plan (CAP) goal of achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley's Center for Law, Energy & the Environment estimated in 2022 that San Francisco would need to invest up to $21.9 billion in green infrastructure, a figure far outweighing what the City can fund with public dollars. No doubt a more current estimate would be much higher. A San Francisco Green Bank would play a critical role in attracting the substantial private, philanthropic and state funding we will need to combat the climate crisis and reach our CAP goals.

Given the urgency of the climate crisis and the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change on the part of the current federal administration, it is more essential than ever that San Francisco stays on track to meet its climate goals and that it remains a strong national leader in the fight against climate change.

The Green Bank would help to produce badly needed affordable housing near transit hubs -- an important component of the City's CAP -- and make it more possible for residents and small business owners to access the capital they will need to retrofit buildings with the zero-emission appliances required by the Bay Area Air District beginning in 2027. These investments will not only help to meet the City's CAP goals but crucially will also improve air quality and public health, and reduce the City's future public health expenditures.

Recently released polling shows two thirds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. There is a substantial public mandate to initiate and accelerate this work.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Green
Steering Committee Member, SF Climate Emergency Coalition
920 Diamond Street, SF 94114

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	52 Letters regarding File No. 251059
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:11:00 PM
Attachments:	52 Letters regarding File No. 251059.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 52 letters regarding File No. 251059, which is Item No. 39 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 251059:** Resolution urging the Treasurer and Tax Collector to design and establish a non-depository municipal finance corporation, to be known as the San Francisco Green Bank, subject to the appropriation of funds for such work. (Fielder, Chan, Chen, Mahmood, Walton, Melgar)

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: Samantha Malpiedi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a Public Green Bank for SF
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:47:01 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Samantha Malpiedi
samantha.malpiedi@gmail.com
952 Guerrero St
San Francisco, CA United States

From: Ron Nieberding
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:27:24 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Ron Nieberding
nieberding2@gmail.com
18 Tenth Street #640
San Francisco , California 94103

From: Vidushi Bhargava
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:40:14 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Vidushi Bhargava
vidushi321@gmail.com
205 Collins St, Apt 9
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Mary Snyder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:25:32 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm a San Francisco resident in Supervisor Mandelman's district and I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Mary Snyder
Marytherese.Snyder@gmail.com
225 Roosevelt Way

San Francisco, CA United States

From:	Jeffrey Perrone
To:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Time For A Green Bank In SF
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 11:27:51 PM

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

Hello.

I'm a resident, and I vote.

This is a step in the right direction that we can take now.

I'm writing to you in support of the resolution urging city leadership to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

The city's work on a public bank and the green bank to date has been an inspiring example of policy universally supported by policymakers in San Francisco, enjoying unanimous votes at the SFBoS whenever the opportunity has arisen. This resolution is an opportunity to continue this expression of universal San Francisco values supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy.

The Green Bank would be critical in the city's fight against climate change. To achieve the city's goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley estimates that investment of up to $1.3 billion per year will be necessary. The Green Bank will provide a reliable financing avenue that will focus on the development of proven, viable, and effective green infrastructure.

Given the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change from the federal government, it is essential San Francisco reiterate our commitment to combating climate change loudly and whenever possible. This resolution is a golden opportunity for our policymakers to unite and reiterate your commitment to combatting climate change.

As San Francisco faces surging rents, the support for affordable housing a green bank can provide would be welcome and help support badly needed affordable

housing. A Green Bank would also support our small businesses who face mounting rents and severe difficulty accessing capital. The low-cost credit a green bank will provide for small businesses, housing, and energy will help bring down the cost of living for San Franciscans.

Recently released polling shows 67% of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. Indicating the public mandate you have to continue this work.

For these reasons and many others, I urge you to support this and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Jeff

Jeffrey Perrone
jperrone@well.com
www.linkedin.com/in/jeffperrone
94131

From:	cm vong
To:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	publicbanksf@gmail.com
Subject:	Support for San Francisco Green Bank
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 9:36:49 PM

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

Dear all,

I am writing to you in support of the resolution urging city leadership to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

I have been following this for years, since being in high school and researching banks and social issues, including finding that our banking options are limited to many corporate ones when we are seeking to safeguard our money's sustaining impact on our local community. Now I have recently graduated from university and back living in San Francisco with my family, excited to see that this is coming up and ready to voice my support for it, as it has been long relevant and needed. I strongly believe in the possibility and supporting the investment of a public bank.

The city's work on a public bank and the green bank to date has been an inspiring example of policy universally supported by policymakers in San Francisco, enjoying unanimous votes at the SFBoS whenever the opportunity has arisen. This resolution is an opportunity to continue this expression of universal San Francisco values supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy.

The Green Bank would be critical in the city's fight against climate change. To achieve the city's goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley estimates that investment of up to $1.3 billion per year will be necessary. The Green Bank will provide a reliable financing avenue that will focus on the development of proven, viable, and effective green infrastructure.

Given the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change from the federal government, it is essential San Francisco reiterate our commitment to combating climate change loudly and whenever possible. This resolution is a golden opportunity for our policymakers to unite and reiterate your commitment to combatting climate change.

As San Francisco faces surging rents, the support for affordable housing a green bank can provide would be welcome and help support badly needed affordable housing. A Green Bank would also support our small businesses who face mounting rents and severe difficulty accessing capital. The low-cost credit a green bank will provide for small businesses, housing, and energy will help bring down the cost of living for San Franciscans.

Recently released polling shows 67% of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. Indicating the public mandate you have to continue this work.

For these reasons and many others, I urge you to support this and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Christy V

From: Calvin Fiske
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 6:02:58 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.
It has happened too often in recent years that something is approved or voted in by the people of this city only for nothing to come of it. This is our opportunity to do something to benefit the working people of San Francisco.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Calvin Fiske

calvinfiske715@gmail.com
454 S Van Ness Ave
San Francisco, California 94103

From:	Paul Wermer
To:	Sherrill, Stephen (BOS)
Cc:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); SherrillStaff; publicbanksf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please support Green Bank/Public Bank resolution
Date:	Sunday, October 26, 2025 5:17:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Sherrill,

I urge you to vote yes on the resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

The need for San Francisco to establish a Public Bank or Green Bank has been recognized for a long time (cf File 230874, Sept 15, 2023), with support at both the Board of Supervisors and in the public at large. Nothng has happened.

This resolution reiterates the intent to establish a public bank supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy. Yes, such a bank would require a large investment to start up. It is an investment – as operating through such a bank will save San Francisco money that otherwise goes to very large banks, and will support needed activity in San Francisco. And perhaps, with continued focus from the Board, San Francisco will create a public bank, that everyone agrees would be a good thing to do.

San Francisco faces numerous expensive challenges, such as:
ensuring the existing building stock is decarbonized;
providing housing affordable to San Francisco workers and residents at all income levels;
transitioning our transit system and streets to support safe, climate-friendly mobility;
ensuring our infrastructure is meets our future needs.

The “small business” that we praise needs access to capital needed to modernize, not just praise. The investment a small restaurant requires to convert from the current gas stoves to induction is significant – not just the stove, but also the cookware. Access to capital is a major problem for small neighborhood serving businesses everywhere. A public bank can help address that problem.

All of this requires banking services – cost effective banking services that the Green Bank would provide.

I am grateful to Supervisors Fielder, Chan, Chen, Mahmood, Walton and Melgar for sponsoring this resolution, and ask you to join them in supporting this resolution.

Sincerely,

Paul

--
Paul Wermer
2309 California St
San Francisco,CA 94115

From:	Elena Engel
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); SherrillStaff
Subject:	Support the Green Bank
Date:	Sunday, October 26, 2025 11:44:43 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board President, Supervisors, Treasurer,

I am asking you to support the proposed resolution to establish a Green Bank in San Francisco. Such an action would provide an avenue to fund and help achieve our City's Climate Action Plan. We cannot afford to wait to take decisive action to stop greenhouse gas emissions in the City of San Francisco.
Standing up the Green Bank will help us to finance the needed actions because it can provide access to capital via loans and/or a revolving loan fund to help citizens to retrofit their homes, install EV charging, and so forth. It also can help to invest in affordable housing projects.
Please support this resolution and help it become a reality so that San Francisco can move briskly forward.
Thank you,
Elena Engel, 350SF, SF-Climate Emergency Coalition

From: Jay Roudebush
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 10:38:34 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Jay Roudebush
jroudebu@gmail.com
1445 Florida st
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Sam Myers
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 9:59:45 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Sam Myers
sam.sq.myers@gmail.com
659 10th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From:	Sienna Hernandez
To:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	publicbanksf@gmail.com
Subject:	Resolution for SF's Green Bank
Date:	Saturday, October 25, 2025 7:40:46 PM

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

Dear Elected Leaders,

I am writing to you in support of the resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

The city's work on a public bank and the green bank to date has been an inspiring example of policy universally supported by policymakers in San Francisco, enjoying unanimous votes at the SFBoS whenever the opportunity has arisen.

This resolution is an opportunity to continue this expression of universal San Francisco values supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy.
The Green Bank would be critical in the city's fight against climate change. To achieve the city's goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley estimates that investment of up to $1.3 billion per year will be necessary. The Green Bank will provide a reliable financing avenue that will focus on the development of proven, viable, and effective green infrastructure.

Given the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change from the federal government, it is essential San Francisco reiterate our commitment to combating climate change loudly and whenever possible. This resolution is a golden opportunity for our policymakers to unite and reiterate your commitment to combatting climate change.

As San Francisco faces surging rents, the support for affordable housing a green bank can provide would be welcome and help produce badly needed affordable housing. A Green Bank would also support our small businesses who face mounting rents and severe difficulty accessing capital.

Recently released polling shows 2/3rds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. Indicating the public mandate you have to continue this work.

For these reasons and many others, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sienna
SF Resident in D8

From: Peter Ratajczak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 6:58:30 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

The standard Green Bank support email is below, and I would like to add that the idea of establishing a Green Bank is long overdue! Please support this!

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Peter Ratajczak

PeteRatajczak@gmail.com
555 Bartlett Street, Apt 216
San Francisco, California 94110

From:	John Barroso
To:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Green Bank
Date:	Saturday, October 25, 2025 3:44:50 PM

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

Hello all,
I am writing to you in support of the resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.
The city's work on a public bank and the green bank to date has been an inspiring example of policy universally supported by policymakers in San Francisco, enjoying unanimous votes at the Board of Supervisors whenever the opportunity has arisen. I'm grateful to those of you who have championed this initiative, and I write to respectfully encourage continued momentum on this critical work. This resolution is an opportunity to continue this expression of universal San Francisco values supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy.
The Green Bank would be critical in the city's fight against climate change. To achieve the city's goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley estimates that investment of up to $1.3 billion per year will be necessary. The Green Bank will provide a reliable financing avenue that will focus on the development of proven, viable, and effective green infrastructure.
Given the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change from the federal government, it is essential San Francisco reiterate our commitment to combating climate change loudly and whenever possible. This resolution is a golden opportunity for our policymakers to unite and reiterate your commitment to combatting climate change.
As San Francisco faces surging rents, the support for affordable housing a green bank can provide would be welcome and help produce badly needed affordable housing. A Green Bank would also support our small businesses who face mounting rents and severe difficulty accessing capital.
Recently released polling shows 2/3rds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank, indicating the public mandate you have to continue this work.
For these reasons and many others, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.
Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Kyle Dickison (Kyanthus)
To:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Urging the Design and Establishment of San Francisco Green Bank
Date:	Saturday, October 25, 2025 3:43:32 PM

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

Hello all,

I am writing to you in support of the resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

The city's work on a public bank and the green bank to date has been an inspiring example of policy universally supported by policymakers in San Francisco, enjoying unanimous votes at the Board of Supervisors whenever the opportunity has arisen. I'm grateful to those of you who have championed this initiative, and I write to respectfully encourage continued momentum on this critical work. This resolution is an opportunity to continue this expression of universal San Francisco values supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy.

The Green Bank would be critical in the city's fight against climate change. To achieve the city's goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley estimates that investment of up to $1.3 billion per year will be necessary. The Green Bank will provide a reliable financing avenue that will focus on the development of proven, viable, and effective green infrastructure.

Given the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change from the federal government, it is essential San Francisco reiterate our commitment to combating climate change loudly and whenever possible. This resolution is a golden opportunity for our policymakers to unite and reiterate your commitment to combatting climate change.

As San Francisco faces surging rents, the support for affordable housing a green bank can provide would be welcome and help produce badly needed affordable housing. A Green Bank would also support our small businesses who face mounting rents and severe difficulty accessing capital.

Recently released polling shows 2/3rds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank, indicating the public mandate you have to continue this work.

For these reasons and many others, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Kyle Dickison (he, him)

From: James Griffith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 2:42:30 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

James Griffith
jamgriff2718@gmail.com
330 De Neve Dr Hedrick Hall North 234
Los Angeles, California 90024

From: Kevin Quigley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:09:01 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Kevin Quigley
kquigley51@gmail.com
283 Moscow st
San Francisco , California 94112

From:	Joni Eisen
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); publicbanksf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please support the resolution to fund and establish a San Francisco Green Bank
Date:	Saturday, October 25, 2025 11:38:06 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to ask you to vote for the proposed resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding for and establishment of a San Francisco's Green Bank.

To achieve the City's official Climate Action Plan (CAP) goal of net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, UC Berkeley's Center for Law, Energy & the Environment estimated in 2022 that San Francisco would need to invest up to $21.9 billion in green infrastructure, a figure far outweighing what the City can fund with public dollars. No doubt a more current estimate would be much higher. A San Francisco Green Bank would play a critical role in attracting the substantial private, philanthropic and state funding we will need to combat the climate crisis and reach the CAP goals.

Given the urgency of the climate crisis and the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change by the federal administration, it is more essential than ever that San Francisco stay on track to meet its climate goals and that it remain a strong national leader in the fight against climate change.

The Green Bank would help to produce badly-needed affordable housing near transit hubs - an important component of the City's CAP - and make it easier for residents and small-business owners to access the capital they will need to retrofit buildings with the zero-emission appliances required by the Bay Area Air District beginning in 2027. These investments will not only help to meet the City's CAP goals but, crucially, will also improve air quality and public health, thereby reducing the City's future public health expenditures.

Recently-released polling shows two thirds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. So, there is a substantial public mandate to initiate and accelerate this work.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Joni Eisen

SF Climate Emergency Coalition steering committee

592 Pennsylvania, SF 94107

From:	Todd
To:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support Green Bank
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 6:33:50 PM

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

I am writing to you in support of the resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

The city's work on a public bank and the green bank to date has been an inspiring example of policy universally supported by policymakers in San Francisco, enjoying unanimous votes at the SFBoS whenever the opportunity has arisen. This resolution is an opportunity to continue this expression of universal San Francisco values supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy.

The Green Bank would be critical in the city's fight against climate change. To achieve the city's goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley estimates that investment of up to $1.3 billion per year will be necessary. The Green Bank will provide a reliable financing avenue that will focus on the development of proven, viable, and effective green infrastructure.

Given the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change from the federal government, it is essential San Francisco reiterate our commitment to combating climate change loudly and whenever possible. This resolution is a golden opportunity for our policymakers to unite and reiterate your commitment to combatting climate change.

As San Francisco faces surging rents, the support for affordable housing a green bank can provide would be welcome and help produce badly needed affordable housing. A Green Bank would also support our small businesses who face mounting rents and severe difficulty accessing capital.

Recently released polling shows 2/3rds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. Indicating the public mandate you have to continue this work.

For these reasons and many others, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

From: Molly Salyer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 6:06:27 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Molly Salyer
mollyblairsalyer@gmail.com
419 Thornton ave
San Francisco , California 94124

From: Dylan Fabris
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 6:03:46 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Dylan Fabris
dsa@dfabris.com
1390 Market St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Edward Chan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 2:10:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Edward Chan
chaneddie0209spam@gmail.com
765 Treat Ave
San Fransisco, California 94110

From: Vern Maxam
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: SF Green Bank
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 1:28:45 PM

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

I am writing to you in support of the resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank
Thank you
Vern Maxam
Sent from my iPhone

From:	Julie Lindow
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Cisneros, Jose (TTX); publicbanksf@gmail.com
Subject:	Please vote YES on the resolution to pursue funding and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 1:13:42 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,
I am writing to ask you to support the proposed resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

To achieve the City's official Climate Action Plan (CAP) goal of achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley's Center for Law, Energy & the Environment estimated in 2022 that San Francisco would need to invest up to $21.9 billion in green infrastructure, a figure far outweighing what the City can fund with public dollars. No doubt a more current estimate would be much higher. A San Francisco Green Bank would play a critical role in attracting the substantial private, philanthropic and state funding we will need to combat the climate crisis and reach our CAP goals.

Given the urgency of the climate crisis and the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change on the part of the current federal administration, it is more essential than ever that San Francisco stays on track to meet its climate goals and that it remains a strong national leader in the fight against climate change.

The Green Bank would help to produce badly needed affordable housing near transit hubs -- an important component of the City's CAP -- and make it more possible for residents and small business owners to access the capital they will need to retrofit buildings with the zero-emission appliances required by the Bay Area Air District beginning in 2027. These investments will not only help to meet the City's CAP goals but crucially will also improve air quality and public health, and reduce the City's future public health expenditures.

Recently released polling shows two thirds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. There is a substantial public mandate to initiate and accelerate this work.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

Thank you for your consideration.

Julie Lindow
Steering Committee Member, SF Climate Emergency Coalition
516 1/2 Linden and 2024 Vicente

From:	anastasia Yovanopoulos
To:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	SF Green Bank
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 12:02:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to you in support of the resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

The city's work on a public bank and the green bank to date has been an inspiring example of policy universally supported by policymakers in San Francisco, enjoying unanimous votes at the SFBoS whenever the opportunity has arisen. This resolution is an opportunity to continue this expression of universal San Francisco values supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy.

The Green Bank would be critical in the city's fight against climate change. To achieve the city's goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley estimates that investment of up to $1.3 billion per year will be necessary. The Green Bank will provide a reliable financing avenue that will focus on the development of proven, viable, and effective green infrastructure.

Given the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change from the federal government, it is essential San Francisco reiterate our commitment to combating climate change loudly and whenever possible. This resolution is a golden opportunity for our policymakers to unite and reiterate your commitment to combatting climate change.

As San Francisco faces surging rents, the support for affordable housing a green bank can provide would be welcome and help produce badly needed affordable housing. A Green Bank would also support our small businesses who face mounting rents and severe difficulty accessing capital.

Recently released polling shows 2/3rds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. Indicating the public mandate you have to continue this work.

For these reasons and many others, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos

D8 resident

From:	Elliot Helman
To:	Cisneros, Jose (TTX); Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Support a SF Green Bank
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 11:34:03 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,
I am writing to you in support of the resolution urging the mayor and all relevant departments to explore and pursue funding opportunities for and establishment of San Francisco's Green Bank.

The city's work on a public bank and the green bank to date has been an inspiring example of policy universally supported by policymakers in San Francisco, enjoying unanimous votes at the SFBoS whenever the opportunity has arisen. This resolution is an opportunity to continue this expression of universal San Francisco values supporting affordable housing, small business and green energy.

The Green Bank would be critical in the city's fight against climate change. To achieve the city's goal of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, the University of California Berkeley estimates that investment of up to $1.3 billion per year will be necessary. The Green Bank will provide a reliable financing avenue that will focus on the development of proven, viable, and effective green infrastructure.

Given the complete abdication of any responsibility for addressing climate change from the federal government, it is essential San Francisco reiterate our commitment to combating climate change loudly and whenever possible. This resolution is a golden opportunity for our policymakers to unite and reiterate your commitment to combatting climate change.

As San Francisco faces surging rents, the support for affordable housing a green bank can provide would be welcome and help produce badly needed affordable housing. A Green Bank would also support our small businesses who face mounting rents and severe difficulty accessing capital.

Recently released polling shows 2/3rds of likely voters support establishing a San Francisco Public Bank and 70% of likely voters support starting a public bank as a green bank. Indicating the public mandate you have to continue this work.

For these reasons and many others, I urge you to support this resolution and vigorously work on the funding, design and establishment of a San Francisco Green Bank.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Elliot Helman
Mission Bay

94158

From: Maria Pavlovic
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:20:20 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Maria Pavlovic
nerves.evening-7z@icloud.com
779 Treat Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Carlos Ciudad-Real
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:31:31 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Carlos Ciudad-Real
cmciudadreal@gmail.com
1222 HARRISON ST
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Michel Rouly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:22:28 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Michel Rouly
michel@rouly.net
2663 Bryant St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Charlie fredrick
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:12:05 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Charlie fredrick
charliefredrick83@gmail.com
310 RUTLEDGE ST
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Pranav Vasishta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 7:59:45 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Pranav Vasishta
pranavv01@gmail.com
65 Saturn St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Rishika Patel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 1:30:19 AM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Rishika Patel
rishikanpatel@yahoo.com
765 Treat Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Daniel Simon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 11:52:29 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Daniel Simon
daniel.simon143@gmail.com
420 Kearney St
El Cerrito , California 94530

From: Tanvi Meringenti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:39:29 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Tanvi Meringenti
enamels-58flues@icloud.com
185 Channel St
San Francisco, California 94158

From: Isa Stefan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support the Green Bank Resolution — Let's Invest in San Francisco's Future
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:27:55 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

Dear Mayor Lurie, Treasurer Cisneros, and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge your full support for Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution and to move forward with establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

For years, the City has worked toward a public and green bank as a concrete expression of our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in support—clear evidence of consensus that San Francisco's economy should serve the public good. This resolution offers another chance to reaffirm that vision by advancing affordable housing, small business development, and clean energy.

With the federal government retreating from meaningful climate action, cities like San Francisco must continue to lead. A public green bank would allow us to directly fund renewable energy, affordable housing, and local enterprise—keeping public money circulating in our communities instead of enriching Wall Street.

This is not untested territory. Public banks already hold a quarter of the world's financial assets, driving local investment and economic resilience worldwide. Here at home, two-thirds of likely voters support creating a public bank, and even more support starting as a green bank. The public mandate is strong.

By investing locally, San Francisco can create a self-sustaining financial system that lowers costs for housing and small businesses, accelerates clean energy projects, and stabilizes our economy. We have a rare opportunity to bank the boom—to channel the city's immense wealth into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

I urge you to fund and implement the public bank framework approved in 2023 and to pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this vital work. Together, these actions will bring San Francisco closer to being a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and commitment to building a just and sustainable San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Isa Stefan

San Franciscans For Social Housing
RTC Collective
Democratic Socialists of American San Francisco

Isa Stefan
alvatenebrae@gmail.com
1177 Market St APT 1432
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Honest Charley Bodkin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:26:35 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Honest Charley Bodkin
hcbodkin@gmail.com
1704 Waller St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Sophy Chen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:16:29 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Sophy Chen
sophychen602@gmail.com
1730 O' Farrell St. PH3E
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Malia Bow
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:10:34 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

As a San Francisco juvenile dependency attorney who represents families facing systemic issues many of which are connected to lack of financial resources, please heed my letter.

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Malia Bow

malia.j.bow@gmail.com
49 Bessie Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Clay Helms
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Your City Wants & Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:49:20 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

Please consider my support for the following message as a resident, citizen, and advocate of the people of San Francisco.

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Clay Helms

helms.clay@gmail.com
604 Waller St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Eva Chen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:32:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Eva Chen
eva12051999@gmail.com
765 Treat Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Daniel Petersen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:29:43 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Daniel Petersen
dajpetersen@gmail.com
1432 S Van Ness Ave
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Matthew Muldowney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:28:00 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Matthew Muldowney
matt.muldowney@gmail.com
1228 Union St
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Eric Chen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:42:44 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Eric Chen
ericc661@gmail.com
3164 22nd St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Joseph Clifton
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:36:04 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Joseph Clifton
jkclifton@gmail.com
11 BRODERICK ST APT 2
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117-3155

From: Jason Kruta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:27:09 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Jason Kruta
jpkruta@gmail.com
712 Arguello Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Eddy Hernandez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:13:37 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Eddy Hernandez
edward.d.hernandez@gmail.com
256 Brighton Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Maya Chaffee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:11:13 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Maya Chaffee
chaffee.maya@gmail.com
1732 Bryant St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Victor Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:03:06 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Victor Smith
vcbsmith@gmail.com
305 Prentiss St
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Gabriel Goffman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:52:48 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Gabriel Goffman
Gfgodflan@gmail.com
273 Frederick
San Francisco , California 94117

From: Harlo Pippenger
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:52:21 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Harlo Pippenger
harlo.p.pippenger@gmail.com
971 Eddy Street, Apartment 211
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Brandon Archbold
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs a Green Bank!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:33:00 PM

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

BOS Supervisors Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to support the Green Bank Resolution that Supervisor Fielder introduced and move forward on establishing San Francisco's long-planned public bank.

The City's work on a public bank and green bank has been an inspiring example of policy that reflects our shared values. Time and again, the Board of Supervisors has voted unanimously in favor of this initiative, demonstrating broad alignment around San Francisco's goal of advancing an economy rooted in public benefit. This resolution is another opportunity to reaffirm that commitment to affordable housing, small business, and clean energy.

As the federal government turns its back on climate action, it is essential that cities like San Francisco continue to take the lead. A green bank would allow our city to directly finance renewable energy projects, affordable housing, and local enterprise, keeping our money circulating in our communities instead of being siphoned off to Wall Street.

This is not a radical idea. Public banks hold 25% of the world's assets, fueling development and resilience across the globe. Here in San Francisco, recent polling shows overwhelming public support: two-thirds of likely voters back a public bank and an even greater share support starting the public bank as a green bank. The mandate is clear.

By investing locally, San Francisco can build a self-sustaining economic engine that lowers costs for housing, small business, and clean energy, while helping to stabilize our economy. We have an opportunity to "bank the boom": to channel the massive wealth generated in the city into projects that benefit working people and future generations.

Please seize this moment. Fund and implement the public bank framework that was already approved in 2023, and pass Supervisor Fielder's Green Bank Resolution to accelerate this work. Together, these steps will help create a city that truly works for everyone—not just the wealthy.

Thank you for your leadership and your continued commitment to building a just, sustainable San Francisco.

Brandon Archbold
brandon-pro@protonmail.com
720 2nd Ave Apt 306
San Francisco, California 94118-4002

Item 13

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	3 Letters regarding File No. 251064
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:13:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding File No. 251064.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding File No. 251064, which is Item No. 44 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

> **File No. 251064:** Resolution supporting the Bay Area Air District's timely implementation of Rules 9-4 and 9-6 that establish zero-emission standards for building appliances. (Mandelman)

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:	Colleen Corrigan
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Item 251064: Supporting the Bay Area Air District's Zero-Emission Building Appliance Rules
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 3:26:57 PM
Attachments:	SF Resolution Support Letter for Board of Supes.docx

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

Hello,

SPUR and the Sierra Club are writing to express strong support for the Bay Area Air District's zero-emission appliance standards, Rules 9-4 and 9-6, and the resolution by the Board of Supervisors to support them. These rules are a critical step toward protecting the health, safety, and quality of life of our communities by phasing out the most polluting furnaces and water heaters and replacing them with clean, zero-emission alternatives.

There is a strong, realtor- and Republican-led opposition campaign that is underway and preparing for a fight to roll back the rules entirely or delay them. In the South Coast Air District, similar forces got cities to adopt resolutions opposing the zero-NOx rules, which may have played a persuasive role with board members. Supportive city resolutions like this one will help demonstrate to the Air District board that the Bay Area wants to move forward, and clean up our air in a timely manner.

Air quality remains a major concern for the Bay Area. Our region still fails to meet state and federal air standards for harmful pollutants such as particulate matter and ozone. Gas-burning appliances including the furnaces and water heaters found in nearly every home are among the largest sources of local pollution, emitting more nitrogen oxides (NOx) than all passenger cars on Bay Area roads combined. This pollution is not abstract: it leads to asthma attacks, premature deaths, and nearly $900 million annually in health-related costs.

Transitioning to zero-emission appliances like electric heat pumps offers wide-reaching benefits. Beyond cleaning our air, these modern appliances provide reliable heating, cooling, and improved indoor air quality, making homes more comfortable, resilient, and attractive to buyers. Contractors also value the potential to save customers money on their utility bills, given the projected savings of about $30/month as calculated in a PCE/SVCE study. Homeowners and renters are increasingly demanding zero-emission equipment in their homes to protect their families and communities from harmful air pollution. Installing zero-emission equipment can be accomplished in the vast majority of homes, as increasingly cost-effective strategies and technologies make it easier than ever to install electric heat pumps.

The workforce is ready to install zero-emission heating equipment across the Bay Area.

However, it is critical that the Air District rules provide a clear market signal to contractors to enable this equipment transition at scale. Rules 9-6 and 9-4 provide that certainty to our workforce, ensuring that contractors will retrain and retool to install zero-emission water heaters and HVAC systems.

We recognize the importance of ensuring a smooth transition. Targeted amendments that provide exceptions and resources for low-income households as needed, plus flexibility for cases that are technically infeasible in the near term, are essential to make these rules equitable. At the same time, it is vital that these amendments do not weaken the rules or undermine the health and environmental benefits the rules are designed to deliver.

It is crucial that we invest in housing that supports clean air, healthy families, and long-term resilience. I urge you to demonstrate San Francisco's strong support of Rules 9-4 and 9-6 by passing this resolution, knowing that the Air District is working on common-sense adjustments that help all residents participate in this transition.

Thank you for your leadership in protecting our region's health and ensuring a healthier, more sustainable future for our housing and communities.

Sincerely,

Sam Fishman
SPUR

Colleen Corrigan
SPUR

Melissa Yu
Sierra Club

SPUR
Join | Get Newsletters | Twitter | LinkedIn

Don't miss the Bay Area's biggest civic celebration — November 13!

Monday, October 28th, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Legislative Chamber, Room 250
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Item 251064: Supporting the Bay Area Air District's Zero-Emission Building Appliance Rules

Hello,

SPUR and the Sierra Club are writing to express strong support for the Bay Area Air District's zero-emission appliance standards, Rules 9-4 and 9-6, and the resolution by the Board of Supervisors to support them. These rules are a critical step toward protecting the health, safety, and quality of life of our communities by phasing out the most polluting furnaces and water heaters and replacing them with clean, zero-emission alternatives.

There is a strong, realtor- and Republican-led opposition campaign that is underway and preparing for a fight to roll back the rules entirely or delay them. In the South Coast Air District, similar forces got cities to adopt resolutions opposing the zero-NOx rules, which may have played a persuasive role with board members. Supportive city resolutions like this one will help demonstrate to the Air District board that the Bay Area wants to move forward, and clean up our air in a timely manner.

Air quality remains a major concern for the Bay Area. Our region still fails to meet state and federal air standards for harmful pollutants such as particulate matter and ozone. Gas-burning appliances including the furnaces and water heaters found in nearly every home are among the largest sources of local pollution, emitting more nitrogen oxides (NOx) than all passenger cars on Bay Area roads combined. This pollution is not abstract: it leads to asthma attacks, premature deaths, and nearly $900 million annually in health-related costs.

Transitioning to zero-emission appliances like electric heat pumps offers wide-reaching benefits. Beyond cleaning our air, these modern appliances provide reliable heating, cooling, and improved indoor air quality, making homes more comfortable, resilient, and attractive to buyers. Contractors also value the potential to save customers money on their utility bills, given the projected savings of about $30/month as calculated in a PCE/SVCE study. Homeowners and renters are increasingly demanding zero-emission equipment in their homes to protect their families and communities from harmful air pollution. Installing zero-emission equipment can be accomplished in the vast majority of homes, as increasingly cost-effective strategies and technologies make it easier than ever to install electric heat pumps.

The workforce is ready to install zero-emission heating equipment across the Bay Area. However, it is critical that the Air District rules provide a clear market signal to contractors to enable this equipment transition at scale. Rules 9-6 and 9-4 provide that certainty to our

workforce, ensuring that contractors will retrain and retool to install zero-emission water heaters and HVAC systems.

We recognize the importance of ensuring a smooth transition. Targeted amendments that provide exceptions and resources for low-income households as needed, plus flexibility for cases that are technically infeasible in the near term, are essential to make these rules equitable. At the same time, it is vital that these amendments do not weaken the rules or undermine the health and environmental benefits the rules are designed to deliver.

It is crucial that we invest in housing that supports clean air, healthy families, and long-term resilience. I urge you to demonstrate San Francisco's strong support of Rules 9-4 and 9-6 by passing this resolution, knowing that the Air District is working on common-sense adjustments that help all residents participate in this transition.

Thank you for your leadership in protecting our region's health and ensuring a healthier, more sustainable future for our housing and communities.

Sincerely,

Sam Fishman
SPUR

Colleen Corrigan
SPUR

Melissa Yu
Sierra Club

From:	Julie Lindow
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff
Cc:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please vote YES on Item 251064 [Supporting the Bay Area Air District's Zero-Emission Building Appliance Rules]
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 5:05:07 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to urge you to vote YES on the resolution supporting the Bay Area Air District's zero-emissions building appliance rules at your next BOS meeting on October 28.

The Bay Area has the sixth worst air pollution in the country, and our polluting gas appliances are a huge part of this problem, contributing to poor health, especially for children and elders, and higher health costs. That is why we need these new appliance standards. The Bay Area Air District's new zero-NOx appliance standards ensure that when gas appliances break down, they are replaced with modern, efficient heat pumps that slash both operating costs and pollution. These new standards align with where the market (and CA state regulation) is already headed—heat pumps are winning over customers and rapidly gaining market share because they're more efficient and they eliminate harmful air pollutants. This is all about cleaner air, safer homes, lower bills, and good jobs for local contractors—not protecting corporate polluter profits.

Unsurprisingly, the fossil fuel industry and its allies are attempting to block these clean air standards entirely to protect their profits. As people switch to efficient electric equipment, gas corporations sell less gas. As a result, we're already seeing the same deceptive misinformation campaigns popping up in the Bay Area that the industry has used elsewhere to scare and confuse residents and water down or even block strong air quality standards.

The Air District Board needs to hear from Bay Area leaders who support strong air quality standards and will stand up against corporate opposition. The Air District is already working to incorporate common-sense flexibility measures into the rules to ensure a smooth and equitable implementation for Bay Area residents. But they need the support of committed Bay Area leaders to keep these standards strong, as they amend the rules to ensure that implementation doesn't unduly burden Bay Area residents.

In addition to accelerating the adoption of zero-emission appliances, cutting deadly air pollution and helping to make energy bills more affordable, **these rules will also give a big boost to San Francisco's efforts to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, our official Climate Action Plan goal.** Given the urgency of the climate crisis and the hostility of the current federal administration toward addressing climate change, it's more essential than ever that San Francisco stays on track to meet its climate goals and remains a strong national leader on climate. Without the boost these ground-breaking rules will provide—to the market, to the

State of California and to residents of our city—San Francisco would have a much more difficult time meeting its climate action goals. **Please vote YES on this resolution.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Julie Lindow
Steering Committee Member, SF Climate Emergency Coalition
516 1/2 Linden and 2024 Vicente, SF CA

From:	Susan Green
To:	Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Chan, Connie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); SherrillStaff
Cc:	Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Please vote YES on Item 251064 [Supporting the Bay Area Air District's Zero-Emission Building Appliance Rules]
Date:	Friday, October 24, 2025 4:53:45 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am writing to urge you to vote YES on the resolution supporting the Bay Area Air District's zero-emissions building appliance rules at your next BOS meeting on October 28.

We need to lower bills, not air quality standards. The Bay Area Air District's new zero-NOx appliance standards ensure that when gas appliances break down, they are replaced with modern, efficient heat pumps that slash both operating costs and pollution. These new standards align with where the market (and CA state regulation) is already headed—heat pumps are winning over customers and rapidly gaining market share because they're more efficient and they eliminate harmful air pollutants. This is all about cleaner air, safer homes, lower bills, and good jobs for local contractors—not protecting corporate polluter profits.

Unsurprisingly, the fossil fuel industry and its allies are attempting to block these clean air standards entirely to protect their profits. As people switch to efficient electric equipment, gas corporations sell less gas. As a result, we're already seeing the same deceptive misinformation campaigns popping up in the Bay Area that the industry has used elsewhere to scare and confuse residents and water down or even block strong air quality standards.

The Air District Board needs to hear from Bay Area leaders who support strong air quality standards and will stand up against corporate opposition. The Air District is already working to incorporate common-sense flexibility measures into the rules to ensure a smooth and equitable implementation for Bay Area residents. But they need the support of committed Bay Area leaders to keep these standards strong, as they amend the rules to ensure that implementation doesn't unduly burden Bay Area residents.

In addition to accelerating the adoption of zero-emission appliances, cutting deadly air pollution and helping to make energy bills more affordable, **these rules will also give a big boost to San Francisco's efforts to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, our official Climate Action Plan goal.** Given the urgency of the climate crisis and the hostility of the current federal administration toward addressing climate change, it's more essential than ever that San Francisco stays on track to meet its climate goals and remains a strong national leader on climate. Without the boost these ground-breaking rules will provide—to the market, to the State of California and to residents of our city—San Francisco would have a much more difficult time meeting its climate action goals. **Please vote YES on this resolution.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Green
Steering Committee Member, SF Climate Emergency Coalition
920 Diamond Street, SF 94114

Item 14

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	88 Letters regarding Cigarette Filters
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:39:00 PM
Attachments:	88 Letters regarding Cigarette Filters.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 88 letters regarding cigarette filters.

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: Jane Petrie
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:33:32 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jane Petrie
rob.en.janie@gmail.com
56 Ellsworth st
SF, 94110

From: Susan McDonough
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 5:16:32 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Susan McDonough
sdrcrm@hotmail.com
21 Marinero Circle, #206
TIburon, California 94920

From: Danielle Jezienicki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: I"m tired of picking up cigarette filters while looking at the golden gate bridge
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:22:29 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Danielle Jezienicki
danielle@fwd.eco
442 4th ave
san francisco, California 94118

From: Mikaila Kalinowski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:29:08 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Mikaila Kalinowski
mikaila.kalinowski@gmail.com
70 Santa Monica Way
San Francisco, California 94127

From: Gayle Zheng
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:41:16 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Gayle Zheng
gayle30321@yahoo.com
30321 Meridien Circle
Union City, California 94587

From: Jenny Van
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:54:27 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency,
Jenny

Jenny Van
jennyvan10@gmail.com
993 Cayuga Ave, Apt 8

San Francisco, California 94112

From: Anne-Marie Prosper
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:59:59 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Anne-Marie Prosper
anniethepro@gmail.com
1025 Stanyan St Apt 5,
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Elaine Gebhard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:28:34 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Elaine Gebhard
elainemgking@yahoo.com
229 Marguerite Ave
Mill Valley, California 94941

From: Ben King
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 5:51:46 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Ben King
bking65@yahoo.com
229
Mill Valley, California 94941

From: Rami Soudah
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 4:00:52 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Rami Soudah
rsoudah@icloud.com
4135 17th Street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Rosemary Math
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 3:00:41 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Rosemary Math
rosemarymath@gmail.com
1627 Rainier Ave
Napa, California 94558

From: Pamela Wright
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:46:15 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Pamela Wright
pamjustinewright@gmail.com
501 38th Ave Apt 101
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Whitney Thornburg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:44:19 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Whitney Thornburg
whitroe@yahoo.com
86 Waller St.
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Olivia Hogan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:32:39 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Olivia Hogan
oliviahogan38@gmail.com
100 Van Ness Ave, Apt 1913
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Anna Johengen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:44:40 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Anna Johengen
ajohengen@comcast.net
286 Bella Vista Way
San Francisco, California 94127-1812

From: Jennifer Chinn
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 10:08:20 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jennifer Chinn
jenchinn@gmail.com
83 6th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Anirudh Shekhawat
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 8:10:26 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Anirudh Shekhawat
anirudhshekh@gmail.com
956 Bonita Ave Apt 10
Mountain View, California 94040

From: Eliot Kent-Uritam
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 8:02:17 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Eliot Kent-Uritam
eku42@hotmail.com
618 47th Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

From: lisa ryers
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 6:05:20 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways. I remember when San Francisco worked to get Juuls off our streets. Let's use that as precedent to get rid of plastic cigarette filters...

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

lisa ryers
lisaryers@gmail.com
698 connecticut st

san francisco , California 94107

From: Ikonija Lopez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 5:04:01 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Ikonija Lopez
missionbaycleanup@gmail.com
Berry St
San Francisco, California 94158

From: Annie Hu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 12:31:20 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Annie Hu
anniemhu@gmail.com
939 Jones St
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Kaveh Waddell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 12:02:14 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency,
Kaveh Waddell

Kaveh Waddell
kavwad@gmail.com
1264B Page St

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Cedric Crocker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Ban on Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Sunday, October 26, 2025 2:47:39 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Cedric Crocker
cedric.crocker@gmail.com
2111 Hyde Street, Apt #306
San Francisco, California 94109

From: sashatheharpist@yahoo.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 7:03:26 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Since the beginning of the year and much of last year, I haven't been able to work much. Instead, I have thrown myself into volunteer work, both in the National Park Service--especially out in the Presidio and specifically at Lobos Creek and the bluffs--and in my local neighborhood, picking up trash with various groups of my neighbors. It's a lot of fun, but one thing it has taught me: smoking is still a huge pollutant. Cigarette butts everywhere! In corners of parking lots and garage drive-ins, packed into every planter, strewn along sidewalks and in gutters, and clogging up drains. It's disgusting, and terrible for the environment! It looks terrible, too, because now that I've seen it, I can't unsee it. Butts everywhere I look, slowly melting away in gutters, toxic waste leaking into our oceans and through fragile ecosystems. Unsightly and gross too. And they literally are everywhere! I didn't even know this many people still smoked!

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce

or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Shalynn Ehrenpfort
San Francisco, CA
94115

sashatheharpist@yahoo.com
1150 Pierce Street
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94115

From: Derek Welty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 1:25:02 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Derek Welty
dwelty329@gmail.com
2222B 15th St
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Clark Heydon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:17:54 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Clark Heydon
aheydon@gmail.com
332 17th Ave
San Francisco, California 94121-2313

From: Vincent DiBiase
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 10:02:43 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Vincent DiBiase
esurfer35@gmail.com
112 Dorado Terrace
San Francisco, California 94112-1743

From: ethan@ejensler.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 9:16:45 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

ethan@ejensler.com
330 2nd Ave #3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Jessica LeGault
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:27:02 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jessica LeGault
jessicalegault@gmail.com
205 16th Avenue, Apt 5
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Helen Hui
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 6:34:41 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Helen Hui
huilaw@gmail.com
550 Davis Street
SF, California 94111

From: Dylan Steele
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:36:02 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Dylan Steele
dsoccer442@gmail.com
2000 Post St
San Francisco, 94115

From: Holly Allen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:07:34 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency,

Holly Allen

Holly Allen
holly.allen@gmail.com

976 Minnesota St
San Francisco, California 94107

From: mpcrehan@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 3:28:27 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

mpcrehan@gmail.com
2023 Balboa Street
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Michelle Duval
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 3:02:59 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Michelle Duval
emptyd@gmail.com
1561 McAllister Street, San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Mary Tran
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 2:45:49 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Mary Tran
maqt2008@yahoo.com
302 Roosevelt Way
San Francisco, California 94114

From: chloejvanloon@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 2:13:42 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

chloejvanloon@gmail.com
3141 Stevens Creek Blvd, #40592
San Jose, California 95117

From: Juliana Lopker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:15:04 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Juliana Lopker
jlopker@gmail.com
1141 DOLORES ST
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94110

From: Rahul Guttal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:07:51 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Rahul Guttal
guttal.rahul@gmail.com
1141 Dolores Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Margaret Newman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:02:43 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Margaret Newman
maggieannenewman@gmail.com
216 4th Ave Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Shelly Ericksen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 9:13:06 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Shelly Ericksen
shellyericksen@gmail.com
259 Dolores Street
San Francisco, California 94103

From: jenny McGrane
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 9:07:06 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

jenny McGrane
Jhmcgrane@aom.com
113 WOOL ST
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94110-5551

From: Senta Tsantilis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 9:01:57 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Senta Tsantilis
sptsantilis@gmail.com
2865 Lincoln Way
San Francisco , California 94122

From: Pranav Sundaram
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:59:46 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Pranav Sundaram
s.pranav94@gmail.com
1655 Mission St
San Francisco, California 94103

From: lillydatnow@berkeley.edu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:53:27 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

lillydatnow@berkeley.edu
2710 Durant Ave
Berkeley, California 94704

From: Garret Madderra
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:32:33 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Garret Madderra
mad42th@sbcglobal.net
657 Corbett Ave
San Francisco , California 94114

From: Leah Hopson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 8:01:14 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Leah Hopson
leah.hopson@humangood.org
1025 post st
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Lisa Amparo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 7:28:17 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Lisa Amparo
ldamparo@gmail.com
1823 Powell street
San Francisco , California 94133

From: Morgan Bromstad
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 7:26:22 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Morgan Bromstad
mbromstad@luminismgmt.com
1592 Union St 215
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Kelsey Rexroat
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 5:23:21 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kelsey Rexroat
kelsey.rexroat@gmail.com
2131 Lincoln Way
San Francisco, California 94122

From: dmahming@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 1:48:18 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

dmahming@gmail.com
48 Haight St Apt 26
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Maya Sol
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 12:04:11 AM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Maya Sol
mayasolmx@gmail.com
326 31st Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Christina Campany
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 10:45:16 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Christina Campany
campanynospam@gmail.com
1350 Washington St.
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Sylvie Mehner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:50:09 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Sylvie Mehner
aubergine.sm@gmail.com
Brighton Ave
Sf, California 94112

From: marisa.mgm@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:52:50 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

marisa.mgm@gmail.com
207 Russia Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Libby Sears
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters in San Francisco
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 8:40:02 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Libby Sears
libbycsears@gmail.com
1309 10th Ave Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Corey Busay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:58:49 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Corey Busay
busayc@gmail.com
1201 Hopkins street
Berkeley, California 94702

From: Madison Sinica
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:34:56 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Madison Sinica
madjoysinica@gmail.com
6224 Valinda Ave
Rancho Cucamonga, California 91737

From: Aryan Mitharwal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:33:32 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Aryan Mitharwal
mitharwalaryan@gmail.com
12509 Overland Dr
Rancho Cucamonga, California 91739

From: David Weber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Should Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:23:36 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

For my work as a biologist, I've been to islands in the Pacific that I have seen covered in plastic trash including cigarette butts. It's incredible saddening to see this junk polluting what should be pristine natural havens. It's just as upsetting seeing them littering the streets of San Francisco.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

David Weber
davidaweber1@gmail.com
1618 MCALLISTER ST
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94115

From: Hannah Hanssens-Reed
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 6:03:09 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Hannah Hanssens-Reed
hannahhreed@gmail.com
681 9th Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Alayna Parker
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:58:57 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.
Alayna Parker

Alayna Parker
alaynadarker@gmail.com
2090 great Highway

San Francisco, California 94116

From: Sara Burke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Recognize It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:52:21 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Sara Burke
saraburke49@gmail.com
790 22nd Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

From: agage@mac.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:43:45 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

agage@mac.com
974 Ashbury Street
San Francisco, California 94117-4409

From: Muhammed Bakr
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 5:09:59 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Muhammed Bakr
muhammed.bakr@berkeley.edu
2546 warring street
berkeley, California 94702

From: Alissa Huntington
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:54:31 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Alissa Huntington
alissalhuntington@gmail.com
1025 green st
San Francisco , California 94133

From: Rita Geraghty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:53:05 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing you to support laws banning plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways. My husband and I (seniors) clean up SF streets with our little pickers. By far, what we pick up the most is cigarette butts. They are tricky little things and take a lot of time.

They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment. It's horrible to think that the bottom of the bay is plastered with them and the fish are eating and living amongst the debris.

Santa Cruz recently decided to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Rita Geraghty
rgeraghtyhhd@yahoo.com
76 Stanford Heights Ave

San Francisco, California 94127

From: Gloria Yarovaya
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:15:27 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Gloria Yarovaya
gloria.yaro@gmail.com
3711 Fillmore Street #202
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Jason Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:15:13 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Jason Smith
js@jayasmith.com
457 Oak St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Holly Galbrecht
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 4:12:07 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Holly Galbrecht
hgalbrecht@gmail.com
560 Presidio Avenue Apt. 1
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Renaissance Zhang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:57:06 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Renaissance Zhang
cherylz0326@gmail.com
11094, Stone River Dr
Rancho Cucamonga, California 91737

From: janiceruthwood46@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:38:25 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

janiceruthwood46@gmail.com
230 Francisco Street
San Francisco, California 94133

From: Kerri Waters
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:35:40 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kerri Waters
kawaters4@gmail.com
1412 18th Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Elizabeth Mcintosh
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:23:36 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Elizabeth Mcintosh
emci36@gmail.com
216 4th Ave Apt 3
San Francisco, ca , California 94118

From: kpr365@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:20:35 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

kpr365@gmail.com
612 South Fairview Avenue
Park Ridge, Illinois 60068-4705

From: SERENA SATYASAI
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:10:58 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

SERENA SATYASAI
serenasf@gmail.com
41 VALPARAISO ST
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94133

From: Dayani Waas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:06:53 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Dayani Waas
waasday@gmail.com
1100 Masonic
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Helena Young
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:03:18 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Helena Young
helenacarmena@gmail.com
4313 24th street
San Francisco, California 94114

From: Benson Wu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:02:57 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Benson Wu
bensontwu@gmail.com
1100 Gough St Apt 13E
San Francisco, California 94109

From: Ryoko Chernomaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:01:37 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Ryoko Chernomaz
bibiryoko@gmail.com
409 Princeton St.
San Francisco, California 94134

From: Philip Metz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:58:24 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Philip Metz
metz.pj@gmail.com
126 Elm St. apt 308
San Mateo, California 94401

From: Madison Rasmus
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:53:51 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

As a frequent participant of my local neighborhood clean-up through Refuse Refuse, one of my first impressions was the shocking amount of cigarette butts littering the streets.

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count, and this has certainly been reflected in the litter I collect in my trash clean-ups. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Madison Rasmus

maddirasmus@gmail.com
874 Page St., Unit 4
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Kyle Combes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:37:14 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Kyle Combes
noreply@aol.com
492 Grove St
San Francisco, California 94102

From: Molly Hayden
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:31:25 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.
Molly Hayden

Molly Hayden
molly@lowerhaight.org
144a Scott Street

San Francisco, California 94117

From: Eric Hantz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:31:01 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Eric Hantz
erichantz@yahoo.com
751 Page St
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Stacie Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:17:41 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Stacie Smith
ssmithcrna@gmail.com
2131 44th Ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Saya Kim-Suzuki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:17:00 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Saya Kim-Suzuki
ssolbeeks@gmail.com
677 Oak St, #2
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Paige Hein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:12:12 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Paige Hein
paigehein07@gmail.com
2325 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Courtney Greene
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: It's Time for San Francisco to Ban Plastic Cigarette Filters
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 2:10:02 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors ,

I'm writing to urge you to introduce or support legislation to ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco. These filters—commonly known as cigarette butts—are the single most littered item on our planet and one of the most toxic forms of plastic pollution affecting our city's streets, parks, and waterways.

Each year, cigarette butts make up nearly one-third of all litter by count. They are non-biodegradable, leach harmful chemicals into our soil and ocean, and provide no health benefit to smokers. Despite their small size, their collective impact is enormous: contaminating storm drains, poisoning marine life, and adding to the growing burden of microplastics in our environment.

Santa Cruz recently took bold, commonsense action to ban plastic cigarette filters, setting a precedent for coastal communities across California. San Francisco—long recognized as a leader in environmental protection—now has the opportunity to do the same.

On October 29, a coalition of advocates, scientists, and community members will gather at Manny's for The Cigarette Surfboard film screening and action night. This event, featuring Senator Scott Wiener, City Attorney David Chiu, and environmental leaders from across the state, will shine a spotlight on the devastating impact of cigarette filter pollution and mobilize public support for policy change.

We have the data, the precedent, and the public will. What we need now is political leadership to turn awareness into action. I respectfully ask that you work with your colleagues to introduce or back legislation to phase out or ban plastic cigarette filters in San Francisco.

Together, we can keep toxic waste off our streets and beaches, protect marine ecosystems, and set a model for the rest of the state—and the nation.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and continued commitment to environmental stewardship.

With respect and urgency.

Courtney Greene
greenetangerine@gmail.com
830 Hayes Street, Apt 208
San Francisco, California 94117

Item 15

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	2 Letters regarding the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:42:00 PM
Attachments:	2 Letters regarding the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding the Crocker Amazon baseball and softball fields.

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: Matthew Gubiotti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); Lurie, Daniel (MYR)
Cc: Jay Harris
Subject: Unequivocal Support for the Crocker Amazon Ballfield Renovation Project
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:44:23 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and San Francisco Supervisors:

I write to you as a West Portal father of a 12-year old baseball lover and as a three-year volunteer coach of San Francisco Little League teams to express my **unequivocal and strong support** for the proposed renovation of the Crocker Amazon baseball complex.

Baseball in San Francisco is in trouble — and you can help save it. A trouble troubling trends:

- The Catholic Youth Organization (CYO) just shuttered its baseball program **permanently** after too few schools and students were interested in participating;
- Youth participation across both SFYBL and San Francisco Little League, while robust, remains **down from its historic numbers**; and
- Weather related closures on poorly maintained City grass diamonds — **like RECs closures just this past Sunday after light rain on Saturday** — cause cancellations and further limit diamond availability.

The Crocker Amazon project — taken in partnership with the Giants — is a critical investment that will directly and significantly enhance youth sports access and community recreation infrastructure in San Francisco. The plan to deliver six fully renovated diamonds, five with new **artificial turf surfaces**, is the key to unlocking massive, immediate benefits for our residents.

The single most important operational outcome will be the projected **90%+ reduction in weather-related closures**. This will instantly provide reliable, year-round access and hundreds of more annual usage hours for San Francisco's youth leagues, which currently demand over 1,500 hours of field time per week. This upgrade is also vital for the underserved middle and high school baseball and softball programs that rely on full-sized, quality fields.

Beyond the ballparks, the project demonstrates a thoughtful commitment to the broader community. The inclusive design includes valuable non-athletic amenities like **two new dog parks, increased onsite parking,** and a new restroom and pavilion area, ensuring the entire complex is improved for all San Franciscans.

Given the project's proven ability to dramatically increase field availability, support youth development missions, and provide holistic community enhancements, I urge you to actively champion this initiative. I am prepared to dedicate time and resources to help build the necessary momentum and support to ensure this renovation moves forward successfully.

Thank you for your leadership on this vital community matter.

Sincerely,

Matthew Gubiotti

33 Allston Way, SF, CA 94127

Coach, San Francisco Little League

---
gubiotti@gmail.com

From: Garrett Spiegel
To: Commission, Recpark (REC); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Mauer, Dan (REC)
Subject: Support for Crocker Amazon Baseball Field Renovation
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 3:09:38 PM

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

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing as a San Francisco parent and youth baseball coach to voice my strong support for the renovation of the Crocker Amazon ballfields.

I've coached baseball in this city for over 5 years now — nine seasons with my oldest son in San Francisco Little League and four with my daughter in both SFLL and SFYBL. I've coached kids from every corner of San Francisco — from the Outer Sunset, where I live with my four children, to neighborhoods across the city. What's always struck me is how much this game brings people together, and how desperately our players need safe, reliable fields to play on.

Right now, too many practices and games are canceled because our fields are unsafe or unplayable after rain. The dust, uneven surfaces, and lack of lighting make it hard to keep kids engaged and teams consistent. My son, who now plays competitive baseball, has to travel all the way down to Twin Creeks in Sunnyvale just to play on fields that meet basic standards for high-quality baseball — something that should exist right here in San Francisco. That kind of travel makes competitive baseball inaccessible to many families who don't have the time or means to leave the city every weekend.

Competitive baseball should be accessible to all kids, not just those with the ability to travel. It's more than just a sport — it's a place where kids learn discipline, teamwork, leadership, and community. These are the experiences that help them grow into better citizens and stronger members of our city.

Crocker Amazon has the potential to change that. It could be a true home for baseball in San Francisco — a place where players from every league and every background can play together on safe, well-maintained fields that reflect the quality and diversity of our community.

Please support this project and help give San Francisco's youth — and our city's baseball community — the facilities they deserve.

With gratitude,

Garrett Spiegel
Outer Sunset resident
Parent of four young ballplayers
Coach – SF Little League & SFYBL
1.818.371.7100

Item 16

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject:	74 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:00:00 PM
Attachments:	74 Letters regarding Zoning.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 74 Letters regarding File Nos. 250700, 251071; 250701, 251072, 251073; 250966; and 251071.

File No. 250700: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250701: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251072: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251073: Planning, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 250966: General Plan Amendments - Family Zoning Plan

File No. 251071: Zoning Map - Family Zoning Plan

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:	Nick Eckenwiler
To:	Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Cc:	McDougall, Paul@HCD; gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; Coy, Melinda@HCD; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; Lisa.Frank@hcd.ca.gov; Fidel.Herrera@hcd.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Matthew.Struhar@doj.ca.gov; David Pai
Subject:	CalHDF Letter Regarding San Francisco's Housing Element Implementation
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:21:46 PM
Attachments:	San Francisco - Housing Element Rezoning Letter - 2025.10.29 (Report Attached).pdf

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

Good afternoon,

Please see attached for a letter from the California Housing Defense Fund regarding San Francisco's proposed Family Zoning Plan and the City's obligations under the Housing Element Law.

Sincerely,

--
Nicholas Eckenwiler
Staff Attorney

Oct 29, 2025

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
49 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: San Francisco's Housing Element Implementation

By email: rachael.tanner@sfgov.org, Lisa.chen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, bos@sfgov.org, bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, aly.bonde@sfgov.org, sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org

Cc: Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov, gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov, Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov, Melinda.Coy@hcd.ca.gov, shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov, David.Zisser@hcd.ca.gov, Lisa.Frank@hcd.ca.gov, Fidel.Herrera@hcd.ca.gov, alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov, Matthew.Struhar@doj.ca.gov, David.Pai@doj.ca.gov

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") submits this letter to outline the City of San Francisco's legal obligations surrounding its efforts to implement its housing element. Specifically, CalHDF writes to remind the City:

1. The City must rezone as promised in its housing element – it must upzone enough to produce (not merely attain capacity for) 36,282 units based on an analytical model that assesses the probability of development for rezoned parcels under current economic conditions.
2. The City's housing element and the housing element law oblige it to reduce constraints on housing production and refrain from adding new constraints, especially in the City's efforts to satisfy its other housing element obligations.

If the City does not obey the law on these points, CalHDF stands ready to challenge the City's intransigence in court. Such a lawsuit would expose the City to penalties, including the payment of CalHDF's attorney's fees. CalHDF urges the City to avoid such needless litigation and instead comply with state law, the contours of which are explained in detail below.

The City's Proposed Rezonings Are Inadequate

The Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580 et seq.) establishes a clear process for the evaluation, planning, and enactment of the City's housing policy. That process has a two-part structure. In the first part, the City must adopt a housing element on a specified timeline and that meets certain requirements. In the second part, the City must implement the programs promised in its housing element. Crucially, the second step relies on the first step: what, precisely, the City must do in the second step has already been established by the housing element. (See Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c).) The second step is *not* a freestanding exercise in policymaking or policy analysis. (See *id.*) The policymaking and policy analysis are conducted in the first step, and the Housing Element Law leaves essentially no room to alter the results at the second step.[1]

San Francisco has completed the first step. It adopted a housing element on January 31, 2023, adhering to the substantive and procedural rules in the Housing Element Law. The California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") also certified the City's adopted housing element as legally compliant, pursuant to its statutory authority. (See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 65585.) That housing element made numerous detailed commitments. These commitments include promises to rezone large areas of the City to accommodate housing growth necessary to meet demand and ease upward pressures on housing costs. (See Gov. Code, §§ 65583 [establishing standards for required rezonings]; 65583.1 [same]; 65583.2 [same].) The housing element, moreover, promised not only to rezone, but to engage in detailed analysis that would help shape the rezoning. (See Program 7.1.1 in San Francisco's Housing Element, available here.)

San Francisco is now at the second step of the process: implementing the commitments in its housing element. This includes the aforementioned rezoning and associated policy analyses. The City's proposed rezoning, however, fails to fulfill crucial aspects of housing element commitments – commitments that the City, as explained above, cannot renege on without going through a full amendment process for its housing element.

Program 7.1.1 of the City's housing element commits the City to implementing a rezoning program that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The housing element uses mandatory language, stating that the City "shall" build its rezoning program around such a "probability-of-development" analysis. In sum: the City must rezone to an extent that the expected number of new units that will be built after the rezoning, calculated via a robust probability-of-development analysis, meets the City's projected housing need (i.e. the

[1] If the City wishes to alter the policy analysis or programs promised by its housing element, it has an avenue to do that: it may amend its housing element according to the procedures set forth in Government Code section 65585. But the process remains a two-step process: the City must first amend its housing element, and only then can it proceed to the second step of implementing the promised housing element programs.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment, or "RHNA," allocation, plus a buffer specified in the housing element).

The current rezoning proposal does not do this. The proposal's failure is twofold. First, none of the methods the Planning Department has relied on to assess whether the proposal will satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation constitutes a probability-of-development analysis using an analytical model in line with Program 7.1.1 in the housing element. Second, when the City has conducted an analysis that meets the requirements of Program 7.1.1, the analysis shows the current rezoning proposal will not satisfy San Francisco's rezoning obligation.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's first failure: the City proposes three methods to project the number of new units the proposed rezoning can be expected to produce. None of the three methods measures up to the standards in Program 7.1.1.

1. The first method is the "soft sites" method, which is described in appendix B of the City's housing element. This method assumes that a site currently hosting a residential use has a two percent probability of being redeveloped with the rezoning's planned residential capacity and a site currently hosting a non-residential use has a seventy percent probability of redevelopment. Such rigid calculations based on uniform, citywide assumptions about the odds of development on thousands of very different sites are not an "analytical model" and do not "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. These assumptions, furthermore, are not reasonable and do not rest on any evidence. They are highly motivated guesswork, and highly motivated guesswork will not cut the mustard.

2. The second method rests on an economic model developed by a consultant. This model does not assess the likelihood of a given site's being developed under the rezoning proposal. Instead, it calculates how many units of housing are "financially feasible" on parcels throughout the City. This is not an "analytical model" that "reasonably account[s] for sites' likelihood of development" as required by Program 7.1.1. As the City well knows, property owners across the City submit permit applications for only a small portion of economically feasible new housing units, and not all of those permit applications ultimately produce actual housing units. The City attempts to address this problem by assuming – similar to the soft sites method – that two percent of sites with economically feasible new housing developments currently occupied by residential uses and thirty-five percent of other sites with economically feasible new housing developments will be developed. This is inadequate for the same reasons the soft sites method is inadequate. Moreover, this method projects only 19,000 new units of housing over the planning period – far below the 36,282 units the City must accommodate.

3. The third method involves looking at "how much of the City's overall zoning capacity has gotten built out over the years." This – again – is not an "analytical model." Nor does it look at the sites slated for rezoning under the current rezoning proposal and assess the likelihood they will produce new housing. This method is further flawed because much of San Francisco's recent increase in zoned capacity, and much of the new housing that has been built, took place on vacant sites, whereas the proposed housing element rezoning covers a broad swath of the City and comprises mostly non-vacant sites. Other problems here include unrealistically low estimates of the City's residential zoning capacity in prior years (thus inflating the share of residential zoned capacity that has been built out) and the inclusion of residential projects built under development agreements, which do not correspond to rezonings, and which were separately counted towards the City's pre-existing residential zoned capacity in the housing element.

With respect to the rezoning proposal's second failure, analytical models that would satisfy Program 7.1.1 in the housing element demonstrate that the proposed rezoning will not produce anywhere close to the required number of new units. San Francisco's City Economist recently released an analysis of the City's proposed rezoning (available at the link and appended to this letter). This analysis relies on the exact approach that San Francisco's Housing Element pledged to use: an analytical model that assesses the probability of development. (Indeed, it is the exact approach HCD suggested the city use.) The results are damning. In the **best case scenario,** San Francisco's City Economist's analytical model found that the rezoning can only be reasonably expected to produce around **14,646 units by 2045**. Less optimistic assumptions produce a forecast of only 8,504 units by 2045. This indicates the rezoning plan falls far short of what is required: being shown by an analytical model to reasonably be expected to produce **36,282 units by 2031**.

These are not minor problems. Program 7.1.1 is central to San Francisco's compliance with the Housing Element Law. The City's housing element meets the requirements of the Housing Element Law *only because* it included Program 7.1.1's commitment to rezone based on a realistic probability-of-development analysis. To be crystal clear: without Program 7.1.1, the housing element does not comply with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). This is because the housing element relies on non-vacant sites to accommodate more than half of its RHNA allocation at the lower-income level, and thus the Housing Element Law requires its housing element to "demonstrate that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development." (Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subd. (g)(2).) "An existing use shall be presumed to impede additional residential development, absent findings based on substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued." (*Ibid.*) San Francisco's housing element does not demonstrate with substantial evidence that specific existing uses on specific sites intended to accommodate low-income housing will not impede additional residential development. Instead, the housing element commits the City, in Program 7.1.1, to rezoning in a manner that "shall

reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." That commitment is the basis of the City's compliance with Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2). Refusing to follow through on that commitment would leave the City without any basis for compliance with the Housing Element Law on this point.[2]

CalHDF urges the City to do as the law requires. The City must adopt a rezoning that an analytical model such as the City Economists' shows can reasonably be expected to produce 36,282 new units under current economic conditions, as required by Program 7.1.1. Alternatively, the City can increase the probability of sites' development (again, according to a realistic analytical model) by adjusting non-zoning policies that constrain housing production: the City could, for example, reduce transfer taxes for residential projects, impact fees for new residential construction, or inclusionary zoning requirements. The City should not – it cannot – rely on flawed and insufficient analyses to justify its planned rezonings. Doing so violates the law.

The City Must Reduce Constraints on Housing Production, Not Add New Ones

The City's planned rezoning, although on net it adds new capacity, includes constraints on housing development that do not exist under current zoning rules. Specifically, the proposal includes minimum office densities, caps on dwelling unit size, new limits on curb cuts, and lower parking maximums. Furthermore, the City's proposed local zoning bonus program, known as the "Housing Choice–San Francisco" ("HCSF") program, imposes new limitations on residential projects' eligibility for protections and benefits under state laws, including the Statewide Density Bonus Law. While some of these constraints may be good policy, they pose a problem for two reasons.

First, the new constraints were not analyzed by the City's housing element. The Housing Element Law requires local governments to analyze governmental constraints on housing production. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).) The results of this analysis then inform the policies and programs in the housing element. (See *id.*; *id.* at subd. (c)(3); *Californians for Homeownership, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills* (2023) Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCP00143, at p. 6, [finding planned rezonings for housing element site inventory must consider constraints identified by the housing element's constraints analysis] [opinion attached to this letter].) Because the new constraints attached to the City's rezoning proposal were not analyzed in the City's housing element, the City cannot rely on the rezoning proposal to produce as many units as it is required to unless the City analyzes the effects of the new constraints and offsets their impact on housing production.

[2] The City could address this issue by producing site-specific evidence that existing uses on non-vacant sites will not impede additional residential development, adding that evidence to a new draft of its housing element, and adopting the amended housing element. But – again – the City would have to do this before rezoning. The process of developing and adopting housing element commitments and then, separately, implementing those commitments remains a two-step process.

Second, the City's housing element explicitly recognizes this and commits the City to refrain from adding new constraints. Program 7.1.1 states: "The rezoning program … shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment." Program 8.1.6 states: "[A]ny City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints." If San Francisco wishes to establish new governmental constraints to housing production (such as making new developments ineligible for the waivers and protections offered by State Density Bonus Law), it must concurrently reduce other constraints to a degree that maintains the overall viability of new residential construction, "as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment" that assess projects' "financial feasibility." Pursuing the new constraints without offsetting them by reducing existing constraints, however, would violate the commitments in housing element programs 7.1.1 and 8.1.6 and hence violate the Housing Element Law.


As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New multifamily housing in San Francisco a public benefit: it will help satisfy demand for housing near jobs and transit, thereby reducing displacement pressure; and it will also cut down on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by providing housing in a major metro area, as opposed to farther-flung regions in the state (and out of state). CalHDF therefore urges the City to follow through on the commitments in its housing element, as the law requires, and obey state law in drafting and enforcing its land use regulations.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,



Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director



James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

Family Zoning Plan: Economic Impact Report

Office of the Controller
Office of Economic Analysis

Items 250700 & 250701
October 29, 2025

Introduction

- Two proposed ordinances would change zoning controls to permit more housing on a large segment of San Francisco, particularly on the western half of the city. They implement changes to the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, a planning document whose revisions were adopted in 2023.
- The Ordinance in file #250700, the Zoning Map Amendment, would generally raise allowable building heights along commercial corridors and transit lines, to permit mid-rise and some high-rise development.
- The Ordinance in file #250701 implements the Housing Choice-San Francisco program, which offers an alternative to the State Density Bonus program.
- The Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) has prepared this report because the proposed legislation may have a material impact on the city's economy. This report uses a model that estimates potential new development, in order to assess economic impact. That model is not a replacement for the City's estimates of realistic capacity under Government Code § 65583.2.


Zoning Map Amendment: Key Provisions

- The Zoning Map Amendment would make changes to allowable building heights and bulk, and/or zoning districts, in over 92,000 parcels in the city.
- The vast majority are residential parcels, whose allowable heights would either remain at 40 feet, or rise to 50 or 65 feet.
- On these and many other rezoned parcels, the Housing Choice San Francisco program (described on the next page) relaxes existing controls on the number of housing units allowed on a parcel.
- Allowable heights are generally increased to 65 to 85 feet along many commercial corridors, with development along wider streets near transit stations or major lines increased to 85 feet.
- Heights above 140 feet are allowed on certain streets that currently allow high-rise development or have larger parcels, at key intersections, and near certain major transit routes and stations. The map on page 5 provides additional details.

Housing Choice San Francisco – Key Provisions

- The Housing Choice San Francisco program, or "Local Program", gives developers an alternative to the State Density Bonus.
- Many of the rezoned residential parcels are too small to be eligible for the State Density Bonus, but may achieve greater density through the use of the Local Program.
- Local Program users also gain benefits associated with housing unit mix, methods of complying with inclusionary housing requirements, rear-yard and setback requirements, broad code flexibility, and certain process changes.
- The ordinance has several other provisions, including limiting the maximum size of new residential units, reducing allowable parking, and restricting new curb cuts. These policy changes are not considered in this report.
- Additionally, the proposed ordinance gives displaced businesses the right to relocate anywhere in the city where their activity is permitted by zoning, without a conditional use permit, and waives development impact fees associated with the relocation.

Details of the Rezoning



The map to the left, from the City Planning department, indicates which parcels in the city will be rezoned, and to which heights. It reflects the plan as of July.

Gray parcels will be zoned for low-rise, 40-50 feet housing developments. This includes single-family residential zones, within which greater density will be permitted via the Local Program.

Yellow and orange parcels will be upzoned to mid-rise development of 65-105 feet.

Pink and purple parcels will have height limits ranging from 120-180 feet, and the blue and green parcels will be upzoned for high-rise development, of 240 feet or greater.

The Rezoning and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

- Each jurisdiction in California is required to have its Housing Element be certified by the State's Housing and Community Development Department.
- Certification involves, among other things, ensuring that the City has the zoning capacity to meet the city's obligations under the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- RHNA is a Statewide planning process, in which future needs are forecasted for metropolitan areas, and then allocated to the individual cities and counties that administer land use planning.
- In San Francisco's case, the RHNA obligation requires the City to have realistic capacity for approximately 82,000 new housing units, at different economic levels, within an 8-year planning period ending in 2031.
- Of this 82,000 unit requirement, the City must create capacity for approximately 36,000 units.

Substitutions and Proposed Amendments

- On September 30, a new version of #250700 was substituted by Mayor Lurie, which made relatively minor zoning changes on a number of parcels. This analysis reflects those changes.
- On October 21, Supervisor Melgar proposed an amendment that would prohibit the use of the Local Program on any parcel containing more then two existing housing units, which would involve the demolition of a unit subject to rent control.
- Also on October 21, Supervisor Sauter introduced an amendment that creates incentives for developers to replace lost commercial space.
- As the language of these two amendments was made public less than one week ago, this report does not attempt to model their economic impact.

Economic Impact Factors

- When the City relaxes zoning controls, by reducing density restrictions or increasing allowable heights, more development projects will become financially feasible, and the supply of housing in the city will rise.
- This increased supply will put downward pressure on housing prices in the city. Cheaper housing benefits city residents who move within the city, and also makes San Francisco more affordable for new arrivals.
- The development of new housing also stimulates investment and employment in construction and related industries.
- The population growth associated with new housing also stimulates the local economy, by expanding the numbers of workers and consumers.
- On the other hand, the limited amount of vacant lots in the city means that new housing generally involves the loss of existing buildings, including both residential and commercial properties. This can impose relocation and other costs on residential and commercial tenants.

Estimating the Likelihood of New Housing Development

- The amount of new housing that the rezoning will produce is an important contributor to its economic impact. To estimate this, OEA refined a statistical model that it has used since 2016 to estimate the impact of policy changes on housing production in the city[1].
- The model was the result of statistical analysis of housing production in San Francisco over the 2004-2024 period. Technical details on the model are provided in the Appendix.
- The first part of the model estimates the likelihood that multifamily housing will be developed on a given parcel, in a given year. The statistical analysis found that a parcel is more likely to develop when:
  - it has smaller existing buildings (or is vacant), and is located closer to downtown.
  - its zoning allows for a greater height, makes it eligible for the State Density Bonus, and does not restrict the number of units that may be constructed.
  - housing prices are relatively high, and construction costs are relatively low, compared to other years.

Estimating the Number of Units Produced

- The second part of the model estimates the number of units that will be produced when a parcel does develop housing. Based on past experience, the statistical analysis found that a parcel developing housing will produce more units when:
  - its land area and allowable maximum height are greater;
  - it is eligible for the State Density Bonus;
  - its zoning does not restrict the number of units that may be built.
- The OEA used the first part of the model to estimate the probability that housing will be built on a parcel over the next twenty years[2]. That probability was multiplied by the estimate of housing units from the second part, to create an expected number of housing units generated for each parcel over twenty years. When this is summed across all parcels, a citywide housing total is generated.
- This method was used to create estimates of housing production under the existing zoning, and the proposed rezoning. The difference is the estimate of housing that could be produced as a result of the proposed zoning changes.


Limitations of the Housing Development Model

- The housing development model can forecast future housing development based on the city's past experience, but important caveats must be made.
- Because of data availability, not every factor that affects housing production could be included. Missing data may include features of the parcel itself, or policies that may have changed over the 2004-24 period, or vary within the aggregated zoning designations used by the model.
- Limited data also prevents the analysis of fine-grained policy changes in the proposed rezoning, such as restrictions on unit size and mix.
- Several new City and State policies that were intended to encourage housing production have been enacted in recent years, such as, for example, the City's 2023 Housing Production Ordinance (0248-23). The model may be unable to properly assess the impact of these policies in the future.
- Despite these limitations, the OEA believes this approach is well-suited to estimating housing production, for the purposes of economic impact reporting.

Future Housing Market Scenarios

- As noted earlier, the amount of housing that will be produced as a result of the rezoning, and its economic impact, will depend on future housing market conditions. This creates an additional level of uncertainty in the forecasts.
- Gauging future market conditions is further complicated by changes in the city's housing market since the COVID-19 pandemic, as described on the next page.
- To understand the scope of what could potentially happen, the OEA created two future scenarios for housing prices and costs in San Francisco.
- In a high-growth scenario, San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-COVID levels by 2030, and grow at the city's pre-COVID rate after that. Construction costs are assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.
- In a low-growth scenario, San Francisco's post-COVID relative housing prices are assumed to represent a "new normal," and housing prices are assumed to grow only at a national average level over the next twenty years. Construction costs are also assumed to grow at the same rate as inflation.

San Francisco and U.S. Housing Price Trends Since 2000




While San Francisco's housing has always been expensive, during the 2010s, average San Francisco condo prices rose much faster than the rest of the U.S., to as much as 5 times the typical U.S. price.

Since 2020, however, San Francisco condo prices have declined, despite rising inflation and rising U.S. condo prices. Adjusted for inflation, typical San Francisco condo prices in 2025 are 25% lower than they were in 2019.

Among other factors, the increase in remote office work during COVID has reduced the value of a residence near large office employment centers like downtown San Francisco.

Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

Housing Price Trends Within the City




Source: Zillow. Data retrieved October 1, 2025.

The reduced value of a downtown location has also shifted multifamily price patterns within the city.

Condos in neighborhoods like Downtown and South of Market have experienced inflation-adjusted price drops of more than 40% since 2016, while the Richmond and Sunset have fallen by far less.

Because most multifamily housing in the city is near downtown, but most of the proposed rezoning is not, the use of a citywide average condo price index is inappropriate. This analysis uses an average price across the 10 Zillow neighborhoods most affected by the zoning, which is somewhat higher than the citywide average.

High and Low Growth Scenario Price Forecasts




Our high-growth scenario assumes that San Francisco's housing prices, relative to the U.S., return to pre-pandemic levels by 2030, and then grow at the city's long-term average rate until 2045. This implies a rapid growth in housing prices over the next five years, of over 10% per year.

In the low-growth scenario, the post-COVID housing market represents a new normal, and San Francisco housing prices are assumed to grow only at the U.S. long-term rate at 1.8% per year, in inflation-adjusted dollars. Under this assumption, San Franciso housing prices would not recover to their pre-COVID peak, in inflation-adjusted dollars, until 2041.

Source: Zillow. 10 Neighborhoods are Buena Vista, Polk Gulch, Inner Sunset, Marina, Mission, North Waterfront, Outer Sunset, Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond, and Western Addition.

Construction Cost Trends and Scenarios



Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; U.S. Census Bureau, "Quarterly Workforce Indicators

The housing development model uses two measures of construction costs: materials cost and local construction industry wages. They are blended into a single index for modeling purposes. Details are in the Appendix.

The cost of construction materials and local wages have grown faster than overall inflation, particularly in the last few years. In 2024, real construction materials costs were 18% higher, and real local wages were 10% higher, than they were in 2016.

In both the high-growth and low-growth scenarios, the blended index is assumed to grow at 0% (after inflation) over the 2026-2045 period. This reflects an assumption that both labor and material costs inflation will revert to the broader rate of inflation in the long term.

Housing Production Forecasts Under Current Zoning

Planning District	Historic, 2000-24	Low-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45	High-Growth Scenario Forecast, 2026-45
Buena Vista	975	43	90
Central	72	192	390
Downtown	289	112	230
Ingleside	0	58	120
Inner Sunset	123	28	59
Marina	131	126	263
Mission	187	197	406
Northeast	449	136	283
Outer Sunset	15	16	33
Richmond	0	23	47
South Central	0	6	11
Western Addition	997	658	1,265
Total	3,238	1,594	3,199

Source: For historic housing production, San Francisco Planning Department

Generally, the housing development model forecasts that the current zoning will produce fewer units in the next 20 years than the numbers of units that were produced in the last 20 years.

The table to the left only covers the portion of each planning district that is in the proposed rezoning area. In total, under the current zoning, the model forecasts 1,594 or 3,199 units under the low- and high-growth forecasts, respectively, while 3,238 units were built in the same areas over the 2000-2024 period.

On the next two pages, the model's forecasts of the additional housing created by the proposed zoning is discussed.

Forecast Net Effect of the Zoning

- As shown in the table below, under the low-growth and high-growth scenarios described earlier, the rezoning would lead to 8,504 and 14,646 additional housing units, beyond what would be produced under current zoning, over the next 20 years.

Low Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	1,594
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	10,098
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	8,504

High Growth Scenario	**Units**
20-Year Housing Production, Existing Zoning	3,199
20-Year Housing Production, Proposed Rezoning	17,845
Effect of Proposed Rezoning	14,646

Summary by Current Zoning District

		Low-Growth			High-Growth		
Current Zoning[3]	Number of Parcels	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units	Average Housing Likelihood, Current	Average Housing Likelihood, Proposed	Change in Housing Units
RH1	43,009	0.001%	0.205%	798	0.003%	0.446%	1,731
RH2	26,486	0.002%	0.259%	576	0.005%	0.565%	1,250
RH3_RM1	13,741	0.009%	0.347%	547	0.018%	0.756%	1,186
Office/Commercial	114	0.570%	0.780%	48	1.185%	1.639%	104
Public	239	0.060%	1.450%	3,483	0.122%	2.560%	4,814
Density-Restricted Multifamily	7,079	0.336%	0.490%	3,007	0.674%	1.026%	5,467
Form-Based Multifamily	2,053	0.725%	0.725%	46	1.502%	1.502%	94
Total	92,721			8,504			14,646

The table to the left breaks out the results by current zoning. It illustrates how many rezoned parcels are in the RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3 or RM-1 residential zones, primarily in the western side of the city. These areas will see a substantial increase in the likelihood of developing housing over the next 20 years, but the chances are still small, so those 83,000+ parcels are only forecast to produce about additional 4,200 housing units by 2045, in the high growth scenario.

Fewer Public parcels (generally owned by the City or SFUSD) are larger, and more likely to develop housing through the rezoning, though this depends on the owner's decisions.

Estimating the Loss of Existing Residential Units

- To evaluate the economic impact, OEA calculated the net increase in housing units.
- In the low-growth scenario, 463 more units would be lost under the proposed zoning than under current zoning, over the 20-year forecast period. In the high-growth scenario, 1,031 more housing units would be lost. These losses represent a 6-8% of the housing units gained as a result of the rezoning. Amendments proposed on October 20th may reduce these losses, along with overall housing production.
- The loss of existing housing slightly dampens the housing price reductions associated with the rezoning, and may impose financial harms on existing tenants. City and State law heavily restricts, but does not prohibit, the eviction of tenants for the purpose of demolition, or the demolition of rent-controlled housing. These events have been quite rare in recent decades. If this occurs, tenants are entitled to relocation payments.
- Without any way to meaningfully estimate the number of evictions or demolitions of rent-controlled units, or the financial impact on tenants, this report does not attempt to quantify these potential costs.

Impacts on Housing Prices

- The responsiveness of housing prices to increases in housing supply is a function of price elasticities of supply and demand, which the OEA has estimated in past research[4].
- The elasticities imply that the proposed rezoning would lead to a -2.5% to -4.2% change in housing prices in the city, depending on the scenario. For context, those percentages are also expressed in terms of current housing prices and apartment rents.

	Low Growth Scenario	**High Growth Scenario**
Net Change in Housing Supply (units produced less demolitions)	8,041	13,615
Percentage Change in Housing Supply[5]	2.0%	3.4%
Price Elasticity of Demand	-0.7	-0.7
Price Elasticity of Supply	0.1	0.1
Percent change in housing prices	-2.5%	-4.2%
Corresponding change in condo prices[6]	-$24,500	-$41,600
Corresponding change in annual apartment market rents[7]	-$903	-$1,529

Estimating Relocation and Disruption Costs

- To account for the impact on commercial businesses, OEA estimated potential displacement costs. Details are provided in the Appendix.
- Displaced businesses are estimated to occupy commercial space ranging from approximately 1.5 to 2.6 million square feet, depending on the scenario. This displacement would occur over twenty years, and it is highly likely that the rezoning would lead to an increase in the amount of commercial space in the city.
- Annual business disruption and relocation costs range from $16 to $28 million, in today's dollars.

	Low Growth	High Growth
Loss of occupied commercial space (million sf)	1.5	2.6
Disruption-relocation cost/sf	$190	$190
Annual disruption/relocation cost (2025 $ million)	$16	$28

REMI Economic Impact Simulation

- Based on the economic impact factors described earlier, the OEA used the REMI model to measure the net economic impact of the changes associated with the high and low growth scenarios to the city's economy over the 2026-2045 period:
  - An increase in the city's residential capital stock of $8.0 billion (low growth) to $13.5 billion (high growth) in today's dollars, representing the investment associated with the new units forecast under the two scenarios. These figures are calculated by multiplying the net increase in units by average prices.
  - A reduction in citywide housing prices, reaching 2.5% (low growth) and 4.2% (high growth) by 2045.
  - Annual business disruption and relocation costs for retail businesses of $16 million (low growth) and $28 million (high growth) in today's dollars, until 2045.

Economic Impact Assessment

- In the low-growth scenario, the city's GDP would be $560 million larger, in today's dollars, on average over the 2026-45 period. Total employment in the city would be approximately 3,000 more than under the current zoning, on average over the period.
- In the high-growth scenario, the city's GDP growth would be $940 million larger than under current zoning, in 2025 dollars. Employment would be about 5,000 higher.
- Employment gains are expected in every sector, but would be most heavily concentrated in the construction, health care, real estate, and accommodations and food services sectors.
- Despite the displacement of businesses, retail trade is forecast to grow as a result of the population and economic growth created by the proposed rezoning, adding about 210 jobs in the low-growth scenario and about 350 jobs in the high-growth scenario.
- Like most major policies, the proposed rezoning involves benefits and costs. Our analysis suggests the proposed rezoning's positive impact on the city's economy, from lower housing prices and construction, outweighs the negative impact from displaced businesses, by a factor of approximately 22:1.

Conclusions

- The context for housing development in San Francisco has changed profoundly in the past several years. Since 2019, after adjusting for inflation, condo prices in San Francisco have dropped by 25%, while our blended construction cost index has risen by 8%.
- Given this starting point, an expansive rezoning effort, like the proposed Family Zoning plan, will be challenged to match the 2010s levels of new housing development in the city, even under an optimistic high-growth scenario.
- Nevertheless, under both scenarios considered in this report, the proposed rezoning would lead to a significant increase in the city's housing supply, and have broadly positive effects on housing prices and the city's broader economy. The benefits of new residential investments and lower housing prices are projected to outweigh the costs of business interruption and displacement by a factor of roughly 22:1.
- If market conditions were such that the 36,000 unit target was achieved, as a result of the rezoning, the economic impact on the city would likely be significantly more positive than the estimates in this report.

Footnotes

1. See, for example, Inclusionary Housing Working Group: Preliminary Report September 2016.
2. Three large parcels were excluded from the analysis: Laguna Honda Hospital, and the USF Main and Lone Mountain campuses. While all three parcels receive height increases in the proposed rezoning, their size and unique uses makes them unsuitable for the model. If the model could accurately estimate the amount of housing likely to occur on those parcels, the total housing estimate reported in this report would be larger.
3. These are the aggregate zoning classifications used by the model. See the Appendix for details.
4. See Potential Effects of Limiting Market-Rate Housing in the Mission.
5. Assuming 406,000 housing units in the city.
6. Based on Zillow's 2025 average condo prices for San Francisco.
7. Based on 2025 average apartment asking rents, from ApartmentList.

Appendix

- Housing Development Model
  - Methodology
  - Data sources
  - Model coefficients and performance
  - Scenario Inputs
  - Zoning District Classification
  - Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning
- Estimates of Business Interruption and Relocation Costs

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The housing development model is a two-stage step model. The first stage is a logistic regression, covering every parcel in the city, except those subject to a development agreement, over the 2004-2024 period.
- The dependent variable of the logistic regression is 1 if the parcel produced housing in a given year, and 0 otherwise. Parcels that produce housing in a given year were removed from the dataset for subsequent years. Independent variables, reflecting existing land use, market conditions, and zoning, are listed on the next page.
- The second stage is a regression model including all parcels that produced multifamily housing with more than 10 units, over the 2004-24 period. The dependent variable is the number of units produced on the parcel, and the independent variables are the parcel's "building envelope" (its area multiplied by its allowable height), and two interaction variables: the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was eligible for the State Density Bonus in that year, and the building envelope times a dummy indicating if the parcel was subject to density-restricted zoning in that year. The intercept of the model was fixed at zero.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Methodology

- The models' coefficients were used in a forecast that calculated the log-likelihood of development for each rezoned parcel, in each of the forecast years 2026-2045, using the site and zoning information, and the price and cost assumptions for each year (shown on the next page). The log-likelihoods were converted into annual probabilities, from which a 20-year probability of development was calculated.
- The model coefficients were also used to calculate a units estimate; the 20-year probability times the units estimate is the expected number of units produced on that parcel in the 20-year forecast period.
- The forecast model was run for both the current and the proposed zoning. See the section "Logic of Applying the Model to the Proposed Rezoning" for more details.
- Three parcels were excluded from the forecast: Laguna Honda Hospital, the University of San Francisco Main Campus, and the University of San Francisco Lone Mountain Campus. While some housing may be built on those parcels in the forecast period, the model is not well-suited for large parcels with unique uses like these.

Appendix: Housing Development Model: Data Sources

Variable Description	Variable	Data Source
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	Planning Department, Land Use Database 4/16/25
Real Construction Cost Variable, 2 years prior	Construc_Cost_Real	a 60/40 average of Real Construction Materials PPI and Real San Francisco MSA Construction Wages, 2016=100
10-Neighborhood Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real, 2 years prior	Zillow_Price_Real	SF real condo prices per Zillow, 2016=100
Dummy indicating eligibility for State Density Bonus, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	Calculated from Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Public/Open Space	zp_Public	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning dummy: Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	Planning Department, Zoning Districts
Planning District dummy variables	DIST_<District Name>	Planning District from Assessor's Secured Roll DB

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
Intercept	Intercept	(1.6226)	1.2829	1.5998	0.2059
Height limit for site in ft	Height_Ft	0.0017	0.0007	4.9693	0.0258
Area for lot in 1000 sq ft	Area_1000	0.0049	0.0009	30.6563	0.0000
Envelope Area in 1000 sq ft (area/1000*ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.0002	0.0001	5.0369	0.0248
Extisting building square footage in 1000 sq ft	Bldg_SqFt_1000	(0.0023)	0.0007	10.7241	0.0011
Residential Existing Use using ResUnits (Dummy)	Res_Dummy	(0.8231)	0.1222	45.3669	0.0000
Historic Status for Parcel (Dummy)	Historic	(1.0378)	0.1271	66.6847	0.0000
Real Construction Cost Variable	Construc_Cost_Real	(0.0992)	0.0129	58.8929	0.0000
SF Housing Price Index (Zillow), Real	Zillow_Price_Real	0.0143	0.0053	7.1326	0.0076
Dummy for State Density Bonus, 5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward	SDB_2016_5Plus	0.6303	0.1608	15.3724	0.0000
Zoning = Office/Commercial	zp_OfficeComm	4.2634	0.4873	76.5337	0.0000
Zoning = Density Restricted Multifamily, RTO = Form Based	zp_DRMulti_RTO	4.2450	0.4523	88.0989	0.0000
Zoning = Form Based Multifamily, RTO = form based	zp_FBDMulti_RTO	5.0508	0.4640	118.4768	0.0000
Zoning = Industrial / Production, Distribution & Repair	zp_PDRInd	3.4115	0.4790	50.7257	0.0000
Zoning = Public/Open Space	zp_Public	1.2491	0.8385	2.2190	0.1363
Zoning = Redevelopment Area	zp_Redev	4.5361	0.4999	82.3213	0.0000
Zoning = Residential 2-Family (2 Units per Lot)	zp_RH2	0.2674	0.6672	0.1607	0.6885
Zoning = Residential 3-Family or Res Mixed (1/800 sqft)	zp_RH3_RM1	1.3187	0.6064	4.7289	0.0297

Appendix: Logistic Regression Coefficients (Continued)

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	StdErr	WaldChiSq	Prob>Chi Sq
District = South Bayshore	DIST_SBayshore	(1.4824)	0.3179	21.7380	0.0000
District = Bernal Heights	DIST_BernalHts	(1.7011)	0.6087	7.8100	0.0052
District = South Central	DIST_Scentral	(1.7307)	0.3867	20.0267	0.0000
District = Central	DIST_Central	(1.1523)	0.3353	11.8102	0.0006
District = Buena Vista	DIST_BuenaVista	(2.5369)	1.0188	6.2010	0.0128
District = Northeast	DIST_Northeast	(1.4171)	0.2539	31.1439	0.0000
District = Western Addition	DIST_WestAddition	(0.6831)	0.2362	8.3630	0.0038
District = South of Market	DIST_SOMA	(0.0756)	0.1903	0.1579	0.6911
District = Inner Sunset	DIST_InnerSunset	(1.6187)	0.4882	10.9939	0.0009
District = Richmond	DIST_Richmond	(2.8019)	0.5355	27.3716	0.0000
District = Ingleside	DIST_Ingleside	(1.8670)	0.4925	14.3711	0.0002
District = Outer Sunset	DIST_OuterSunset	(2.6147)	0.6098	18.3867	0.0000
District = Marina	DIST_Marina	(1.2492)	0.3253	14.7457	0.0001
District = Mission	DIST_Mission	(1.0938)	0.2380	21.1176	0.0000

Omitted Variables for Groups of Dummy Variables:

Omitted zoning = RH1

Omitted district = Downtown

Appendix: Units Regression Coefficients

Variable Description	Variable	Coeff	St Error	T-Stat
Simple building envelope (area/1000 * ht/10)	Env_1000_Area_Height	0.4252	0.0159	26.72
State Density Bonus * Simple Bldg Envelope (5+ Unit Sites, 2016 forward)	SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull	0.4385	0.0389	11.28
Simple Bldg Envelope only if density-restricted	Zoning_DR_EnvFull	(0.1601)	0.0174	(9.22)

Note: Model removes largest 5% (Positive and Negative) residual outliers

Appendix: Model Performance

Logistic Regression	
Number of Observations	3,369,573
Number with Dependent Variable = 1	422
Pseudo R-Square	0.000611
Max Rescaled R-Square	0.244596

Units Regression	
Number of Observations	383
R-Sq	0.867779
Adj R-Sq	0.866735
Dependent Mean Value	81.87206
Standard Error of Regression	48.40184

Appendix: Zoning Classifications

- The table below shows the correspondence between the City's zoning districts, and the aggregate zoning variables in the model.

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_RH1	C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; M-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-1; RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1(D)/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1(S); RH-1/C-M; RH-1/M-1; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; RH-1/RH-1(D); RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1
zp_RH2	NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-1; RH-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2
zp_RH3_RM1	RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; P/RM-1/RH-2; RH-2/RH-3; RH-2/RM-1; RM-1/RH-2; RH-3/RH-2; RH-1(D)/RM-1; RH-1/RM-1; RM-1/RH-1; RH-3/RH-1; C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; HP-RA/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; RH-3; RH-3/C-2; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/M-2; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-1; RM-1/RH-3; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO
zp_OfficeComm	C-2/RH-3; C-2/RM-1; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-M/RM-1; RH-3/C-2; RM-1/C-M; RM-1/C-M/M-1; C-2/RH-1(D); RH-1(D)/C-2; C-M/RH-1; RH-1/C-M; C-2; C-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-G; C-3-G/C-3-R; C-3-G/C-M; C-3-G/RC-4; C-3-O; C-3-O(SD); C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/C-3-O(SD); C-3-O/C-3-R; C-3-O/C-3-S; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-O/TB DTR; C-3-R; C-3-S; C-3-S/P; C-M; C-M/M-1; CMUO; CMUO/MUR; CMUO/P; MUO; NCD/C-2; P/C-3-R; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; WMUO

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_DRMulti_RTO	NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; C-2/RM-1/RM-4; C-3-G/RC-4; NCD/C-2; RM-3/C-2; RM-4/C-2; NC-1/RM-1; RM-1/NC-1; NC-2/RH-3; NC-2/RM-1; NC-3/RH-3; NC-3/RM-1; NCD/RH-3; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARKET; NCD/RH-3/UPR MARK; NCD/RH-3/VALENCIA; NCD/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO ST; NCD/SACRAMENTO/RM-1; NCD/RM-1/SACRAMEN; RH-3/HAYES; RH-3/NC-2; RH-3/RM-2; RM-2/RH-3; RH-3/RM-3; RM-3/RH-3; RH-3/RSD; RH-3/VALENCIA; RM-1/NC-3; RM-1/RM-2; RM-1/RM-3; RM-1/RM-4; RM-1/SACRAMENTO; NC-1/RH-1/RH-2; NC-1/RH-2; NC-2/RH-2; NC-3/RH-2; NCD/RH-2; NC-S/RH-2; RH-2/NC-1; RH-2/NC-2; RH-2/NC-3; RH-2/RM-2; RM-2/RH-2; RH-2/RM-3; RM-3/RH-2; NC-1/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1; NC-2/RH-1(D); NC-3/RH-1; NCD/RH-1; NCD/RH-1(D); NC-S/RH-1; RH-1(D)/NC-2; RH-1/NC-1; RH-1/NC-2; RH-1/NC-3; RH-1/NC-S; 24TH-MISSION; 24TH STREET- NOE VALL; 24TH-NOE; BROADWAY; BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; C-2/RM-4; CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; CASTRO; CCB; CRNC; CR-NC; CRNC/CVR; CR-NC/CVR; CRNC/RM-4; CVR; DTR/RC-4; FILLMORE; HAIGHT; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; HAYES; HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; INNER CLEMENT; INNER CLEMENT STREET; INNER SUNSET; INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-1; NC-1/RM-2; NC-1/RM-3; NC-2; NC-2/M-1; NC-2/NC-3; NC-3/NC-2; NC-2/RM-3; NC-2/RM-4; NC-3; NC-3/RC-4; NC-3/RM-3; NC-3/RM-4; NCD; NCD/; NCD/24TH STREET- NOE VALL; NCD/24TH STREET-; NCD/24TH-MISSION; NCD/24TH-NOE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLE; NCD/24TH-NOE-VALLEY; NCD/BROADWAY; NCD/BROADWAY NEIG; NCD/BROADWAY NEIGHBORHOOD; NCD/CASTRO; NCD/CASTRO STREET; NCD/CASTRO STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/EXCELSIOR OUT; EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSI; NCD/FILLMORE; NCD/HAIGHT; NCD/HAIGHT STREET; NCD/HAIGHT STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/HAYES; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/INNER CLEMENT; NCD/INNER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/INNER SUNSET; NCD/INNER SUNSET NEIGHBOR; NCD/IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/IRVING STREET; NCD/IRVING; IRVING STREET NEIGHBO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JAPANTOWN NEI; JAPANTOWN NEIGHBORHOO; NCD/JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/JUDAH; NCD/JUDAH STREET; JUDAH STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/NC-1; NCD/NC-2; NCD/NC-3; NCD/NCT; NCD/NO BEACH; NCD/NORIEGA STREET NEIGHB; NCD/NORIEGA STREE; NCD/NORIEGA; NCD/NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORH; NCD/NORTH BEACH N; NCD/NORTH BEACH; NCD/NORTHBEACH; NCD/NORTH BEACH/RM-1; NCD/NORTHBEACH/RM-1; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/OUTER CLEMENT STREET; NCD/PACIFIC; NCD/PACIFIC AVENU; NCD/PACIFIC/RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC;RM-3; NCD/PACIFIC AVENUE NEIGHB; NCD/POLK; NCD/POLK STREET N; NCD/POLK STREET NEIGHBORH; NCD/POLK/RC-3; NCD/POLK/RC-4; NCD/RC-3; NCD/RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, O; NCD/RESIDENTIAL-; NCD/RM-2; NCD/RM-3; NCD/RM-3/PACIFIC; NCD/RTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO; NCD/SACRAMENTO STREET NEI; NCD/TARAVAL STREET NEIGHB; NCD/TARAVAL STREE; NCD/TARAVAL; NCD/UNION; NCD/UNION STREET; NCD/UNION STREET NEIGHBOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE NEIGHB; NCD/UPPER FILLMOR; NCD/UPPER FILLMORE; NCD/UPPERFILLMORE; NCD/UPPER MARKET STREET N; NCD/UPPER MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NC; NCD/UPR MARKET; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NCD/VALENCIA; NCD/WEST PORTAL; NCD/WEST PORTAL A; NCD/WEST PORTAL AVENUE NE; NCD/BAYVIEW; NCD/COLE VALLEY; NCD/CORTLAND AVENUE; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD; NCD/GEARY BOULEVA; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RH-2; NCD/GEARY BOULEVARD/RM-1; NCD/INNER BALBOA STREET; NCD/INNER BALBOA S; NCD/OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/ OUTER BALBOA STREET; NCD/OUTER BALBOA S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT S; NCD/LOWER HAIGHT STREET/RH-3; NCD/LOWER POLK STREET; NCD/MISSION BERNAL; NCD/INNER TARAVAL STREET; NCD/INNER TARAVAL; NCD/SAN BRUNO AVENUE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAGE; NCD/LAKESIDE VILLAG; NC-S; NC-S/PM-R; NC-S/RM-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; NO BEACH; OUTER CLEMENT; POLK; RC-3; RC-3/POLK; RC-3/RM-3; RC-4; RC-4/NC-3; RC-4/RH DTR; RC-4/RM-4; RED/SLR; RM-2; RM-2/M-1; RM-2/NC-1; RM-2/NC-2; RM-2/NO BEACH; RM-2/RM-3; RM-2/RM-4; RM-3; RM-3/NC-1; RM-3/NC-2; RM-3/NC-3; RM-3/NC-S; RM-3/RC-3; RM-3/RM-4; RM-4; RM-4/CR-NC; RM-4/NC-2; RM-4/NC-3; RM-4/RC-4; RSD; RSD/SLR; SACRAMENTO; SLR; SSO; UNION; UPR MARKET; VALENCIA; WEST PORTAL

Appendix: Zoning Classifications (Continued)

Zoning Variable	Zoning Districts
zp_Public	C-2/M-1/P; C-2/P; C-3-O(SD)/P; C-3-O/C-3-S/P; C-3-S/P; CMUO/P; P/C-3-R; P/RM-1/RH-2; P/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-3; P/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; P/RH-1/RH-2; P/RH-2; P/P-W/RH-1; P/RH-1; P/RH-1(D); P/RH-1/RH-1(D); Remove; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; MB-O; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-OS; MB-RA/P; MUG/P; NC-2/P; NC-3/P/RM-3; NCD/P; NC-S/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P; P/C-3-O(SD); P/M-1; P/M-2; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; P/MUR; P/NC-S; P/NC-2; P/PDR-2; P/PM-OS; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/P-W; P/RC-4; P/RM-2; P/RM-3; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF; PM-CF/PM-OS; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; PM-OS/PM-S; Public
zp_FBDMulti_RTO	DTR/RC-4; NCD/HAYES NCT; NCD/HAYES NCT/RTO; NCD/NCT; NCD/RTO; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT; NCD/UPR MARKET NCT/; NC-S/PM-R; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-3; NCT/RM-3; NCT/RM-4; RC-4/RH DTR; RED/SLR; P/PM-R/RM-1; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R/RM-1; MUG/P; NCT/P; NCT-3/P; NCT-3/RTO; P/MUR; P/PM-OS/PM-R; P/TB DTR; P/RTO-C; P, RTO-C; PM-CF/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-MU1/PM-OS; PM-MU2/PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R; PM-OS/PM-R/PM-S; C-3-O(SD)/TB DTR; C-3-O/TB DTR; CMUO/MUR; NCT-DIVISADERO/RH-3; NCT-DIVISADERO/RM-1; NCT/RH-3; NCT/RM-1; PM-R/RM-1; MUR/RH-2; NCT-GLEN PARK/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-2; NCT/RH-2; NCT-OCEAN/RH-1(D); NCT/RH-1(D); DTR; DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; MB-RA/MR-MU; MR-MU; MUG; MUG/RED; MUR; NCT; NCT-DIVISADERO; NCT-FOLSOM; NCT-GLEN PARK; NCT-HAYES; NCT-HAYES/RTO; NCT-HAYES/RTO-1; NCT-MISSION; NCT-UPPER MARKET; NCT-UPPER MARKET;; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-2; NCT-UPPER MARKET/RH-3; NCT-OCEAN; NCT-SOMA; NCT/NCT-3; NCT/RCD; NCT/RED-MX; NCT/RTO; NCT/RTO-M; NCT/UMU; NCT-1; NCT-2; NCT-3; NCT-3/NCT-HAYES; RTO-1/NCT-3; RTO/NCT-3; P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; PM-MU1; PM-MU1/PM-R; PM-MU2/PM-R; PM-MU2; PM-R; RCD; RED; RED-MX; RED-MX/WMUG; RH DTR; RH DTR/SB-DTR; RH DTR/TB DTR; RTO; RTO-1; RTO/NCT; RTO-1/RTO-C; RTO-C; RTO-M; SB-DTR; SPD; TB DTR; UMU; WMUG
zp_PDRInd	DTR/M-1; M-1/RH DTR; M-2/MR-MU; M-2/P70-MU; PDR-1-D/UMU; PDR-1-G/UMU; M-1/NC-2; M-1/RM-2; M-1/RSD; NC-2/M-1; RM-2/M-1; C-2/M-1/P; HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-1/M-2/P; M-1/P; M-2/MB-OS; M-2/MB-RA/P; M-2/P; P/M-1; P/M-2; P/PDR-2; C-2/M-1; C-M/M-1; RH-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RH-2/RM-1; M-1/RM-1; M-2/RH-3; RH-3/M-2; M-1/RH-1; RH-1/M-1; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-1; M-1/M-1; M-1/M-2; M-1/PDR-1-B; M-1/PDR-2; M-2; M-2 (MB); M-2/MB-RA; M-2/PDR-2; M-2/SLI; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; PDR-1; PDR-1/PDR-2; PDR-1-B; PDR-1-B/PDR-2; PDR-1-D; PDR-1-G; PDR-2; SALI; SLI; SLI/M-2
zp_Redev	HP-RA/M-1/M-2/P; HP-RA/M-2/P; M-2/MB-RA/P; HP-RA/M-1; HP-RA/M-2; M-2/MB-RA; MISS BAY S PLN/M-2; MISS BAY S PL; MISS BAY S PLN; MISS BAY S PLN/M-; MB-RA/MR-MU; MB-O/MB-RA; MB-RA/P; P/MISS BAY S PL; P/MISS BAY S PLN; HP-RA/RM-1; HP-RA; MB-RA; MISS BAY N RED; MISS BAY N RED PLN; MISS BAY N RED PL; MISS BAY S RED; MISS BAY S RED PLN; MISS BAY S RED PL

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model

- This section of the appendix describes in more detail how the model was used to produce estimates of future housing production.
- For the existing zoning (“baseline”), the application of the model is straightforward. Current zoning was encoded using the zoning classification on the previous page, and current allowable height was used as the height variable in the logistic regression, and to calculate building envelope in the units regression.
- For the proposed rezoning (“policy”), the logic used was as follows: based on the units regression, each 1000 square feet of building envelope results in 0.42 units. The State Density Bonus adds an additional 0.44 units. Parcels that elect to use the Local Program therefore need to accommodate at least 0.44 additional units per 1000 square feet of envelope if developers are to choose this option. For parcels where the Local Program was more desirable, and on parcels that are ineligible for the SDB, because their zoning and size prevents them from building more than 5 units, the Local Program was applied. For all other parcels the SDB was used.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the State Density Bonus were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the first new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - Incorporating the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - Incorporating the Zoning_DR_EnvFull if applicable (i.e. the parcel is density-restricted.

Appendix: Logic of Applying the Model (Continued)

- Probabilities and units for any parcel using the Local Program were calculated by:
  - In the logistic regression, setting zp_FBDMulti_RTO = 1, to account for the relaxation of density controls in the Local Program;
  - In the logistic regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table for Height_Ft and in the Env_1000_Area_Height calculation.
  - In the units regression, using the second new height in the rezoning table to calculate Env_1000_Area_Height;
  - In the units regression, removing the SDB_2016_5Plus_EnvFull effect;
  - In the units regression, removing the Zoning_DR_EnvFull effect.

Appendix: Business Disruption / Relocation Costs

- The analysis makes the following assumptions about business disruption and relocation costs:
  - Lost space will be 10% vacant, so 90% of the loss represents the loss of occupied space.
  - Lost business net income (for 6 months of disruption): $5/occupied square foot.
  - Fixed labor costs (for 6 months): $10/occupied square foot.
  - Moving costs and build-out of space at new premises: $175/occupied square foot

Staff Contact

Ted Egan, Ph.D., Chief Economist ted.egan@sfgov.org

From:	Jane Natoli
To:	paul.mcdougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc:	gustavo.velasquez@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; Zisser, David@HCD; megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov; shannan.west@hcd.ca.gov; Frank, Lisa@HCD; Herrera, Fidel@HCD; matthew.struhar@doj.ca.gov; david.pai@doj.ca.gov; alex.fisch@doj.ca.gov; Annie Fryman; Tanner, Rachael (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC); Sonja Trauss; matt@caforhomes.org; senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Severiano.Christian@sen.ca.gov; Mohtashemi, Raayan; David Broockman; Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Supervisors; Board of Supervisors (BOS); Bonde, Aly (MYR); Dennis Phillips, Sarah (CPC)
Subject:	SF YIMBY"s letter on the City Economist"s report
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:13:34 PM
Attachments:	SF YIMBY FZP Letter October 29 2025.pdf

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

Hello,

We are writing to urgently draw your attention to the just released report from the City Economist that shows San Francisco's rezoning will not meet our state housing requirements. Please see our attached letter, and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

--
Jane Natoli (she/her)
San Francisco Organizing Director
415-335-9950



Check out everything we achieved in 2024!

Paul McDougall, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Mayor Daniel Lurie
San Francisco Board of Supervisors (re: file #250700)
October 29, 2025

We write to urgently draw your attention to **an analysis the City of San Francisco ("SF") released that finds that its own rezoning plan would violate state law.** The Family Zoning Plan ("FZP") is a significant step forward, but the city's analysis found that it will not meet the city's Housing Element's 36,282-unit requirement. **According to the city's own numbers, state law requires the city to conduct additional rezoning beyond the FZP.**

As a reminder, in 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development ("HCD") suggested that, instead of a traditional sites inventory, SF instead pledge to assess the capacity of its rezoning using the method from its underutilized sites analysis (a model called BlueSky, which estimates the likelihood of development). Housing Element Program 7.1.1 thus committed that SF's rezoning "shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model."

SF's August submission to HCD revealed that SF still had not done so (see Appendix). HCD thus instructed SF that "As part of Program 7.1.1 and using analytical models to account for a site's likelihood of development in the planning period, the city should continue to explore additional and multiple methods and make adjustments as appropriate."

Today, SF did so: its City Economist reported that he used an updated version of the BlueSky analytical model—the same method HCD originally suggested SF use—to estimate the number of units the FZP will likely develop. **He reported that, in the best case scenario, the City's analytical model finds that the FZP is only likely to develop 14,646 units by 2045, far less than the 36,282 required by 2031** under 7.1.1. In other words, **using the exact method HCD suggested SF use, the City itself has found that its rezoning plan does not meet Program 7.1.1's requirements, and is around 10 times too small.**

Gov. Code § 65588(e)(4)(C)(iii) states, "If a jurisdiction…fails to complete the required rezoning within the time period required, the jurisdiction's adopted housing element shall be subject to" the housing element decertification process. Thus, **if SF fails to expand its plan, HCD will be legally obliged to begin the decertification process**.

We encourage HCD to offer SF guidance about how to bring its proposed rezoning into compliance, building on HCD's recent guidance to the city to "make adjustments as appropriate" when more analysis was made available. For example, using recent changes in state law (e.g., SB 131, SB 79), additional rezoning or policy changes that supplement the FZP (e.g., reduced fees and exactions) could be passed within months. Given the timeline required for decertification, HCD could reasonably offer SF up to six months before the builders' remedy would apply to fully complete its "required rezoning" through such a supplement.

Confirming that SF must rely on the City Economist's updated BlueSky analytical model to assess the rezoning's capacity, as well as the actions taken to satisfy Program 8.1.5 (the "circuit breaker"), would also be consistent with HCD's recent direction to the city to "us[e] conservative assumptions…that facilitate the highest housing outcomes."

SF's actions risk paving a path for other cities to evade state law. In particular, rather than "demonstrat[ing] that the existing use [on each non-vacant site] does not constitute an impediment to additional residential development" (Gov. Code, § 65583.2(g)), cities will be tempted to follow SF: promise in a Housing Element to provide this evidence later in the form of statistical analysis—but then ignore what this evidence shows when rezoning.

Best regards,

Salim Damerdji
Volunteer Lead, San Francisco YIMBY

Jane Natoli
San Francisco Organizing Director,
YIMBY Action

CC: Gustavo Velasquez, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Megan Kirkeby, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Melinda Coy, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Shannan West, California Department of Housing and Community Development
David Zisser, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Lisa Frank, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Fidel Herrera, California Department of Housing and Community Development
Alex Fisch, California Department of Justice
Matthew Struhar, California Department of Justice
David Pai, California Department of Justice
Annie Fryman, SPUR
Aly Bonde, Office of Mayor Daniel Lurie
Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Rachael Tanner, and Lisa Chen, San Francisco Planning
Sonja Trauss, YIMBY Law
Matt Gelfand, Californians for Homeownership
Senator Scott Wiener

Appendix: Why the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy the Housing Element's requirement to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model"

The San Francisco Planning Department's August 1 submission to HCD contained three analyses of the capacity provided by its rezoning. None of these analyses satisfy Program 7.1.1's commitment to "reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model." The below details why each of the Planning Department's methods do not satisfy this requirement. Indeed, a closer look at the Planning Department's analyses suggests conclusions that are in line with the City Economist's finding that the rezoning is insufficient.

"Soft Sites Method"

Under this method, the vast majority of the rezoning's capacity is from sites without existing residential uses (but that largely have other uses). The Planning Department assumes that 70% of these sites will be developed to their maximum capacity during the planning period. This 70% assumption is not "reasonabl[e]" (and certainly not "conservative" like the city claims):

1. In San Francisco, fewer than 70% of entitled projects are ultimately developed — making it implausible that 70% of all sites without residential use will be developed, even those where no interest has been expressed in development or discontinuing existing uses. As another comparison, the Terner Center found that only 8.6% of LA's very best sites are developed over 5 years (versus SF's 70% assumption across a huge number of sites).
2. These sites largely do have other non-residential uses which make their development especially improbable. For example, the first page of SF's parcel list includes 1201-05 Columbus Avenue, a 3-story Travelodge in Fisherman's Wharf. The city assumes there is a 70% chance that properties like this will be redeveloped during the planning period.
3. The city's related assertion that 2% of sites with existing residential uses will be redeveloped during the planning period is similarly made without evidence.

This approach also allows the city to evade complying with GC 65583.2(g)'s requirement that the city provide substantial evidence that existing uses on "lower income" sites are likely to be discontinued during the planning period. The city has not provided site-specific evidence supporting their assertion that most sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed during the planning period. The lack of site-specific evidence would not be a problem if the city had provided statistical evidence (i.e., had statistically estimated what percent of these sites will have their existing use discontinued during the planning period based on historical data, as action 7.1.1 promises). But the Planning Department simply provides no evidence whatsoever that 70% of sites with existing non-residential uses will be developed, either site-specific or

statistical. This 70% figure is simply fabricated — not from "an analytical model," and it is not at all "reasonable."

"Citywide Capacity Method"

This method calculates what share of the city's remaining zoned capacity was developed annually over the last 18 years (2005-2023). It then assumes the new capacity created by the rezoning will be developed at a similar annual rate.

While reasonable in theory, there are several errors and problems with how the Planning Department is implementing this approach that make it not "reasonabl[e]" in practice:

1. The city has two versions of this approach, each with errors:
    a. The primary version (with "exclusions") divides citywide development by the amount of capacity on only a subset of parcels. This overstates the rate at which capacity historically translates into development because less capacity is considered despite all development being considered. This is like computing the average grades of all students in a class by adding up all students' grades but then dividing this total by half the number of students there are in the class.
    b. The city describes another version of the method that measures capacity on all parcels but uses Planning entitlements to measure development; during this period there were 90K entitlements but only 53K building permits. Using entitlements to measure development overstates the historical development rate, as in San Francisco many entitlements are never developed (in part due to constraints the city places on development).
2. The city's statistic that 53K units were constructed citywide 2005-2023 includes development from development agreements (DAs). By counting historical DA development when computing the rate at which historical zoned capacity is developed, the city therefore assumes that the rezoning will produce new DA development during this planning period. This is unreasonable, as DAs do not result from (re)zoning. Furthermore, the city's housing element already counted expected development from DAs during the planning period in its claims of existing capacity.
3. Parcels where projects have been proposed but have not received permits are excluded from the city's calculation of its historical capacity; this leads the city to underestimate how much historical capacity it had, and therefore overstate the development rate of its capacity.
4. The new rezoned capacity is also less developable than the existing remaining capacity. Specifically, according to the city's Bluesky model (the model it used for its underutilized sites analysis), the new capacity is about 20% less likely to be developed. This is because, for example, rezoned capacity is 3x more likely to be on sites with an existing residential use than existing capacity. It's therefore not entirely reasonable to assume that the city's historical rate of development will manifest for the new capacity.

5. The Planning Department is relying on its UrbanSim tool to measure its remaining zoned capacity (313K). But the city's housing element (Sites Inventory Appendix B2 p. 4) gives a much larger number for this (572K), as do our own calculations. Insofar as the city is now understating how much capacity it has, it is therefore overstating the rate at which that capacity has been developed. We have asked for data that would help us understand this discrepancy, but the city has indicated that its UrbanSim tool is unable to provide the underlying data that supports this 313K calculation.

When addressing the first four errors and issues above, and when using the city's housing element's estimate that the city has 572K units of capacity remaining (see point 5), the historical development rate is 0.4% and the adjusted capacity of the rezoning is therefore 10K units.

"Financial Feasibility Method"

The Planning Department has contracted with UrbanSim to estimate whether development will be economically feasible on rezoned parcels. While this analysis is welcome, there are several problems with this approach:

1. Totaling the amount of economically feasible development does not "account for sites' likelihood of development." Historically, only a fraction of economically feasible units are actually developed, and some research practitioners have advised us that there is nearly an order of magnitude difference between the two.
2. The Planning Department's economic assumptions are not "reasonabl[e]": the Department assumes that construction costs, interest rates, and developer return expectations will drop without providing evidence. It also assumes rents will jump. The Department justifies these optimistic assumptions by asserting that it is only responsible for making housing feasible to develop under better economic conditions than are likely during this planning period — but action 7.1.1 commits to providing enough capacity to make 36K units likely developed during this planning period. Furthermore, the city's poor economic environment for development reflects the city's constraints on development that Housing Element Law is supposed to remediate. I.e., the fact that the city so heavily constrains development makes more rezoning (and changes to its other policies) necessary, and cannot be ignored when considering the appropriate scope of actions to accommodate development.
3. The Department's submission describes a flawed approach for using UrbanSim's output to account for the likelihood of development: asserting that 2% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with existing residential uses and 35% of economically feasible projects will occur on sites with other non-residential uses. These assumptions are not based on any evidence and, for the same reasons we described in the context of the "soft sites" method, are not reasonable.
4. After applying this flawed approach for accounting for the likelihood of development, the Planning Department nevertheless finds that only 19K units will be developed during the planning period. This is short of the 36K required by action 7.1.1. The Planning

Department argues that this is acceptable because the method must only demonstrate sufficient capacity for meeting the city's 16K RHNA shortfall in the Moderate and Above-Moderate income categories. But action 7.1.1 makes no reference to separate by-category targets, it simply states that the rezoning must "accommodate… approximately 36,282 new units." Furthermore, the Department's argument is also belied by the Housing Element Law and the No Net Loss Law, both of which contemplate development of market-rate and mixed-income projects on "lower income" sites (GC 65583.2(c) & (h); GC 65863(c)(2)).

From:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Cc:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 9:17:48 AM
Attachments:	Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf

---

From: Kenneth Kim <ken.ei.kim@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:15 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: Andrews, Michelle (BOS) <michelle.andrews@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment – 875 Lombard St (Technical Map Correction, Files 250700 / 250701)

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

Dear Commission Secretary and Supervisors,

I support the Expanding Housing Choice / Family Zoning proposal and request a technical map correction for 875 Lombard Street (Block 0073, Lot 017B, APN 0073017B).

My parcel is shown as 40//40-R-4, while the immediately adjacent parcel (APN 0073018) and all parcels directly across Lombard Street are 40//50-R-4, all within RM-1. The attached Exhibit A illustrates a single-parcel discontinuity.

Extending the 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height one parcel west to include 875 Lombard would not change the underlying use (it remains RM-1) but would:

• restore consistent streetwall and block-face form,

• support gentle-density objectives in RM-1 under the Local Program framework, and

• add incremental Housing Element capacity without altering neighborhood character.

Thank you for considering this technical correction for inclusion in the final map clean-ups for Files 250700 / 250701.


Sincerely,

Kenneth Kim

Owner – 875 Lombard Street, San Francisco, CA 94133

917-891-1805 | ken.ei.kim@gmail.com

Attachment: Exhibit A – 875 Lombard St Height Correction Map.pdf


San Francisco Planning
Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map)
Legend
Info
Layers
Imagery
PDF
Help
Legend
Rezoning September 2025
Ordinance (Board File 250700 - v3)
Proposed Local Program Height Limits (September 2025)
40'
50'
65'
85'
105'
120'
130'
140'
160'
180'
240'
250'
300'
350'
875 LOMBARD ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNI…
Search result
Proposed Height District (September 2025)
Zoom to
Parcel 0073017B
Block 0073
Lot 017B
Proposed Local Program Height 40//40-R-4
Proposed Base Height 40
Existing Height District 40-X
Supervisor District 3
Existing Zoning District RM-1
Proposed Zoning District No change
All opposite parcels: 40//50-R-4 Local Program Height
0073017B – 40//40-R-4
875 Lombard
0073018 -40//50-R-4
869 Lombard
875 Lombard St (0073017B) – Single-parcel discontinuity in proposed Local Program Height (40//40-R-4 vs. 40//50-R-4 adjacent)
Source: San Francisco Planning Department – Expanding Housing Choice (Proposed Zoning Map, Sept 2025).
Esri Community Maps Contributors, California State Parks, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, TomTom, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, Bureau of Land Management, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA, USFWS
Powered by Esri

From: Tamila Wong
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:02:32 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Tamila Wong
tamilawong@yahoo.com
106 Byxbee St
San Francisco , California 94132

From: shelbyville500@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shelby Campbell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 1:32:37 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan resident, I oppose parts of Mayor Lurie's plan. Residents deserve the opportunity to have more input in the process.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees. Together, these plans prioritize the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent.

I provided my comments to the Planning Department's proposed upzoning of the Sunset. I was very much in support of the upzoning of transportation corridors that run perpendicular to the ocean, with two exceptions:
1. Consider not upzoning past Sunset Blvd or maybe as far as 44th Avenue on these corridors, to preserve the coastal environment of the outer Sunset.
2. Strongly oppose high rises at the beach. If you grant an exception for the investor on Sloat, you will set a precedent for a row of high rises at the beach, destroying the open space and coastal environment that defines the Outer Sunset.

We hope you will take the neighborhood's comments into consideration in making decisions about our community.

Sincerely,
Shelby Campbell
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: Vivienne Hay
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 12:56:06 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Vivienne Hay
vivienne.l.hay@gmail.com
1495 Golden Gate Avenue, Apt 207
San Francisco, California 94115

From: eugenemccarthy63@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eugene McCarthy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Saturday, October 25, 2025 8:44:26 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Eugene McCarthy

From: Sophia Hagy
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:32:17 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

To whom it may concern,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more

than ever!

Sincerely,
Sophia Hagy
San Francisco community member and Paraeducator for SFUSD

Sophia Hagy
sophiahagy@gmail.com
1302 York Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: ROMALYN SCHMALTZ
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Thursday, October 23, 2025 3:05:32 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Romalyn Schmaltz

ROMALYN SCHMALTZ
romalynschmaltz@gmail.com
740 Union St
San Francisco, California 94133-2747

From: Kate Blumberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:10:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I live in a rent-controlled apartment in D10. Over the 24 years we have lived here, we have seen the incredible benefits that more housing can bring to support a thriving local business community and a more walkable and vibrant neighborhood. But only do the small business districts sprinkled throughout our neighborhoods need more homes to thrive, the citizens of San Francisco need more homes to provide the flexibility and affordability that can help us stay in this great city even if our circumstances change.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes in every corner of our city — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

I know there are several amendments proposed, some of which make sense and others which would weaken the plan. I especially support providing funds and resources to small businesses to help them weather change and incentives for larger family units to be built. While in theory I like the idea of any incentive to get builders building, I don't think a strict time clock would help in these turbulent times.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Kate Blumberg
kate@acmetron.com
2002 22nd. St
San Francisco, California 94107-3204

From: Ted.Hexter@proton.me
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 2:03:34 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ted.Hexter@proton.me
1670 Market Street Apt 68
San Francisco, California 94102

From: elizbreilly@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Reilly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 1:40:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Reilly
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Cheryl Meeker
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:58:52 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not be manipulated into destroying rent controlled units and small businesses with this zoning change.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the

private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Cheryl Meeker
cherylmeeker@gmail.com
1296 Haight St Apt 28
San Francisco, California 94117

From: rout.rishav@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 11:19:39 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Rishav Rout

rout.rishav@gmail.com
1075 Valencia St, Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94110

From: sayuri.anya@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:00:25 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

sayuri.anya@gmail.com
38 Tacoma St
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94118

From: alvatenebrae@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:53:16 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning plan will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis. It will accelerate displacement, enrich developers, and prioritize luxury units over homes for working people. Without significant amendments, this plan will make the housing crisis worse, not better.

There is a way forward that meets State density requirements while protecting renters, preserving small businesses, and delivering truly affordable housing. Any upzoning plan must include these transformative policies. Establish an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to guarantee a minimum of 50% genuinely affordable homes on large opportunity parcels. Protect all 100,000 rent-controlled homes – representing 200,000 people – from this plan. Our elected officials have already prioritized preserving people's homes.

Require more, not fewer, affordable units. Reject any scheme to swap BMR homes for market-rate units. Raise the BMR inclusionary requirement to 20% on-site so that new construction actually benefits working San Franciscans. Build for families. Require 50% of units to be 2-3 bedrooms with communal living spaces. Protect small businesses. Prohibit demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses. Require developers to cover relocation costs starting at $150k and provide turn-key "warm shell" improvements for displaced tenants.

Ensure workers who build our city receive a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements across all projects. Protect public space and our coast. Prevent the privatization or development of protected waterfront land. Go beyond the Mayor's plan. Push a real affordable housing financing strategy. Leverage state and federal support instead of relying on private developers or Downtown donors.

San Francisco's housing crisis is a product of systemic inequality. It is time for bold, people-first policies that confront developers' greed, protect working people, and ensure housing is a right, not a commodity. We need leadership that will fight for the city's residents, not developers' profits.

alvatenebrae@gmail.com
1177 Market St Apt 1432
San Francisco, California 94103

From: slpretti@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Pretti
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:12:17 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

I've lived in the Richmond district for over 30 years. These changes would be devasting to renters like me, to seniors, and to families living and working in SF. This proposed plan is NOT a viable way to create affordable housing. It is reckless and harmful and will leave many people without housing. Also, I think it's reprehensible to put small businesses at risk. Neighborhood communities and small businesses are what define SF, NOT luxury high rises designed for the wealthy.

PLEASE work to scale back this very dangerous upzoning plan.

Sincerely,
Sharon Pretti
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Charlie Musoff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:11:21 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Charlie Musoff
charliemusoff@gmail.com
507 Bartlett St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: mary@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of MARY THOMAS
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:47:05 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS WE WILL NEVER HAVE ENOUGH AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNLESS YOU RAISE THE FEE DEVELOPERS HAVE TO PAY IF THEY OMIT THE 15% AFFORDABLE HOUSING... THE CURRENT FEES ARE NOT HIGH ENOUGH AND JUST BURRIED IN THE SALE PRICE OF UNITS AND GIVES SAN FRANCISCANS WHO NEEED LOW INCOME HOUSING NO HOPE... JUST MORE RISING COSTS OF HOUSING - DO THE MATH

Sincerely,
MARY THOMAS
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: Olivia Page
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:22:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Olivia Page

Olivia Page
oliviaindigopage@gmail.com
780 Shotwell St
San Francisco , California 94110

From: jeanettercool@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeanette Cool
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:21:16 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jeanette Cool
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: Nick DeRenzi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); BOS-Legislative Aides
Subject: All Eyes on the Mayor's RV Ban - No Tows Before Housing!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:33:04 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,

I'm a San Francisco resident writing to strongly protest the implementation of Mayor Lurie's 2-hour restriction on oversize vehicle parking. RV residents, advocates, and media are all reporting exactly what we all feared: a rushed, inadequate rollout that clears the way for the Mayor to pursue his true goal of reducing visible poverty no matter the human cost.

Many longtime San Francisco RV residents were not included in the May 31st, 2025 count of vehicles that the City used to create the refuge permit eligibility list. Appeals are cumbersome and require large amounts of documentation and a five-day wait for a response - all done against an only month-long timeline before tows take place. The City has also arbitrarily tightened appeal requirements - going from requiring proof of residence at any time before May 31st, to an arbitrary window between March and May 2025.

Some permits are being issued, but outreach has been utterly inadequate, with RV residents just two blocks away from HOT team events unaware they're occurring. Into these gaps, a patchwork of groups, including RV residents, the Coalition on Homelessness and DSA SF members, are stepping up to try to ensure eligible residents get permits. We can't - and shouldn't - have to do this work against a manufactured deadline of November 1st.

To prevent irreparable harm to our neighbors living in RVs, this is what we're demanding:

1. Provide transparent reporting on the program before tows take place, including permits issued, appeal statistics, number of RV residents who attended outreach events, and number and type of housing offers made to RV residents.
2. Have outreach workers go door to door to issue permits to all RV residents currently on the permit eligibility list. RV residents already on the permit eligibility list should be automatically given permits. Until all permits have been issued, have SFMTA workers validate if an oversize vehicle is permit-eligible using license plate numbers before ticketing / towing.
3. Delay implementation of the November 1st towing deadline. If tows occur, ensure multiple warnings are given before towing vehicles. until permits can be issued.
4. Restore the original time window for appeals eligibility - documents showing an RV resident was present before May 31st, 2025 should be honored by the City. Expand the acceptable documents list to include Additional acceptable documents Acceptable documents must include enrollment at SFUSD or childcare, letters from employers, enrollment in benefits or Coordinated Entry, letters from medical or social service providers that residents you are receiving services in SF, or pictures/videos of vehicle with geolocation and time stamps (e.g. Google Maps streetview).

5. Issue short-term permits for RV residents currently appealing their permit status or with appeal hearings scheduled once the 2-hour parking limit goes into effect.
6. Provide direct, real-time support in troubleshooting appeals (not just a web portal), including establishing a permanent physical location, run by HSH or another department, for RV residents to ask questions.
7. For appeals, SFMTA must also cross reference anyone's ineligibility with already existing parking and tow records. Rather than putting the onus on RV residents to find a ticket record, the SFMTA should provide the record when someone is appealing.
8. Ensure housing offers that are given to permit recipients are provided in writing, and that residents have a transparent, well-documented system for refusing offers that don't work for them without losing their refuge permits.
9. Have family providers do mobile Coordinated Entry registration at city information sessions for RV residents.
10. For residents that accept an offer of temporary shelter, continue to provide a refuge permit or alternative parking for their vehicle until a permanent housing offer is made.

Our City owes RV residents more than a month of chaotic bureaucracy, inaccurate AI, and half-hearted outreach before towing their homes. Thank you for your attention and action.

Sincerely,

Nick D

Nick DeRenzi
nickderenziphoto@gmail.com
2808 Golden Gate Ave
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Cecily Gardner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:00:28 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cecily Gardner
gardner.cecily@gmail.com
3627 21st St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: ramon lazo
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:41:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
R Lazo

ramon lazo
9guj0037j@hotmail.com
193 gladstone drive
san francisco, ca

From: Thomas Plagemann
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:31:16 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely, Thomas Plagemann

Thomas Plagemann
thosplag@sbcglobal.net
762 Capp St
San Francisco , California 94110

From:	dj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Josephs
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Request for a Committee of the Whole Hearing [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:48:42 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to hold a Committee of the Whole hearing on Mayor Lurie's "Family Zoning Plan".

This proposal represents the most significant, consequential and irreversible land use changes in San Francisco's history. It should not move forward without every member of the Board hearing directly from the public, and the public hearing directly from all 11 Supervisors.

Limiting public comment to the 3-member Land Use Committee is not acceptable. The full Board must be accountable for this decision.

Please call a Committee of the Whole hearing before any final vote!

Additional comments:

Sincerely,
Diane Josephs
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: Julia Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:18:53 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Julia Diaz
jmdiaz2016@g.ucla.edu
3841 24th st
San Francisco , California 94114

From: David Alexander
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:33:00 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I am a parent of two SFUSD students. We badly need housing for families on the Westside and beyond. The current housing availability is untenable and needs to change.

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

thank you,

Dave Alexander

David Alexander
alexanderdavid415@gmail.com
2806 Anza St
San Francisco, California 94121

From: msmarlomunoz@yahoo.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:31:31 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Marlo Dowell

msmarlomunoz@yahoo.com

San Francisco, California 94114

From: nieberding3@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:27:35 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

nieberding3@gmail.com
18 10th St Apt 640
San Francisco, California 94103

From: Edward Sullivan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:14:23 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Edward Sullivan
efsullyjr@aol.com
2448 Great Hwy Apt 14
San Francisco, California 94116

From: Jim Chappell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:38:29 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jim Chappell
jimchappellsf@gmail.com
708 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Francesca P
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:57:28 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Francesca P
ballets.lank_0z@icloud.com
Po Box 460703
San Francisco, California 94146

From: Ben Wessel
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: I support the family zoning plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:28:11 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Hi Board of Supervisors --

My name is Ben Wessel, I live in the Inner Sunset, and I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. This year, my wife and I were fortunate enough to move out of our small rent-controlled apartment into a condo on Judah Street, an opportunity that made it easier for us to decide to have a child -- and our daughter Mika was born just two weeks ago! Unfortunately, for many of our friends who we've met in the neighborhood over the last ten years, the cost to move into a bigger place or even buy a place was too high for them to stay in the city. We've lost four different families from our friend crew who have all moved to Oakland to find more affordable places to live or more space. Each of these families told us they would have stayed in SF if they could have found a place like our condo.

I guess I write all this because I just wish San Francisco was a place that my friends could see themselves for years to come, the way that I do. I don't know if this plan will get that done, but it seems better than doing nothing. Let me know if you have better ideas.

Thanks,
Ben

PS: Here's the boilerplate language from the Housing Action Coalition that I think you've probably all read already: "San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future."

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration."

Ben Wessel
benkwessel@gmail.com

937 Judah Street
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Eric Baird
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:26:44 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Eric Baird
erichansb@gmail.com
141 Scott Street
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Meg Kammerud
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support Family Zoning Plan - SF Needs More Homes of All Sorts in Every Neighborhood
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:18:18 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. I am a long-time District 8 home owner and support bringing more housing to my neighborhood -- and every neighborhood across our city. We must not let individuals or individual neighborhoods dismantle a plan that will make all of San Francisco better and more livable, somewhere my children may be able to not only grow up but stay.

I support Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance.

I strongly oppose any proposal to exclude residential sites from rezoning or impose any restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state housing obligations.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and the original plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Sincerely,
Meg Kammerud
Glen Park

Meg Kammerud
meg.kammerud@gmail.com
810 Congo St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Ted Neranchi
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:01:05 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Ted Neranchi
tneranchi@gmail.com
296 Guttenberg St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Tim Colen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:18:40 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tim Colen
timcolen@gmail.com
1501 Greenwich St, Unit 502
San Francisco, California 94123

From: Alan Billingsley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:54:35 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Alan Billingsley
alanbillingsley215@gmail.com
215 Eureka St
San Francisco , California 94114

From: leobilly69@gmail.com
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:07:54 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

William T. Heaton

leobilly69@gmail.com
168 Hyde Street Apt 206
San Francisco, California 94102-3656

From: Megan Bute
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:12:22 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Megan Bute
wikis-scows.4t@icloud.com
273 29th St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: John Oda
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:43:19 AM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

John Oda
jandjoda@aol.com
2000 post
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Jason Fischel
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Redevelopment Plan is too timid
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:21:37 AM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Hello,

The proposed redevelopment plan will not increase housing enough in SF. Look at Austin, we can bring down rents, but we need to greatly decrease the burden of regulations and make SF a city for all.

Cheers,
Jason

Jason Fischel
fischelj@udel.edu
227 Clinton park
San Francisco, ca, California 94103

From: Steven Susaña-Castillo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:29:49 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Although I think the plan doesn't go far enough, I think this gets in the right direction of undoing wrongs. Historically, San Francisco's zoning (and downzoning in the mid 20th century) was used as a tool to keep neighborhoods exclusive and keep out low income folks, immigrants, and/or racial minorities. (Many wealthier neighborhoods like Forest Hill and Pac Heights have used their City Hall connections to keep out minorities like the Japanese in the 40s from their neighborhoods by ensuring that mixed used zoning was banned and that the newly arriving immigrants could not set up their businesses there). Its scars are still evident today.

The Environmental Impact Report and a Chronicle article back in 1978 rightfully pointed out what would happen if we doubled down on restrictive zoning. Both warned that such restrictive zoning would cause San Francisco to become an exclusive playground for the rich, would deny the ability of low income people to live (and stay) here, would skyrocket home prices, and would inevitably lead to a housing shortage. We are now living the consequences.

Personally, we cannot call ourselves a progressive and/or liberal city when we are actively defending keeping intact zoning that is a derived from redlining. When you revisit Chronicle articles, newspaper cartoons, speeches/public comments from past supervisors, etc, you begin to pick up that these zoning rules were initiated from a standpoint of xenophobia and racism. By attempting to undo these policies, we are declaring that we want a San Francisco that is for everyone and that we are not just giving lipservice to these ideals we say we have.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and

collaboration.

Steven Susaña-Castillo
coolsteven2@gmail.com
1075 Valencia St, Apt 4
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Jen Rosas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:36:02 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my very strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. Especially as a resident of the Outter Richmond, we need more density, and more housing options.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Jen Rosas
jenmrosas@yahoo.com
825 La Playa St #228
San Francisco, California 94121

From: Rachel Sheinbein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:09:14 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Rachel

Rachel Sheinbein
rachel.sheinbein@gmail.com
2621 harrison st
San Francisco , California 94110

From: Laurie Dewan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:57:53 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan. My grandparents came to San Francisco in the 1930s and raised four children on a working-class income. While I am proud to be raising my children here too, I see so many families who simply can't make it work - and I wonder how long my husband and I can continue to manage the high cost of housing.

To me, the Family Zoning plan means taking this city I love into a bright, diverse future where families and working people can thrive.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Laurie Dewan
laurie.dewan@gmail.com
3362 Sacramento Street
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Lada Shchekleina
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:20:30 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Lada Shchekleina
ladannn@gmail.com
555 MISSION ROCK STR, APT # 630
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94158

From: Tyler Pullen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:16:47 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan, preferably without the amendment casually excluding the literal majority of rental buildings (that are rent-controlled) from the plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes, and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love and the work they need.

Part of me wants the state to take over a preempt our land use rules -- which, to be clear, are the very stakes we are playing with -- because of the seeming inability of our local government to competently and earnestly allow enough housing to meet demand. But I'd love to avoid tempting that outcome by enthusiastically supporting the functional upzoning reflected in the original plan (and even more than that, ideally). Market rate housing will not single-handedly solve our affordability crisis, but we have all the evidence in the world that restricting housing of all types only makes the entire situation worse, especially so for the low income households we purport to care so much about.

This barely meets the state-mandated Housing Element goals which represents the bare minimum of meeting our city's long-underserved housing obligations, and amendments like the exclusion of rent-controlled buildings nakedly undermine the spirit of the plan in a way that is performatively progressive but functionally regressive. Our city's low income households (of which I am a part) live daily the consequences of our housing crisis most severely, and plans that continue to resist the improvement and expansion of our housing stock worsen our outcomes in both relative and absolute terms.

I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan without the rent-controlled unit exemption, and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Tyler Pullen

tpullen28@gmail.com
3477 1/2 17th St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Beth O"Leary
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:11:10 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Beth O'Leary
beth@oleary.con
445 Baden St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: Carlos Abela
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan need to be
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 8:34:26 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Do not change zoning in the Sunset District Leave zoning changes up to the people who live in that zone. Some, like the downtown area, would welcome it. Others, like in the Sunset District, do not want it. You can build plenty of housing by converting offices and building high rises where they already exist.
Sincerely,
Carlos Abela

Carlos Abela
abela@mac.com
1266 40th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122

From: Charissa Schaefer
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:53:46 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I know how gentrification starts and this upzoning plan is not in service of the people who live here. Please choose us over the corporations who would like to change the face of these neighborhoods. This city is already hugely expensive to live in. Don't make it worse.

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds,

beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,
Charissa Schaefer

Charissa Schaefer
cbs.music.news@gmail.com
1420 Turk St, Apt 1101
San Francisco, California 94115

From: Marty Cerles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:41:23 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Marty Cerles
martycerles@gmail.com
2940 Turk Blvd
San Francisco, California 94118

From: George Ference
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:32:35 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

George Ference
michael.ference@gmail.com
1386 31st Ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: David Downs
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:28:44 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

D11 voter in support of the Family Zoning Plan.

Build, baby, build.

David Downs
daviddownspresents@pm.me
251 Farallones St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: Cora M. Shaw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:24:33 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Cora M. Shaw
daft-sniper-0e@icloud.com
451 Guerrero St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Mark Macy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:24:04 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Amendments I Support:

Supervisor Melgar's small-business fund, and Supervisors Sherrill and Sauter's amendment to encourage larger family units (2-3 bedrooms). These strengthen the plan without risking state compliance, and the Mayor has signaled support.

Amendments I Oppose:

Proposals to exclude nearly all residential sites from rezoning or impose restrictions that would undercut housing capacity and jeopardize our state housing obligations.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Mark Macy
markm@macyarchitecture.com
241 10th Avenue #1
San Francisco, California 94118

From: Elliot Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: San Francisco Needs More Housing Options: Support Family Zoning Plan
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:21:36 PM

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

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo,

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Family Zoning Plan.

San Francisco urgently needs more homes — and this plan moves us in the right direction. It will expand housing choices across the city, especially in high-opportunity areas near transit, jobs, and schools. It gives families the flexibility to build backyard units, in-law apartments, and small buildings that allow them to stay close to the people they love.

This is a thoughtful, community-informed proposal that aligns with our Housing Element goals while addressing the real, everyday needs of San Franciscans. I urge you to support the Family Zoning Plan and to continue working toward a housing system that is fair, inclusive, and responsive to the city's future.

Let's build a San Francisco where everyone can belong. Thank you for your partnership and collaboration.

Elliot Schwartz
elliot.schwartz@gmail.com
2828 Bryant Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: Heather Davies
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Real Affordability Housing in D4
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 6:56:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Heather Davies

Heather Davies
daviesva@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94116

From: Sharon Bradbury
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 6:32:11 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Sharon Bradbury
sharcrow@yahoo.com
839 Haight St, Apt 8
San Francisco, California 94117

From: Lynetta Oliver
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: Lurie's Redevelopment Plan Must Be Significantly Amended - We Deserve Real Affordability!
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 1:00:05 PM

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

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Mayor's blanket upzoning proposal will not solve San Francisco's affordability crisis – it will make it worse without significant amendments, by displacing renters and small businesses, and prioritizing luxury development over the housing our communities need.

There is a better way forward that meets State capacity mandates without displacement, while ensuring housing built is affordable to San Franciscans. As a voting constituent, I urge you to include these policies in any upzoning plan:
Create an Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) to require a minimum of 50% truly affordable development on large opportunity parcels.
Carve out ALL 100,000 rent-controlled homes (representing 200k renters) from the Mayor's Plan. Our local electeds voted to adopt a Housing Element that prioritized the preservation of people's homes – this should not be up for negotiation. We can build the housing we need on opportunity sites that do not include rent-controlled homes.
We should be requiring MORE affordable homes – not replacing them with market-rate units. Please vote down any proposals to swap BMR homes for rent-controlled market rate units. And increase the BMR inclusionary requirements to 20% on-site, so that the private housing that does end up getting built is at least affordable to 20% of working San Franciscans.
Require family-sized housing for a growing San Francisco and require developers to make 50% of the units 2-3 bedrooms plus communal living space.
Truly support mom & pop small businesses in the impacted neighborhood commercial corridors by prohibiting the demolition of SF-certified Legacy Businesses, requiring developers provide relocation costs starting at $150k and turn-key "warm shell" tenant improvements for displaced small businesses.
Workers who build our housing deserve a living wage. Include local prevailing wage requirements in Mayor's Plan.
Protect public access to our waterfront and environmental protections for our coast. Do not side with Trump policies to privatize and develop our protected coastal waterfront and carve out the parcels that should be protected for the public.
Finally, beyond this legislation — please get serious about an affordable housing financing strategy. The lack of political will to move forward voters' number one priority is disheartening – the City can and must be stronger advocates for San Franciscans to the State and the Feds, beyond private fundraising for Downtown. Our neighborhoods cannot afford to wait for the private market to do the job of local government. We need your creative leadership now more than ever!

Sincerely,

Lynetta Oliver
lynettaoliver@gmail.com
527 Balboa
San Francisco , California 94118

From: lunbeck@sbcglobal.net
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChenStaff
Cc: CPC.SF.Housing.Choice
Subject: Public Comment: Family Zoning Plan -- follow-up to 10/20 meeting of LUT Committee
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 12:40:26 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please accept the following comment on the ongoing Family Zoning Plan (upzoning initiative) under consideration:

I live in Lakeside and have lived in San Francisco for over 35 years. I am deeply concerned about the density decontrol provision in the Family Zoning Plan.
Blanket density decontrol will irretrievably devastate West Side neighborhoods.
It's often remarked that SF is a city of neighborhoods. Many are low-density residential. Uncontrolled high-density development permitted virtually anywhere in low-density residential blocks will destroy local neighborhoods by tearing at the hard-won fabric of local community woven over the years.
It appears blanket density decontrol was introduced to reduce the plan's maximum building heights. Proponents disingenuously claim that preserving existing 40' limits on the West Side should allay concerns that neighborhoods will be dramatically transformed. This is misleading. Very few dwellings in the West Side now reach maximum heights, with the vast majority well under 30'. Newly permitted multifamily dwellings will certainly push toward the 40' maximum, towering over the other dwellings in their blocks, permanently destroying such blocks' longstanding character and architectural integrity.
Worse, density decontrol would enshrine – in perpetuity – this devastating threat to neighborhood integrity by allowing such out-of-place development anywhere and at any time. It's a permanent Sword of Damocles threatening virtually every West Side block, with no recourse once this predictable disaster begins to unfold.
Density decontrol will create a crazy quilt of inappropriate, out-of-place new development opportunistically scattered across the entire West Side. No block will be safe from ruination. Even one isolated large new multifamily dwelling will damage the surrounding neighborhood's character. Instead of unnecessarily putting every dwelling on every block in the West Side at risk, dense development should be concentrated in defined zones, as embodied in earlier iterations of upzoning maps.
Further, density decontrol could change every parcel's highest and best use to multifamily development. Single-family homes will turn into de facto teardowns, discouraging maintenance and improvements. This itself is a formula for widespread neighborhood deterioration – even if no new development has occurred in the vicinity.
The Planning Department contends that density decontrol is the only way to achieve State mandates. This claim appears dubious, as earlier versions of the proposed zoning map

achieved State mandates without incorporating blanket density decontrol.
Please remove the pernicious blanket density decontrol provision from the City's upzoning plan.

Thank you for your consideration.
Yours sincerely,
Robert Lunbeck
150 Junipero Serra Boulevard
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: sfdavidbancroft@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Bancroft
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:53:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a 54 year D2 resident.

Don't Do It!

The Mayor's upzoning plan for Lombard St. will create a canyon entrance to SF, cleave Cow Hollow from the Marina and Chestnut St., and make those neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors. Where's the affordable housing?

No competent city planner would ever choose this as part of a viable solution for SF's housing needs!

Don't Do It.

David Bancroft
San Francisco, CA 94109

Sincerely,
David Bancroft
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: jeannelu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeannette Luini
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:41:56 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Jeannette Luini
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: georgesery@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of George Sery
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:38:18 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
George Sery

From:	scarampi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebastiano Scarampi
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:34:01 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):You will destroy one of the world's most beautiful cities if you allow this zoning to pass. I WILL NEVER VOTE FOR, AND ACTIVELY CAMPAIGN AGAINST, ANY SF ELECTED OFFICIAL WHO SUPPORTS THIS MONSTROSITY. The San Francisco northern waterfront should be a UNESCO World Heritage site instead of a new Miami Beach or Manhattan. It is one of the most beautiful places in the world, thanks to its unique geography and views and the respect with which it has been developed up to now. Its beauty is dependent on the harmony of the city with its surroundings, and the human scale at which it is built. It is fully built up. There is no more room unless you want to destroy a beautiful community that has evolved in harmony with its environment. The neighborhood does not want more development. POLL US IF YOU HAVE ANY DOUBT. Notre Dame in Paris was exactly rebuilt as it was after the fire, because the French knew its importance. Where are the similar leaders here? Who will rebuild San Francisco after the aesthetically clueless, money-grabbing developers who can't tell a properly functioning neighborhood from a hole in ground are done defacing our magnificent neighborhood, a magical place that attracts visitors from all over the world?

Sincerely,
Sebastiano Scarampi
San Francisco, CA 94115

From: jandckehoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Kehoe
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:17:46 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a lifelong San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

While I know we need housing that working people can afford, this is not the answer. PLEASE OPPOSE THIS!

Sincerely,
Christine Kehoe
San Francisco, CA 94116

From:	evajfortune@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Altobelli
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:04:29 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional): Affordable housing is necessary, luxury towers will not provide an answer. This looks hasty & a land grab which irreconcilablely destroy not only the scale of our city but the citizens that live work & have small businesses will be permanently displaced. . San Francisco is not a play ground for the rich , it's a city made up of people from all economic levels, that's what we should value & protect . There's always a way . Let's not hear our elected politicians say our hands are tied & we won't give our citizens a chance to disagree, comment or discuss. Don't shut the people & our city out . Don't turn San Francisco into a billionaire city , for the rich , for corporate businesses. No one wants that .

Sincerely,
Jay Altobelli
San Francisco, CA 94121

From:	jayelliott415@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jay Elliott
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:27:48 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

WE are the stewards of our beautiful city, not Sacramento. They are the ugly step sister hellbent on ruining Cinderella. San Francisco has made mistakes before (Fillmore), let's not do it again! Many brave San Franciscans have fought against development that would harm, and because of their sacrifices and subsequent wins, we have Mt. Davidson (my neighborhood) as open space and many other treasures (Tea and Cookies ladies saved the Bay when the Sierra Club couldn't be bothered!). We can do better than Sacramento and as a Charter city, we have the right to. Strategic growth is smart, mandates are not!

That';s why, as a native San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors (and haven't we seen how the billionaire class is ruining our country!) while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
Jay Elliott
San Francisco, CA 94127

From: vandana1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vandana Di Scala
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:21:31 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

The building at 2550 Irving is across the street from our apartment. This building is far too big for existing transit services and there is little to no parking. I strongly suggest repurposing existing commercial vacant buildings in/around downtown that are along multiple transit lines into affordable housing vs adding high density housing throughout SF before ensuring adequate transit lines and parking.

Sincerely,
Vandana Di Scala
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: randymazzei@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Randall Mazzei
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:11:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Randall Mazzei
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: john.nulty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 8:42:34 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor’s upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie’s upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco’s land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

Sincerely,
John Nulty
San Francisco, CA 94142

From: terence.y.chu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terence Chu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:07:43 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Terence Chu
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: jg1964chi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joan Albertson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Protect Our Neighborhoods — Reject Extreme Upzoning [Files: 250700, 250701, 250966]
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:50:32 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Franciscan, I strongly oppose Mayor Lurie's plan, which incentivizes the demolition of existing homes, displacement of renters and small businesses, and transformation of our neighborhoods into unaffordable luxury high-rise corridors.

We call on you to:

- Drastically scale back the Mayor's upzoning maps
- Request a postponement of the arbitrary January 2026 upzoning deadline

Mayor Lurie's upzoning maps would impose permanent, irreversible changes to San Francisco's land use — going far beyond what is required, with zero affordability guarantees.

Together, these plans clear the way for mass demolition and luxury towers, prioritizing the interests of developers and billionaire investors while silencing the voices of the very communities they are supposed to represent. This is not planning — it is displacement disguised as progress.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (optional):

Sincerely,
Joan Albertson
San Francisco, CA 94109

Item 17

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: JFK Drive
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 11:51:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Kim Wong regarding John F. Kennedy Drive.

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: Kim Wong <Kim.Wong.497238737@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2025 9:56 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: JFK Drive

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The 24/7 closure of JFK drive has left many people unable to access Golden Gate Park and its institutions. The current closure is for those who live close enough, have the money to pay for parking, or are able bodied enough to travel on foot or bicycle.

We need to go back to the compromise that was struck and reopen JFK as it was before the pandemic!

Sincerely,
Kim Wong

Item 18

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	3 Letters regarding Sunset Dunes
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 1:14:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding Sunset Dunes.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding Sunset Dunes.

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:	Kate Phillips
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	I love Sunset Dunes
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:00:10 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:
- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:
- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Mary Fryer
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	I love Sunset Dunes
Date:	Monday, October 27, 2025 7:15:51 AM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

Sunset Dunes has been an incredible success, drawing tens of thousands to enjoy our coast each week. The park has been a boon for Outer Sunset businesses, is an important first step towards rehabilitating our coastal ecosystem, and has connected San Franciscans to the coast more than previously imagined - kids learning to ride bikes, wheelchair users finally able to roll by the sea, elders at free Tai Chi and chair yoga classes, and people of all ages soaking up our City's incredible coastline more than ever before.

As one of the 206,000 San Francisco voters who supported Prop K, I urge you to:
- Be forward-looking and appoint a District 4 Supervisor who will support the future of one of the city's most popular parks
- Champion the future of Sunset Dunes to make it more accessible, welcoming, and enjoyable while increasing revenues for local businesses

Why? Because:
- San Franciscans have already made clear that they want a coastal park. Voters overwhelmingly rejected Prop I in 2022, which would have dedicated the coast to cars. In 2024, voters chose a full-time oceanfront park with a ten point margin of victory. Since the park opened, it has become one of SF's most visited parks, and visitor numbers have only continued to grow.

- Before approving Prop K, voters experienced the promise — and shortcomings — of a weekend road closure. The weekend road closure was incompatible with any park improvements, let alone use of the park on weekdays. A weekend-only road closure would mean removing all park improvements, including seating, picnic tables, fitness equipment, art, and the skate park the neighborhood has quickly come to love. A part-time road closure also precludes any possibility of the necessary dune restoration and sea-level rise protection work. Now that Sunset Dunes has opened, twice as many people come each day as visited during the weekend pilot. San Franciscans did not vote for a closed road; we embraced the vision of a coastal park. Now, voters are counting on their elected leaders to implement that vision, not rehash the issue yet again when it was already debated for five years.

- The southern portion of Great Highway has been slated for permanent closure since the Board of Supervisors adopted the Ocean Beach Master Plan in 2012. The southbound lanes are already closed, with the northbound lanes set for closure imminently as part of the SFPUC's work. Sunset Dunes has lost its primary utility as a road, as traffic patterns needed to shift inland regardless. While change is always challenging, traffic data demonstrates that this shift has been successful and the traffic impacts have been minimal.

San Franciscans voted resoundingly to make Sunset Dunes a full-time oceanfront park, and even more have come to love the park now that it's been opened and had amenities added.

Mayor Lurie, I urge you to appoint a supervisor who is supportive of Sunset Dunes, someone who will bring the community together to solve neighborhood challenges while designing the Outer Sunset's newest park together. Supervisors, I urge you to champion the park to deliver the will of the 206,000 voters: a coastal park that will welcome San Franciscans and our visitors to enjoy our coastline for generations to come.

Thank you for your leadership.

From:	Mieko Yeh
To:	Lurie, Daniel (MYR); Chan, Connie (BOS); Chen, Chyanne (BOS); Dorsey, Matt (BOS); Engardio, Joel (BOS); Fielder, Jackie (BOS); Sauter, Danny (BOS); Sherrill, Stephen (BOS); Mahmood, Bilal (BOS); Melgar, Myrna (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)
Cc:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	So much gratitude for Sunset Dunes :)
Date:	Sunday, October 26, 2025 6:01:58 PM

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

Dear Mayor Lurie and Board of Supervisors,

I live in the Inner Parkside and have individually messaged Supervisor Melgar about this as well, but I just wanted to say thank you for Sunset Dunes.

Prior to it becoming a park, I have gone there daily for the past several years for morning beach walks and runs. It's my happy place, and it was my dog's happy place too when she was still alive. Thanks to Ocean Beach, I have discovered the antics of the Snowy Plovers. They are now many favorite bird :)

There was already a great little community of outdoor enthusiasts who frequented the beach, but now that it's a park, it's great to see so many more people enjoying the Pacific Ocean, the dunes, the art installations, and other activities at the park.

A couple of my bandmates have a little 6 year old who recently learned how to ride her bike at Sunset Dunes. I randomly ran into them down there a few weeks ago and she was gleefully zipping on her way to the bike ramp area at Sloat with her parents in tow.

It's really become a place where you see so many people of all ages getting some physical activity due to the length, which is unique for the parks in our fair city.

I know there are some very vocal people who are not happy with the park, but just wanted to share my thoughts. Thank you so much for reading. In my opinion, Sunset Dunes is a true gem of San Francisco.

Warm regards,
Mieko Yeh

Item 19

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	3 Letters regarding the Vaillancourt Fountain
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 1:24:00 PM
Attachments:	3 Letters regarding the Vaillancourt Fountain.pdf

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding the Vaillancourt Fountain.

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:	Donald Crabtree
To:	Collins, Charles (ART); Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART); Ferras, Suzie (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	info@docomomo-noca.org
Subject:	Public Comment for SFAC and SFRPD meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date:	Saturday, October 25, 2025 6:51:33 PM

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

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

SF Recreation and Park Department seeks Arts Commission approval to deaccession, remove, and demolish the Vaillancourt Fountain, accelerating their blank-slate, urban redevelopment plan.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an international landmark, symbolizing our city's diverse history, our relationship with Canada and Quebec, and countless gatherings and activist events.

I oppose deaccession, removal, or demolition. Instead, I request that:

• (1) You reject this attempt to follow the federal trend of history erasure; retain and rehabilitate this landmark for current and future generations.
• (2) You reject describing internationally renowned art as “a design constraint” to a redevelopment project.
• (3) You conduct an inquiry into the deferred maintenance of the Vaillancourt Fountain and ascertain if gross negligence has occurred.
• (4) You grant stakeholders other than project sponsors—such as the artists or recognized art and preservation organizations—the opportunity to present at SFAC proceedings.

Please include this as a public comment in or adjacent to the agendas for the next occurrence of these meetings:
• (1) SF Arts Commission - Visual Arts Committee meeting
• (2) SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting
• (3) SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting
• (4) SF Board of Supervisors

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessement
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)

Thank you.

From:	Jan Markels
To:	Collins, Charles (ART); Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART); Ferras, Suzie (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	info@docomomo-noca.org
Subject:	Public Comment for SFAC and SFRPD meetings + Immediate Disclosure Request
Date:	Saturday, October 25, 2025 6:08:46 PM

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

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

SF Recreation and Park Department seeks Arts Commission approval to deaccession, remove, and demolish the Vaillancourt Fountain, accelerating their blank-slate, urban redevelopment plan.

The Vaillancourt Fountain is an international landmark, symbolizing our city's diverse history, our relationship with Canada and Quebec, and countless gatherings and activist events.

I oppose deaccession, removal, or demolition. Instead, I request that:

• (1) You reject this attempt to follow the federal trend of history erasure; retain and rehabilitate this landmark for current and future generations.
• (2) You reject describing internationally renowned art as “a design constraint” to a redevelopment project.
• (3) You conduct an inquiry into the deferred maintenance of the Vaillancourt Fountain and ascertain if gross negligence has occurred.
• (4) You grant stakeholders other than project sponsors—such as the artists or recognized art and preservation organizations—the opportunity to present at SFAC proceedings.

Please include this as a public comment in or adjacent to the agendas for the next occurrence of these meetings:
• (1) SF Arts Commission - Visual Arts Committee meeting
• (2) SF Arts Commission - Full Commission meeting
• (3) SF Recreation and Park Commission meeting
• (4) SF Board of Supervisors

Recreation & Parks: Please complete an **Immediate Disclosure Request** by supplying to me via email the following simple and routine public records by the close of the next business day:
• 2025 Embarcadero Plaza HRR
• 2025 Sue Bierman Park HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain HRR
• 2025 Vaillancourt Fountain Conditions Assessement
• 2024-05-10 BxP Presentation BXP version
• MAP Embarcadero Plaza Maintenance Responsibilities
• Justin Herman Embarcadero Plaza - Maintenance Agreement Docs, 1998-2000 (not in order)

Thank you.

Sent from my iPad

From:	kash
To:	Collins, Charles (ART); Dhaliwal, Manraj (ART); Ferras, Suzie (ART); ART-Info; Madland, Sarah (REC); Ginsburg, Phil (REC); Commission, Recpark (REC); Goodwin, Eoanna (REC); Summers, Ashley (REC); SauterStaff; Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject:	Save the Vaillancourt Fountain
Date:	Saturday, October 25, 2025 4:58:54 PM

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

My kids grew up playing on the fountain. It has a history we need to save.

Demolishing the fountain just because previous administrations willfully neglected it hoping everyone would forget how beautiful it is when the water is running is wrong. Please restore it so I will be able to bring my grandchildren there someday.

Item 20

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); Entezari, Mehran (BOS)
Subject:	FW: UPDATED: Muni Now, Muni Forever coalition letter on Muni funding
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:42:00 PM
Attachments:	image.png UPDATED Muni Now, Muni Forever letter to Mayor Lurie - transit parcel tax 2025102812.pdf Go for 10 two-pager.pdf Variable Rate Parcel Taxes in California- Context for a Potential Muni Measure.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please see a letter regarding MUNI funding from the MUNI Now, MUNI Forever Coalition.

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: Dylan Fabris <dylan@sftransitriders.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:36 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: John-Baptiste, Alicia (MYR) <a.john-baptiste@sfgov.org>; Sweet, Alexandra C. (MYR) <alexandra.c.sweet@sfgov.org>; BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>; SFMTA Board <MTABoard@sfmta.com>; Kirschbaum, Julie (MTA) <Julie.Kirschbaum@sfmta.com>; True, Judson (MTA) <Judson.True@sfmta.com>; Angotti, Kathryn (MTA) <Kathryn.Angotti@sfmta.com>
Subject: UPDATED: Muni Now, Muni Forever coalition letter on Muni funding

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



Dear Mayor Lurie,

Attached, please find an updated version of the Muni Now, Muni Forever coalition's October 17 letter. The text of this updated version is the same, but with several new signatures:

Charles Whitfield
Chair, San Francisco Group
Sierra Club

Peter Wilson
Vice President
Transport Workers Union Local 250A

Jon Hee

Chair
Chinatown Transportation Research and Improvement Project (TRIP)

Jodie Medeiros
Executive Director
Walk San Francisco

To make a local transit funding measure truly effective, we continue to urge you to design a winnable, fair, and ambitious parcel tax that meets the following principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10%.
2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so larger properties pay more.
3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.
4. Scale with inflation and rising costs.

We still hope we can meet with you soon to discuss these principles in greater detail.

Sincerely,
Dylan Fabris, on behalf of the Muni Now, Muni Forever coalition and other supporting organizations.

Dylan Fabris (he/they)
Community and Policy Manager
San Francisco Transit Riders
Office open Monday through Thursday
Support our work!

Donate $15 today to celebrate SFTR's 15th Anniversary!









































October 28, 2025

Mayor Daniel Lurie
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Ensuring a successful Muni funding measure in 2026.

Dear Mayor Lurie,

We appreciate that your office is considering a local ballot measure to fund Muni via a parcel tax. Even if a regional funding measure passes at the ballot, Muni will still face a growing annual deficit of over $150 million. The stakes could not be higher. San Francisco's economic

recovery, climate goals, and basic mobility for working people all depend on a stable, well-funded public transit system.

To make this measure truly effective, we urge your administration to design a winnable, fair, and ambitious parcel tax that meets the following principles, which we have identified through extensive public outreach with voters, community organizations, and Muni riders:

1. Go above and beyond filling the budget deficit – a local measure should generate at least $262M per year.

   Together with the regional measure, the local measure must be large enough to not only close Muni's projected operating shortfall, but also to deliver tangible improvements to Muni service. When talking to voters, the message is clear: They do not want to pay more money for less service. Right now, Muni service is the lowest it has been in over a decade (except for in the immediate reaction to the pandemic) and riders on more than half of all daytime Muni routes must endure overcrowding at some point during the day.[1, 2]

   Based on our coalition's outreach, San Franciscans overwhelmingly want an end to service cuts, and, at minimum, a 10% increase to current operating levels – an increase that would bring us back in line with pre-pandemic norms and set Muni up for future growth. It is unrealistic to expect Muni ridership to grow without investments into expanding Muni service.

   Together with the regional measure, a $262M local measure would generate enough funding to increase current service by 10% or provide other needed improvements. For more financial and other details, please see the attached "Go for 10!" document.

2. Structure the parcel tax with a variable rate to make it as fair and equitable as possible.

   In order to be most popular with San Francisco voters, the tax must be structured to generate more from the taxpayers with the greatest means. In the context of a parcel tax, that means the tax should be structured with a variable rate such that San Francisco's largest properties contribute the most. Single-family homeowners should not be asked to pay the same amount as Salesforce Tower.

---

[1] Federal Transit Administration. (2023). *National Transit Database: City and County of San Francisco.* United States Department of Transportation. https://www.transit.dot.gov/ntd/transit-agency-profiles/city-and-county-san-francisco.

[2] San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. (2025, August). *Percent of daily Muni trips crowded by route and month.* https://www.sfmta.com/reports/percent-daily-muni-trips-crowded-route-and-month

Last year, statewide, 17 out of the 18 variable rate parcel taxes on the ballot passed overwhelmingly, demonstrating a broad preference for this type of tax.[3] A recent survey on the regional transit measure also showed that San Franciscans prefer a more progressively-structured tax.[4]

A variable-rate tax would ensure fairness while protecting lower-income property owners through targeted exemptions or rebates. This measure should lift up working San Franciscans, not add to their burdens.

3. No pass-through to tenants.

   Strong tenant support will be a mandatory component to pass a significant parcel tax, so, wherever possible, the measure must not allow for any portion of the tax to be passed through to tenants. The structure of this measure should reflect that tenants, including residents and small businesses, are already facing an affordability crisis, and should therefore not introduce additional passthroughs that would worsen housing insecurity or harm small business owners. The overwhelming majority of San Franciscans are renters; we risk hurting the measure's support if tenants feel alienated.

4. Index for inflation or future needs.

   To avoid repeating today's funding crisis, the measure must be indexed for inflation or otherwise scaled to grow with operational costs over time. A stagnant tax will quickly erode in value, forcing us into a similar Muni funding crisis in a few years.

Public transit is the backbone of a prosperous, equitable, climate-friendly, and sustainable city. We have an opportunity to stabilize Muni and invest in the city's future. As you know, a thriving Muni system is critical to a thriving economy, as Muni delivers nearly half a million trips each day that we cannot afford to lose. We urge your administration to ensure the transit funding measure delivers a positive future for San Francisco by meeting the principles outlined above.

We also request an opportunity to speak with you directly regarding these principles before your proposal is drafted so we may discuss them in more detail.

Our coalition has extensive grassroots power and experience working on local funding measures. We know firsthand the positive difference it makes to run a ballot measure people are excited about. We are concerned that this measure will not pass if it does not provide clear benefits to voters. We look forward to continuing to work with your office and city departments

---

[3] See attachment: "Variable Rate Parcel Taxes in California: Context for a Potential Muni Measure"
[4] Levin, A. (2025, June 4). *New polling shows better transit funding results from business tax.* Transbay Coalition. https://www.transbaycoalition.org/new-polling-shows-better-transit-funding-results-from-business-tax/

to deliver a measure that meets these principles, presents a clear vision for future growth, and earns broad community support.

Sincerely,

Dylan Fabris
Community and Policy Manager
San Francisco Transit Riders

Shaya French
Director of Organizing
Senior & Disability Action
Indivisible SF

League of Women Voters

Emma Hare
4th Vice Chair
San Francisco Democratic Party

Aditya Bhumbla and Jennifer Bolen
Co-Chairs
Democratic Socialists of America, San Francisco

Abibat Rahman-Davies
Transportation Policy Manager
Transform

Tom Radulovich
Livable City

Joni Eisen
Steering Committee
San Francisco Climate Emergency Coalition

Sara Greenwald
Coordinating Committee
350 San Francisco Action

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Robin Pam
Executive Director
Streets For All SF

Bob Allen
Director of Policy and Advocacy
Urban Habitat

Christopher White
Executive Director
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition

Carter Lavin
Co-Founder
Transbay Coalition

Adina Levin
Executive Director
Seamless Bay Area

Jodie Medeiros
Executive Director
Walk San Francisco

Charles Whitfield
Chair, San Francisco Group
Sierra Club

Jon Hee
Chair
Chinatown Transportation Research and Improvement Project (TRIP)

Peter Wilson
Vice President
Transport Workers Union Local 250A

Attachments: *Go for 10!*
Variable Rate Parcel Taxes in California: Context for a Potential Muni Measure

CC: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
SFMTA Board of Directors
Alicia John-Baptiste
Alex Sweet
Julie Kirschbaum
Judson True
Katherine Angotti

Muni Funding: Go for 10!

Report from the Muni Now, Muni Forever campaign's *Muni Forever* summit

Due largely to decreased city tax revenue and the expiration of COVID-19 emergency funding, Muni is facing a budget deficit that necessitates the passage of a local funding measure in 2026.

In September 2025, the Muni Now, Muni Forever campaign convened the *Muni Forever* summit to hear from transit riders and better understand positive framings for a future ballot measure to fund Muni. This report outlines what we heard, and proposes a framework for a Muni funding measure that not only addresses the immediate deficit, but also charts a path toward delivering improved transit service that San Franciscans need.

What we need

A thriving city demands a thriving public transit network. According to San Francisco Controller Greg Wagner, "A well-functioning Muni is critical to San Francisco's economic recovery."

An unaffiliated 2024 poll found that **64% of San Franciscans take Muni at least two or three times per week**, and **half of all San Franciscans would like to ride Muni more often than they currently do**. Public transit improvements were ranked as the most important investment in improving transportation in San Francisco.[1]

Top priorities for riders

1. Expand services by at least 10% to meet the needs of riders
2. Eliminate crowding on transit vehicles
3. Make Muni faster and more reliable
4. Expand accessibility of transit (Accessible boarding zones at all stops, improved elevator and escalator reliability, enhanced staff training for seniors and people with disabilities)
5. Provide greater transparency, accountability, and oversight for voters and riders (clearer budget breakdowns, clearer audits, greater input for riders, and board accountability)
6. Provide basic amenities (seating, lighting, trash cans, shelters, ambassadors) at more stops
7. Improve safety and comfort for riders (more ambassadors, cleaner facilities)

More, not less

It will be extremely difficult to pass a local funding measure in 2026 that does not present a clear vision for the future of Muni. Polling indicates that **72% of San Franciscans think we should focus on long-term improvements to public transit, rather than simply keeping public transit running in the short term.**[2] In order to pass two simultaneous transit funding measures next year (local and regional), voters will need to see that they are not just being asked to pay more for less.

---

[1] GrowSF & FM3 Research. (2024, May). *Q2 2024 poll on street safety, Muni, and transit.* https://growsf.org/pulse/growsf-pulse-may-2024/

[2] Metropolitan Transportation Commission & EMC Research. (2025, February). *Bay Area regional transportation measure voter survey report.* https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-02/Regional%20Transportation%20Measure%20Voter%20Survey%20Report%20Feb%202025.pdf

Go for 10!

Muni is currently operating only about 90% of the amount of service it was offering in 2019.[3] Based on our outreach, San Franciscans overwhelmingly want, at minimum, a return to pre-pandemic levels of Muni service – a 10% increase to current operating levels. We therefore set this as a baseline for what we aim to generate from a local funding measure. Achieving this would cost approximately $110m per year.[4] In order to fill the $152m deficit that is expected even after the regional measure passes, that means the local funding measure should generate **$262m per year** in order to achieve this goal.

What it means for San Francisco

Through our outreach, we were able to discern the top transit priorities for riders. While we calculated our figures based on what it would take to increase current levels of service by 10%, the agency could realistically choose to spend that extra money on a variety of potential improvements.

> *Go for 10* to fund a **10% increase in current revenue service hours delivered.**
>
> *Go for 10* to increase frequency and **reduce crowding on Muni's ten most packed bus routes.**
>
> *Go for 10* to **restore lost routes like the 10, 2, and 14X.**
>
> *Go for 10* to hire **over ten times more Muni Transit Ambassadors** to improve safety and offer help to Muni riders.

These are just a few examples of what Muni could do with a funding measure that generates $262m per year. Exact framing of how those funds can and should be used is something that can be worked out by the agency following more insight on voter sentiment and feasibility.

Going for 10 wins at the ballot

If this proposal were placed on the ballot as a variable rate parcel tax, it would require a rate of just under $0.50 per building square foot to generate the amount of revenue needed to achieve these goals.
Last year, four other California cities each passed similarly-sized measures, each winning over 75% of the vote.[5] By making a clear case that this funding will go beyond the status quo, the City has a real opportunity to save Muni from its constant cycle of cuts and improve service for its half-million daily riders.

---

[3] US Department of Transportation: National Transit Database, based on annual vehicle revenue miles
https://www.transit.dot.gov/ntd/transit-agency-profiles/city-and-county-san-francisco
[4] Calculations based on National Transit Database operating expenses data, adjusted for inflation
[5] Alameda USD Measure E ($0.585/building sq ft, 76.15%), Albany USD Measure G ($0.55/building sq ft, 78.86%), Berkeley USD Measure H ($0.54/sq ft of improvements, 88.26%), Piedmont USD Measure P ($0.50/sq ft of building improvements, 81.07%)

Variable Rate Parcel Taxes in California: Context for a Potential Muni Measure

Compiled by Emily Horsman and Kat Siegal

Summary

In the past 15 years, districts throughout California have successfully implemented variable rate parcel taxes to bypass limitations imposed by Prop 13 (1978) on ad valorem property taxes. Square footage-based structures with caps have emerged as the dominant politically and legally viable approach following court validation in 2023. This led to a notable increase in variable rate parcel taxes in 2024, which were especially concentrated in the Bay Area and were overwhelmingly successful at the ballot. Tiered rate approaches and measures that differentiate by property use have been less successful and have faced legal challenges.

Districts have generally relied on county assessor records for square footage data and provided clear mechanisms for property owners to file claims for tax re-computation in case of error. Other common characteristics of successful measures have included Senior Citizen and SSI/ SSDI exemptions, square footage caps, tax expiration dates, and a separate flat rate for vacant or unimproved parcels.

Establishing Legal Precedent in California

Evolution of Variable Rate Structures

From 2010-2024, California districts experimented with three main approaches:

1. **Property type differentiation** (2010-2013) - later ruled illegal
2. **Square footage with caps** (2011-present) - legally validated and dominant approach
3. **Complex multi-tier systems** (2022-2023) - all unsuccessful at ballot

Legal Milestones

- **Borikas v. Alameda USD (2013)**: Invalidated property-type differentiation (residential vs. commercial rates) **for school parcel taxes specifically**. (Source)
- **San Francisco Proposition G (June 2018)**: Established the precedent that citizen-initiated taxes could pass with simple majority rather than two-thirds
- **Dondlinger v. LA County (2019)**: Validated square footage-based taxes as uniform application
- **Traiman v. Alameda USD (2023)**: Established precedent that square footage taxes with caps satisfy uniformity requirements for school districts.

Past Variable Rate Parcel Tax Measure Performance

In 2024 alone there were 17 square footage based parcel tax measures and 2 use-differentiated or tiered variable rate parcel tax measures in California, with all but one passing. The sole defeated measure, EE, directly competed with Measure FF, which had a higher per sq ft rate and passed.

Dimensions to add:

- *Where do they get the data*
- *Were there any implementation or validation challenges?*
- *How long did implementation take?*
- *How do appeals work?*

Square Footage Based Parcel Taxes 2024

Measure	Election Date	Rate Structure	Results	Annual Revenue	Cap	Exemptions	Expiration Date	Inflation Adjustment	Purpose	Ballotpedia Link	Legal Text
Alameda USD Measure E	March 5, 2024	$0.585/building sq ft $598/unimproved parcel	**PASSED** 76.15%	$24 million	$15,998	Senior, SSI/SSDI	9 years	None	Schools	Link	Link

Albany USD Measure G	March 5, 2024	$0.55/building sq ft on improved property $25/unimproved	**PASSED** 78.86%	$4.8 million	None	Senior, SSI/SSDI	None	3% annually	Schools	Link	
Albany, California Measure C	November 5, 2024	$0.017/lot sq ft	**PASSED** 70.51%	$400k	$6,000	Low income	10 years	Annual CPI adjustment up to 3%	Sidewalk Repairs	Link	
Berkeley USD Measure H	March 5, 2024	$0.54/sq ft of improvements $25/unimproved parcel	**PASSED** 88.26%	$44 million	None	Low income senior, low income SSI/SSDI	8 years	Annual CPI adjustment	Schools	Link	
Berkeley Measure EE (competed with FF)	November 5, 2024	$0.13/sq ft of improvements	**FAILED** 45.64%	$10.5 million	None	Very low income	12 years	CPI or income growth annually	Sidewalks and Streets	Link	
Berkeley Measure FF (competed with EE)	November 5, 2024	$0.17/sq ft of improvements to dwelling units $0.25/sq ft of improvements to other property	**PASSED** 60.85%	$15 million	None	Very low income	14 years	CPI or income growth annually	Sidewalks and Streets	Link	
Berkeley Library Tax Measure X	November 5, 2024	$0.06/sq ft residential $0.09/sq ft other improved property	**PASSED** 78.55%	$5.6 million	None	Very low income	None	CPI or income	Library	Link	

								growth annually			
Berkeley Parks Tax Measure Y	November 5, 2024	$0.2652/sq ft of taxable improvements	**PASSED** 75.2%	$3.8 million additional	None	Very low income	None	CPI or income growth annually	Parks	Link	
LA County Fire District Measure E	November 5, 2024	$0.06/sq ft of structural improvements (excluding parking)	**PASSED** 55.05%	$152 million	None	Low income seniors	None	Up to 2% annually	Fire and Emergency Responders	Link	Can't find online
Local Classrooms Funding Authority Measure CL	November 5, 2024	$0.02/sq ft residential $0.075/sq ft other property types	**PASSED** 78.3%	$14 million	None	Senior and SSI	"Advisory" measure every 4 years	Up to CPI	Schools	Link	Link
Mountain View Whisman SD Measure AA	November 5, 2024	$0.15/sq ft of building area $25 for unimproved	**PASSED** 75.28	$5.4 million	$1750	Senior, SSI/SSDI	8 years	None	Schools	Link	Link
Piedmont USD Measure P	November 5, 2024	$0.50/sq ft of building improvements	**PASSED** 81.07%	$5 million	None	Senior, SSI, Religious Purposes, Publicly Owned Utility / Government	8 years	None	Schools	Link	Link

Puente Hills Habitat Authority Measure PH	November 5, 2024	$0.01/building sq ft	**PASSED** 68.1%	$1.15 million	None	Undeveloped and tax-exempt parcels	None	Up to 3%	Open Space	Link	Link
Rincon Ranch Community Services District Measure C	March 5, 2024	$10/acre plus $250 per parcel	**PASSED** 66.67%	?	?	?	?	?	Road Repair	Link	Can't find online
San Rafael Measure P	November 5, 2024	$0.145/sq ft improved building area $75/vacant parcel	**PASSED** 52.02%	$6.37 million	None	Senior	30 years	None	Library and Community Center	Link	Link
Santa Fe Springs Measure SFS	November 5, 2024	$0.07/sq ft of commercial lots $0.035/sq ft of industrial/ vacant lots	**PASSED** 76.72%	$6 million	None	Residential; parcels exempt from ad valorem e.g. state assessed public utility	25 years	2% annually	Road Repair	Link	Link
Sausalito Marin City School District Measure G	November 5, 2024	$0.15/sq ft $25/unimproved parcel	**PASSED** 70.06%	$1.3 million	23,000 sq ft ($3450)	Low income seniors, SSI, SSDI	8 years	None	Schools	Link	Link

Other Variable Rate Parcel Taxes 2024

Measure	Election Date	Variable Rate Structure	Results	Annual Revenue	Cap	Exemptions	Expiration Date	Inflation Adjustment	Purpose	Ballotpedia Link	Legal Text
Piedmont Measure F	March 5, 2024	Between $743 and $1,254 per single family residential parcel, $1,254 or $1,882 per commercial parcel, or $515 per multi-family dwelling unit, subject to CPI adjustment	**PASSED** (75.65%)	$3.27 million	N/A	None	12 years	CPI up to 4%	Police, Fire, First Responders, Parks, Recreation, Public Works	Link	
Belvedere Measure C	March 5, 2024	Renewing existing tax – $994 per residential dwelling unit, $1,131 per occupancy in commercial structures, and $199 per vacant parcel	**PASSED** (78.05%)							Link	

CBD Precedent in San Francisco

PBIDs in SF already levy an assessment on property owners. These are based on variable rate formulas involving property areas.

- PBIDs Property Charge
  - Castro CBD
    - It is the responsibility of each property owner to ensure that the information provided to the Castro/Upper Market CBD, from the Assessor's office is correct.

source

Other Implementation Considerations

Condos

- Condos are assessed and tax for each individual unit.
- The basis for this is the California Subdivision Map Act, which sets the framework for subdividing land into multiple parcels
- If you search, as an example, 181 Fremont on this site, you will see multiple parcels for the address, each for a unit https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/
    - You can also see each individual unit in the assessor roll – here it is filtered to the block for 181 Fremont
- Specification in language, example in Prop J parcel tax for schools: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_business/0-0-0-49740
    - *"Parcel" means a unit of real estate…with an Assessor's parcel number as shown on the most current official assessment roll…*
    - *A Parcel created by a subdivision map approved in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act…shall be deemed to be a single assessment*
- Example article – the condo owner is taxed for owning the unit: https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/nevius/article/2-property-tax-bills-1-for-condo-1-for-parking-5894175.php
    - *La Rose, like some other residents, is taxed once for his one-bedroom condo and a second time for his parking space.*

Timeshares/Tenancy-In-Common

These situations result in shared ownership of a single parcel. Fact Sheet: https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/ASR_Factsheet_PurchasingTIC_English_2025.pdf

"One tax bill is sent out for the entire parcel."

Exemptions and Appeals

Measure Data

All Past Variable Parcel Tax Measures

Note: this table is in progress and is definitely not complete. It includes both per sq ft parcel taxes and other "variable rate" schemes such as tiered systems and property use differentiated taxes.

All California parcel tax measures

March 2024 local revenue measures

November 2024 local revenue measures

Measure	Election Date	Variable Rate Structure	Results	Annual Revenue	Purpose	Ballotpedia Link
Berkeley Measure EE	November 5, 2024	$0.13 per square foot of improvements; competed with measure FF	**FAILED** (45.64% Yes, needed simple majority)	$10.5 million		Link
Berkeley Measure FF	November 5, 2024	$0.17 per square foot of improvements to dwelling units and $0.25 per square foot of improvements to other property; competed with measure EE	**PASSED** (60.85% Yes, needed simple majority)	$15 million		Link

Berkeley Library Tax Measure X	November 5, 2024	$0.06 per sq ft residential, $0.09 per sq ft other improved property	**PASSED** (78.55% Yes, needed 2/3)	$5.6 million		Link
Berkeley Parks Tax Measure Y	November 5, 2024	Increased from $0.221 to $0.2652 per sq ft of taxable improvements	**PASSED** (75.2% Yes, needed 2/3)	$3.8 million additional		Link
Puente Hills Habitat Authority Measure PH	November 5, 2024	1¢ per building sq ft	**PASSED** (68.1% Yes, needed 2/3)	$1.15 million		Link
LA County Fire District Measure E	November 5, 2024	6¢ per sq ft of structural improvements (excluding parking)	**PASSED** (55.05% Yes, needed simple majority)	$152 million		Link
Albany, California Measure C	November 5, 2024	$0.017 per lot square foot, annual CPI adjustment up to 3%, rate capped at $6,000 (replaced existing parcel tax)	**PASSED** (70.51%)	$400k		Link

Piedmont USD Measure P	November 5, 2024	Increased from $0.25 to $0.50 per sq ft of building improvements	**PASSED** (81.07% Yes, needed 2/3)	Over $5 million		Link
Mountain View Whisman SD Measure AA	November 5, 2024	15¢ per sq ft of building area, capped at $1,750 per parcel; $25 for unimproved	**PASSED** (75.28% Yes, needed 2/3)	$5.4 million		Link
Local Classrooms Funding Authority Measure CL	November 5, 2024	2¢ per sq ft residential, 7.5¢ per sq ft other property types (renewal of existing tax)	**PASSED** (78.3% Yes, needed ⅔)	$14 million		Link (Link to legal text bc ballotpedia is missing a lot of info)
San Rafael Measure P	November 5, 2024	$0.145 per sq ft improved building area, $75 per vacant parcel	**PASSED** (52.02% Yes, needed simple majority)	$6.37 million		Link
Santa Fe Springs Measure SFS	November 5, 2024	7¢ per sq ft of commercial lots, 3½¢ per sq ft of industrial/ vacant lots	**PASSED** (76.72% Yes, needed ⅔)	$6 million		Link

Sausalito Marin City School District Measure G	November 5, 2024	$0.15 per sq ft up to 23,000 sq ft, $25/unimproved parcel	**PASSED** (70.06% Yes, needed ⅔)	$1.3 million		Link
Albany USD Measure G	March 5, 2024	$0.55 per building sq ft on improved property, $25 per unimproved	**PASSED** (78.86% Yes, needed 2/3)	$4.8 million		Link
Berkeley USD Measure H	March 5, 2024	$0.54 per sq ft of improvements, $25 per unimproved parcel	**PASSED** (88.26% Yes, needed 2/3)	$44 million		Link
Alameda USD Measure E	March 5, 2024	$0.585/building area square foot capped at $15,998/parcel, and $598/unimproved parcel	**PASSED** (76.15%)	$24 million		Link
Piedmont Measure F	March 5, 2024	Between $743 and $1,254 per single family residential parcel, $1,254 or $1,882 per commercial parcel, or $515 per multi-family dwelling unit, subject to CPI adjustment	**PASSED** (75.65%)	$3.27 million		Link
Belvedere Measure C	March 5, 2024	Renewing existing tax – $994 per residential	**PASSED** (78.05%)			Link

		dwelling unit, $1,131 per occupancy in commercial structures, and $199 per vacant parcel				
Rincon Ranch Community Services District Measure C	March 5, 2024	$10 per acre plus $250 per parcel	**PASSED** (66.67%, needed ⅔)			Link
Calistoga Measure E	March 7, 2023	$0.32/sq ft residential, $1.42-$2.15/sq ft hospitality, $0.11/sq ft undeveloped, plus other rates for commercial/industrial, rural, multi-family, mobile home, and ADU properties, increasing 2% annually thereafter	**FAILED** (33.87% Yes, needed 2/3)	Would have been ~$4 million		Link
Santa Lucia Community Services District Measure T	November 2023	$954.67 per parcel	**PASSED** (84.42%)	$389,840		Link
Vernon Measure W	April 11, 2023	$0.03683 per sq ft on non-residential parcels	**PASSED** (73.53% Yes, needed ⅔)	$2.18 M		Link

Cathedral City Measure K	November 8, 2022	15¢ per building square foot annually on single-family residential units, other rates for other land uses	**FAILED** (54.58% Yes, needed ⅔)	$4.5M		Link
Inverness Public Utility District Measure O	November 8, 2022	$0.20 per sq ft on improved parcels, $150 per parcel for vacant parcels	**FAILED** (28.01% Yes, needed simple majority)	$276K		Link
Riverside County Measure L	November 8, 2022	7¢ per building square foot annually on single-family residential units, other rates for other land uses	**FAILED** (54.25% Yes, needed ⅔)	$3.9M		Link
Los Angeles Proposition SP	November 8, 2022	8.4¢ per sq ft of improvements, reduced to 2.2¢ after 30 years	**FAILED** (35.49% Yes, needed 2/3)	Would have been $227 million		Link
Pomona Measure PS	November 8, 2022	$0.15 per gross square foot special tax on industrial parcels	**FAILED** (56.02% Yes, needed ⅔)	Would have been 14M		Link

San Francisco Proposition O	November 8, 2022	$150-$4,000 per parcel based on size and use (residential vs. non-residential)	**FAILED** (36.67% Yes, needed simple majority)	Would have been $37 million		Link
South San Francisco Measure DD	November 8, 2022	$2.50 per square foot of parcel size on commercial office parcels	**FAILED** (47.24% Yes, needed simple majority)	Would have been $55.9M		Link
Commerce Measure PS	November 2, 2021	$0.3321 per square foot on industrial property	**FAILED** (58.74%, needed ⅔)	Would have been $12M		Link
Kenwood Fire Protection District Measure E	November 2, 2021	$0.12 per sq ft for residential and commercial properties and $16.00 per acre for agricultural land	**PASSED** (83.08% Yes, needed ⅔)	$300K		Link
Alameda USD Measure A	March 3, 2020	$0.265 per building sq ft with $7,999 cap per parcel, $299 per vacant parcel	**PASSED** (67.1% Yes, needed 2/3)	$10.5 million		Link

Berkeley USD Measure H	March 3, 2020	9.1¢ per sq ft on improvements, $20 per unimproved parcel	**PASSED** (78.6%)	~$7.3 million		Link
Burbank USD Measure I	March 3, 2020	$0.10 per sq ft of improved property	**FAILED** (64.12% Yes, needed ⅔)	Would have been $9.1M		Link
Emery Valley USD Measure K	March 3, 2020	12¢ per square foot of building area	**PASSED** (75.25% Yes, needed ⅔)	$1.8M		Link
Los Angeles USD Measure EE	June 4, 2019	16¢ per sq ft of building improvements	**FAILED** (45.68% Yes)	Would have been $500 million		Link
LA County Regional Park District Measure A	November 8, 2016	1.5¢ per sq ft of structural improvements (now 1.81¢ with inflation)	**PASSED** (74.9%)	~$90 million currently		Link
West Contra Costa Healthcare District Measure C	May 6, 2014	14¢ per sq ft on houses	**FAILED**	Would have been $20 million		Link

Local Classrooms Funding Authority Measure CL	November 6, 2012	2¢ per sq ft residential, 7.5¢ per sq ft other property types	**PASSED** (68.4%)	$11 million		Link
Alameda USD Measure A	March 8, 2011	32¢ per building sq ft with $7,999 cap, $299 for vacant parcels	**PASSED** (69.4%)	~$10 million		Link
Berkeley USD Measure H	November 2, 2010	6.31¢ per sq ft residential, 9.46¢ per sq ft commercial	**PASSED** (73.6%)	~$5 million		Link
San Francisco USD Proposition A	June 8, 2010	$32.20/year single-family residential, $16.10 per unit multi-family	**PASSED** (71.8%)	~$20 million		Link

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	208 Letters regarding Transportation Funding
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 1:42:00 PM
Attachments:	208 Letters regarding Transportation Funding.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 208 Letters regarding Transportation Funding.

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: Andrea Robinowitz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:32:33 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Andrea
California

From: Ona Keller
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:12:17 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Ona
California

From: Emma MacKenzie
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:04:52 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Please take action to stop the Muni funding cuts and create a sustainable funding source! I use Muni several times a day, every day of the week, at hours ranging from 7am to 11pm. The bus route cuts and time limits have already impacted the routes I am able to take and I am hoping that they do not continue! Please, San Francisco needs our government to support public transportation now more than ever!

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Emma
California

From: Emma MacKenzie
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:04:51 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Please take action to stop the Muni funding cuts and create a sustainable funding source! I use Muni several times a day, every day of the week, at hours ranging from 7am to 11pm. The bus route cuts and time limits have already impacted the routes I am able to take and I am hoping that they do not continue! Please, San Francisco needs our government to support public transportation now more than ever!

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Emma
California

From: Corinne Dietz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:43:55 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Corinne
California

From: Maya Terplan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:35:18 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I rely on public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Maya

From: Neil lawson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 8:19:09 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Neil
California

From: Jarrod Hsu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 3:40:44 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jarrod
California

From: Sola Morrissey
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 1:28:07 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Sola
California

From: Anna Mistele
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 11:47:06 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Anna
California

From: Sprague Terplan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please Support a Great Muni Funding Measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 11:25:37 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Our family relies on Muni for nearly all our trips. It is critical that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Sprague
California

From: Corey Busay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:48:26 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Corey
California

From: Jennifer Barnason
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support the Muni Now Muni Forever funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:25:02 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As someone who doesn't own a car, I take public transportation in San Francisco daily. Public transit is vital to our community. We're lucky in San Francisco to have a public transit system that's accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night. I urge to you help keep it that way!

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

Please ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Many thanks!

Jennifer
California

From: Zia Davidian
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:23:57 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Zia
California

From: Rebecca Rubenstein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:13:14 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I have lived in San Francisco for 14.5 years and have taken public transportation my entire time here. As someone who neither has nor can afford a car, I cannot overstate how important it is to me and everyone else who relies on Muni (especially our most vulnerable populations) that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night. As a resident of the Panhandle neighborhood, I have already witnessed and experienced the difficult effects of having Muni service cut (the recent merging of the 21 with the 6 to create a sole 6 line has left large parts of my neighborhood under-serviced and inaccessible to those who need it most), and I ask for Muni funding to be prioritized so residents stop bearing the burden every time we run into a deficit.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

I appreciate your diligence towards this matter, and look forward to a future where San Francisco can proudly say it serves all its residents through large-scale access to public transportation, and not just the percentage of the population who are fortunate enough to reap the benefits of alternative transportation methods. Cities are for everyone. Public transportation acts as an equitable measure to ensure that as fact.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Rubenstein

Rebecca

California

From: 7lunasnuevas@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:06:27 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

California

From: brandon-pro@protonmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:43:42 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

California

From: Sam Myers
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:40:47 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Sam
California

From: Travis Thompson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 6:57:52 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Travis
California

From: Casey Bennett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 6:50:55 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Let's keep San Francisco's public transit system running smoothly and effective.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Casey
California

From: Eric Gregory
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 6:36:21 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Eric
California

From: Thea Selby
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 6:35:38 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Thea
California

From: jonieisen@sbcglobal.net
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 5:33:36 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a Potrero Hill resident, I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching especially in hilly neighborhoods, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

California

From: Brittany Smail
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:51:17 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Brittany
California

From: Pam Lin
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:40:28 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Pam
California

From: Patrick Jurney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 3:12:14 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Patrick
California

From: Danielle Truppi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure -- thank you!
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 1:13:30 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Public transportation is integral to my daily life in San Francisco, and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Danielle
California

From: Jon Tyburski
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 1:10:00 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and do not own a car. Ensuring a frequent and reliable public transit system is the best way to bring SF back to its former glory and more.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jon
California

From: Dylan Steele
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 1:08:16 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Dylan
California

From: Katherine Bourzac
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:56:26 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Like so many, I rely on public transit in SF. It is critical that the system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and available into the night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Katherine
California

From: Aderet Parrino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:48:46 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Aderet
California

From: Gillian Garaci
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:39:10 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Gillian
California

From: Kevin Darling
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:33:15 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night. We need more frequent and reliable public transit. And, importantly, we need less cars on our streets.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Kevin
California

From: Gordon Liu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:20:32 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Gordon
California

From: Amber Schulenburg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:13:45 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Modern, successful, green cities have high quality public transit. We want to be in line with London and Paris, not Dallas.

I take public transportation in San Francisco regularly and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Amber
California

From: Christina Castro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 12:06:25 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a homeowner and City employee, I take public transportation in San Francisco almost everyday of the week. it is vital to me, my neighbors, and co-workers that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Christina
California

From: Cristy Bodnar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 11:06:22 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Cristy
California

From: TERRY TAYLOR
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:40:12 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

TERRY
California

From: Deb Porter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:38:28 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Thank you, but I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Deb
California

From: Roni Diamant-Wilson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:24:35 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Roni
California

From: Laura Saunders
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:14:59 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Laura
California

From: Robin Lapid
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:02:03 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take Muni every day in San Francisco; I don't own a car. I ride with people of all ages and backgrounds. I depend on Muni to get me to my job, the store, the parks, and to live my life in this beautiful city that I love. We're a world-class city, and it's important to you and me and your constituents and guests/tourists/visitors that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Robin
California

From: Rosa Mendoza
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:54:16 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Rosa
California

From: Richard Gallo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:40:22 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Richard
California

From: Jason Gonzales
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:37:56 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jason
California

From: Colette crutcher
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:23:38 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

First, I want to thank you for keeping ICE out of our city--at least for now. Today I'm writing on another issue very close to my heart.

I moved to San Francisco 45 years ago, largely because it is a beautiful, walkable city with a great public transportation system. I do not own a car, so I take Muni everywhere, and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Colette
California

From: Stanford Rosenthal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support for SF Transit Funding Measure with Key Principles
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:13:17 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As an Inner Sunset resident who relies on Muni—especially N-Judah—regularly, I'm writing to express strong support for a ballot measure that addresses SFMTA's funding deficit while maintaining and expanding service.

Living car-free in San Francisco is both a personal choice and a climate necessity. But it only works when our transit system is reliable, frequent, and comprehensive. Right now, crowded buses and service cuts threaten the viability of car-free living for thousands of residents like me who depend on Muni for every trip.

I urge you to ensure the transit measure includes these four essential principles:

• Generate sufficient revenue to grow service by 10% so we can reduce overcrowding and add routes where demand is highest. Better service means more people can choose transit over driving—a critical climate win.

• Structure rates fairly, with variable rates where smaller properties pay less and larger ones pay more. Equity must be central to how we fund our shared infrastructure.

• Protect tenants by avoiding pass-through costs wherever possible. Transit-dependent San Franciscans shouldn't bear disproportionate burden.

• Scale with inflation so the measure's value doesn't erode over time. We need sustainable funding that maintains real service levels for the next decade and beyond.

A well-funded, expansive Muni system strengthens neighborhood vitality, reduces emissions, and makes San Francisco more livable for everyone.

Thank you for prioritizing this critical measure!

Stanford
California

From: Stephanie Wagner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:53:08 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night. SF Muni is one of the greatest public services this city offers - with the ease of getting around the city on a reliable, clean, enjoyable service with friendly drivers and service workers. I rely on public transportation, as many of my fellow citizens do. Please do what you can to ensure that Muni is well funded and continues running to serve our communities long into the future.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Stephanie
California

From: Sara Clark
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:32:45 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.
As my ten year old son says, having a transit system is what makes San Francisco a city, not just a town. He loves riding the bus, and I love having opportunities to give him a bit of freedom of transportation that is safe, efficient, and fun!!

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Sara
California

From: Ashleigh Heinichen
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:17:00 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

SF transit should be the best it can be and not capped at the knees. Our city needs effective transit so we can continue to have a low density of cars on the road. Please help make this happen!

Ashleigh
California

From: Nancy Arbuckle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:39:16 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Nancy
California

From: Lydia Wrench
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 6:39:29 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Lydia
California

From: Jennifer Ruocco
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 6:37:29 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jennifer
California

From: Jennifer Ruocco
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 6:36:11 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jennifer
California

From: Kimberlee Howley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 6:28:44 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Kimberlee
California

From: Susan Setterholm
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 5:15:33 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation, especially Muni, every day in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Susan
California

From: Wendy Park
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:41:13 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Wendy
California

From: Red Lee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:26:45 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Red
California

From: Caroline Gillis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:59:00 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Caroline
California

From: Asheem Mamoowala
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:45:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Asheem
California

From: AJ cho
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:24:52 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

AJ
California

From: June Li
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:41:54 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

June
California

From: Erik Islo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Funding Muni with a Variable Rate Parcel Tax
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:40:58 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I ride muni almost every day, including for my commute. I also am fortunate to own my home in San Francisco. Along with Muni Forever, I strongly encourage you to implement a new parcel tax to help fund muni and keep improving its service.

Better muni means more people will ride muni, creating a virtuous cycle. It means more job opportunities and makes more commercial areas more accessible. It also means less cars on our roads, making them safer and more efficient for everyone. Funding transit is the right thing to do!

Erik
California

From: Vishakh Talanki
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:37:26 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Vishakh
California

From: William Malloy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:32:19 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night. I want to tell you about a recent visit from some friends of mine from a small city in the Midwest. They were of course blown away by our beautiful city's culture, food, and natural beauty. But over and over, as we road buses, muni trains, BART, and even cable cars; they kept commenting on how livable our city is because of its convenient transit options. Near the end of the trip my friend said to me, "I just can't imagine how much better our home would be if we had transit options like this, instead of having to drive everywhere."

This is the San Francisco I love, and I hope you will fight to preserve it for everyone.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

William
California

From: Frank Lorch
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:14:08 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles and also consider another idea:

Idea: find additional sources of revenue like a "billionaires tax" and/or congestion pricing.

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Frank
California

From: Barnaby Lewis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:58:40 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Barnaby
California

From: Caroline Ayres
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support Muni funding
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:55:13 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation every day in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Caroline
California

From: Jennifer Anderson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:42:18 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie,

I'm a San Francisco resident and regular Muni/BART rider. I'm writing to urge your office to make reliable, frequent transit a top priority of the recovery—our small businesses, workers, students, and visitors depend on it.

My asks:

* Champion a stable operations funding plan for Muni and regional transit—back a 2026 local measure and help secure state/regional revenue so we avoid frequency cuts that would stall our recovery.

* Appoint rider-first SFMTA Board members who will defend all-day frequency, bus priority, and safety.

* Accelerate bus priority (quick-build transit lanes, signal priority, all-door boarding) so riders get faster, more reliable trips this year—not years from now.

* Support seamless fares and passes across Bay Area agencies to make transit the default for more trips.

* Frame transit as core city infrastructure in your budget and public messaging, and on par with streets and public safety.

These steps are pragmatic, pro-equity, and pro-business: they cut travel times, boost downtown access, and reduce congestion for everyone.

I'd welcome the chance to share a rider's perspective or help mobilize neighbors in support. Thank you for your leadership, and all that you are doing!

Sincerely,
Jennifer Anderson
Pacific Heights, San Francisco
661-282-0138 | janderson5417@gmail.com

Jennifer
California

From: Sarah Katz-Hyman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:41:15 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Sarah
California

From: Anna Sojourner
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:19:30 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I have taken transit my whole life. Every time I ride muni, there is more room for people driving private cars, yet my whole life I've seen transit treated like an afterthought. It's long past time for that to change.

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Anna
California

From: Faithy Leong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:18:40 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Hello Board of Supervisors and Mayor Lurie,

I take Muni and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Faithy
California

From: Joseph Wang
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Urging you to support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:14:56 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I regularly use public transportation in San Francisco, and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Joseph
California

From: Iris Biblowitz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:01:22 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night. I'm a senior and a retired nurse who took MUNI to work on all shifts (day, evening, night) for many years.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Of course, the best idea is taxing millionaires and billionaires. Would you support that, Mayor Lurie?

Iris
California

From: Andrew Tremblay
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:57:56 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Andrew
California

From: Juan LARGAESPADA
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:39:08 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Juan
California

From: Ned Raggett
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:36:07 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Greetings -- the writing below the line is a standard message that's been provided, but as I do support these goals I choose to simply forward that along. I will add that having moved here ten years ago from a spot with much less in the way of regular transit options, having MUNI has been truly wonderful this whole time -- especially since I do not drive myself. All efforts to support and maintain it are valuable to me, and to many others. Thanking you in advance for all work being done,

Ned Raggett

--

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Ned
California

From: Anthony Bu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:29:22 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Anthony
California

From: Morgan Dox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:28:40 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Morgan
California

From: Lusia Foster
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 8:12:16 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Lusia
California

From: Angana Gurung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:59:46 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Angana
California

From: Beth Goldstein
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:59:32 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Beth
California

From: Xoce Ruiz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:58:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Xoce
California

From: Ninette Westendorff
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:58:19 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Ninette
California

From: Jennifer Nsima
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:50:33 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jennifer
California

From: John Nulty
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:40:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

John
California

From: Elliot Schwartz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:34:44 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Elliot
California

From: Angelina Montes
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:32:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Angelina
California

From: Peter Johnson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:17:07 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Peter
California

From: Aidan Jones
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support a measure that reliably funds Muni
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:00:13 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I ride Muni everyday and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Aidan
California

From: Christopher Cornell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:00:10 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Christopher
California

From: Stephannie Depa
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:47:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Thank you,
Stephannie

Stephannie
California

From: Art Siriwatt
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:45:54 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Art
California

From: Felicia Tacto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:34:28 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Felicia
California

From: Eileen Bernhardi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:27:49 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

A great city must have great public transportation, great public schools (real leaders like Bernie, AOC, Mamdani only come from public schools), parks and services. I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Eileen
California

From: Stewart Wilber
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:27:12 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

It is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and addresses maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Stewart
California

From: Trevor Burke
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:23:30 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Trevor
California

From: Caitlin Haas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:22:31 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Caitlin
California

From: Anthony Criscione
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:20:32 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Anthony
California

From: Jen Miko
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:14:16 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jen
California

From: Naznin Maru
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:13:29 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Naznin
California

From: Joyce Calagos
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:06:25 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Daniel Lurie,

I think the year was 2015 when I was a member of S.F.'s non-profit organization called Senior and Disability Action. As a member of S.D.A., I spoke at City Hall to urge the S.F.M.T.A. Board to pass Free Muni for Seniors and People with Disabilities. Happily, The S.F.M.T.A. Board passed our request at 100%.

Now, more than ever, we need additional buses because, so often, whenever I ride the 8, 38 and 43 bus lines, the buses are jam packed. The aisles are crowded withe canes, walkers, wheelchairs, granny carts and baby buggies, especially during commute hours. And I think I read somewhere that by the year 2030 the S.F. population may consist of 30% seniors. All the more will we need additional public transportation.

Daily, I take bus or B.A.R.T. in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transportation system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Joyce
California

From: MaryLee McNeal
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:59:46 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie, I voted for you because I knew you were in a position to help my beloved city. Please support our muni system. I take public transportation in San Francisco and i am one of thousands who need our public transit system to remain accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covering most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

MaryLee
California

From: Justin Truong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:56:52 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Justin
California

From: Mark Cantrell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:53:36 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Mark
California

From: Latasha Taylor
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:46:13 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Latasha
California

From: Carol Brownson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:35:35 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I rely on public transportation in San Francisco. It is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible. I need a mobility scooter to get around, but "accessible" means more than permitting access for the disabled. It also means frequent, far-reaching, and that it covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Carol
California

From: Jelena Kolomejac
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:29:24 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jelena
California

From: William Henriques
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:26:25 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

San Francisco is a world class city, a crown jewel. The underfunded public transit system is an international embarassment.

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

William
California

From: Janelle Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:23:12 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Janelle
California

From: Richard Cox
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:22:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Richard
California

From: Don Ino
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:22:31 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Don
California

From: Madeleine Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:18:47 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Madeleine

From: Regina Islas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:16:48 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Regina
California

From: Breanna Barton-Shaw
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:08:40 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night. I have taken public transit since childhood and I will continue to take it as my default method of transportation.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Breanna
California

From: Iman Moaddeli
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:07:24 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Iman
California

From: Alice Mosley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a vital Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:04:03 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I rely on public transport in San Francisco. It is essential to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, comprehensive , and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Does not pass through additional costs to tenants!

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Alice
California

From: Ellen Hibdon
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:03:53 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Ellen
California

From: russwalker21@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:56:46 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Thank you,
Russell Walker

California

From: Nicolas Pardee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:56:24 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am both a MUNI Operator and passenger on public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that the jobs of City workers remain secure and dignified, and that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded transit vehicles and more service where we need it the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Nicolas
California

From: AJ Snyder
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:56:14 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

AJ
California

From: Donna Goodman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:52:29 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Donna
California

From: Becki Gerson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:51:12 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Becki
California

From: Matthew Muldowney
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:49:21 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Matthew
California

From: Daniel Kim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:49:21 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Daniel
California

From: Maya Chaffee
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:45:41 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco every day and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, affordable, fast, frequent, far-reaching, and covers the whole city most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Do this for the low income San Franciscans, do this for our immigrant communities, do this for the 30% of people with no access to a car, do this for those that will live in the new housing we will build, do this for the climate, and do this because its visionary and will keep our city from collapsing.

Thank you,

Maya Chaffee
Environmental justice advocate and resident who loves this city.

Maya
California

From: Tyler Moselle
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:40:25 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Tyler
California

From: Mary Wilson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:36:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Mary
California

From: Anne Verga
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:36:53 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Anne
California

From: Neil Williams
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:34:25 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Neil
California

From: yasmina bourdais
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:32:22 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

yasmina
California

From: Bob Penrod
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:31:48 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco every single day and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Bob
California

From: Maryann Hrichak
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:29:41 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Maryann
California

From: Ellen Koivisto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:28:37 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

You don't know because you are not anywhere close to an average person, but MUNI is a lifeline. I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Ellen
California

From: Genevieve Fujimoto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:27:43 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Genevieve
California

From: Ivan Gonzalez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:27:19 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Ivan
Utah

From: Sophia Chimley
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:25:47 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

We need to value public transportation as a multi faceted public good!

It reduces traffic!

It reduces greenhouse gases!

Supports students and school staff with zero parking options on their way to school and seniors going to appointments

Incentivizes shopping, going to work, nightlife , eating out, seeing shows etc without the nightmare of traffic, looking for parking, tickets or getting towed.

Mayor Lurie, people say all you care about is big business. That you weee born with a silver spoon and never needed the bus. But you know that for restaurants and hotels to thrive we need reliable transportation for working class folks. Even rich people hate to sit in traffic. Please please do all you can to support affordable public transportation without hefty hikes and citations when the residents of SF, many of us born and raised here like yourself, are struggling g with the high cost of living . Please Mayor Lurie don't you want to be remembered as a friend to SF ?

Sophia
California

From: Benji Reade Malagueno
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:25:24 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Benji
California

From: LIII F
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:25:02 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

LIII
California

From: blair sandler
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:24:50 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I often take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night. In fact, it should be more accessible, frequent, and far-reaching than it is or has been. Good public transit is one of the most significant hallmarks of a great city.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most. In particular, service should be improved in the Bayview district, which is one of the most underserved neighborhoods in San Francisco.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

blair
California

From: Howard Fernandez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:24:13 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Howard
California

From: Cristian Avila
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:22:18 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Cristian
California

From: Jesse Atkinson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:19:56 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jesse
California

From: Katie Miles
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:18:35 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Katie
California

From: Lia Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Build onto the excellent job by ensuring Muni"s future
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:17:44 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Mayor Lurie---

I am impressed with the work you are doing and with what you've accomplished in a short time as our mayor.

Although I own and drive my car, by choice I use Muni and BART for the majority of my city and Bay Area travel. To prevent San Francisco from becoming another Venice whose workers live outside city limits, we must do everything we can to preserve socio-economic diversity in our city and that means ensuring our public transit system remains robust and continuously improving.

I am with the focus groups who, with your help, have identified four core principles for a parcel tax proposal:

1) Justification: Growing current service to account for the inevitable off schedule/out of service run, ensure equity, coverage, and service hours for all
2) Fairness: variable rate for property owners depending on the size and unit number of owned property(ies)
3) Language to emphasize that these parcel taxes are not intended to and should not be passed on to tenants
4) Be forward looking by scaling the tax for inflation and rising costs

Thank you Mayor Lurie! Keep up your good work,

Lia Smith
Portola Neighborhood
San Francisco

Lia
California

From: Shayan Panjwani
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:11:43 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Shayan
California

From: Brynne Burns
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:08:41 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Brynne
California

From: Kristin Tieche
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:04:41 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Kristin
California

From: Bryan Deng
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:04:17 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Bryan
California

From: W Chan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:04:17 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

My family has been car free for 25 years. We depend on public transportation to meet our daily needs.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

W
California

From: claire alloway
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:03:33 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

claire
California

From: Shoshannah Flach
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:02:24 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Shoshannah
California

From: Wanda Nichols
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:00:46 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Wanda
California

From: Gabriel Quiroz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:59:53 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Gabriel
California

From: Betty Kissilove
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:59:14 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it's important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I strongly urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Betty
California

From: Lisa Lu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:58:22 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Lisa
California

From: Cyrus Hall
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:58:05 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Cyrus
California

From: Belen Bravo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:57:20 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Belen
California

From: Jennifer Willis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:57:13 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jennifer
California

From: Jason Kruta
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:56:57 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jason
California

From: Theresa McGovern
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:56:28 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Theresa
California

From: Gregory Stevens
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:55:39 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Gregory
California

From: Nithin Kumar
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:53:50 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Nithin
California

From: Gabe Goffman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:52:25 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Gabe
California

From: Sean Sharp
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:51:11 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Sean
California

From: David Tatarakis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support additional funding for Muni
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:51:04 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I live in SF and get around exclusively by public transportation. Muni is essential for all of my daily activities. It is crucial that service is frequent and lasts all day.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the deficit. Please ensure that whatever measures are moved forward allow for Muni to not only avoid shrinking but continue to grow to meet the needs of people like me. It isn't enough for us to narrowly avoid cliff after cliff. We need to know that Muni is on solid ground and can be relied upon for years to come. We need to see service improved and expanded. Thank you very much.

David
California

From: Shikha Srinivas
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:51:00 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I love not owning a car in the city and take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Shikha
California

From: Luis Guzman
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:50:37 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Luis
California

From: Samantha Alvarez
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:50:27 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Samantha
California

From: Tristan Campbell
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:49:29 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Tristan
California

From: Lydia W
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:47:58 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Lydia
California

From: Kian Behroozi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:47:56 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Kian
California

From: Surekha Boyd
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:47:38 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Surekha
California

From: Isaac Mays-Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:46:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Isaac
California

From: Hayden Smith
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:46:42 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Hayden
California

From: Justin Philipps
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:46:02 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Justin
Ohio

From: raclyde959@gmail.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:21:24 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

California

From: Cat Carter
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:29:16 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

However, we need to do more than just fill the current gap. We need to continually grow and improve service to attract more riders and meet our City's equity and climate goals. Increasing Muni ridership needs to be an ongoing goal of SFMTA and the City.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Cat
California

From: CARL STEIN
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:09:30 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

CARL
California

From: Shiwei Yan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:07:28 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Shiwei
California

From: Richard Gallo
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:10:59 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Richard
California

From: Justin Philipps
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 6:33:51 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Justin
Ohio

From: Andy Luan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 5:43:08 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Andy
California

From: AJ cho
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 4:28:53 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

AJ
California

From: edna kozikaro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 1:28:12 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

I've used public transportation in this city since moving here in 2008 for college. It's always both had problems, and fallen short of what San Franciscans deserve from their transit systems, and yet been one of the strongest systems in the country. The degradation of public transit, in favor of privately owned car services, has to stop.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

edna
California

From: Marla Flores-Jauregui
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 1:21:44 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Marla
California

From: Leonor Melara
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 12:55:39 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Leonor
California

From: Eileen Bernhardi
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 12:19:02 PM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Please be civilized and public spirited, not a privatized barbarian.
I'm sure you never take public transportation, but I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Eileen
California

From: Colleen Beach
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:29:53 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take Muni every day, and am proud to live in a city where I do not need to own a car, but when buses don't show up or are too crowded to board, I'm late to work and appointments.

I'm grateful you're working on a ballot measure to fund transit to maintain service and reduce the deficit.

Please ensure this measure generates enough to grow service by 10%, scales with inflation, uses fair variable rates based on property size, and wherever possible protects tenants from passed-through costs.

Colleen
California

From: Jennifer Willis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:26:33 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Jennifer
California

From: Addison Luria-Roberson
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:06:35 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing in support of a funding measure which expands Muni service beyond what it is today. Muni connects me to the city, my friends, and my communities. It allows me to live car free and help protect our environment. It allows me to afford a very expensive and unequal city.

Muni is convenient and accesible for me, but the service, despite being the best it's been in years, is inadequate for many. The modest cuts months ago have left the 7 Haight crowded and unpleasant. The metro meltdown last week showed how critical a functional Muni is.

Please support to growth of Muni. Please support funding to enable Muni to develop their property in ways that increase revenue and allow for more development. San Francisco was built on top of transit and we should continue our history by building publicly managed housing that funds the infrastructure it relies on. San Francisco led the country by establishing the first publicly owned transportation agency. We have the option to lead the country again by solving our systemic lack of funding and showing there is a way to sustainably move the people.

In the face of a federal government intent on destruction, we should pick up the slack.

I support Muni Forever in their requested ballot measure features, listed below:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Addison
California

From: Irene Ly
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:55:48 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Irene
California

From: Patricia D
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:45:56 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Patricia
California

From: Carrie Leung
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:27:49 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Carrie
California

From: Matt Jalbert
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:27:37 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I regularly use San Francisco's Muni to get around town. I can see that it's vitally important that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

We cannot let Muni service decline. We must adequately & sustainably fund our public transportation.

Sincerely,
Matt Jalbert
Potrero Hill

Matt
California

From: Genevieve Fujimoto
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:27:25 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Genevieve
California

From: Wanda Nichols
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:13:08 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Wanda
California

From: Daniel Kim
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:12:24 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Daniel
California

From: Clay Helms
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:53:31 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Clay
California

From: Maddy Tenzer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:52:00 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

HELLO!!!

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Maddy
California

From: Pavel Paramonov
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:50:14 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Pavel
California

From: L. Diaz
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:35:56 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

L.
California

From: Meagan Cummins
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Muni Funding - Top of Mind
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:30:40 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Hi Mayor Lurie,

Thank you for working on a ballot measure that addresses the large deficit Muni and ensures maintaining service for Muni. Public transit makes it easier, safer, and more enjoyable for everyone to exist in San Francisco.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

I find that the 22 line is constantly overcrowded during the week after work. I love taking the N but in the summer on baseball game days it can be unbearable.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

Large businesses benefit the most from public transit. They rely on the city to bring their workers into the office. I would like to see this need reflected in funding.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Living in the Sunset means it can take 45min-1hour for me to reach the downtown commercial district where many shopping opportunities, entertainment venues, and offices are. I am heavily dependent on public transit to reach this area of the city.

Hearing threats to transit funding coming up year after year is so dissapointing when I think we should be moving towards transit expansion. I've had two knee surgeries and have lasting pain issues. When public transit is cut, I lose my ability to get around on my high pain days. Accessibility is something that will affect all of us, and public transit is one of the best ways to keep us connected and safe.

Thank you,
Meagan Cummins

Meagan
California

From: Brette Howard
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:24:07 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Brette
California

From: Shayan Bahrainy
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:08:25 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Convenient transit is part of what makes San Francisco great, I'd like to keep it that way.

Shayan
California

From: Sally Holland
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:06:50 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a SF resident with no car I am dependent on Muni and Caltrain.

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

Sally
California

From: flatter.tags.1s@icloud.com
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please support a visionary Muni funding measure
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 9:03:00 AM

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

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I take public transportation in San Francisco and it is important to me that our public transit system remains accessible, frequent, far-reaching, and covers most hours of the day and night.

Thank you for working on a ballot measure for San Francisco that addresses the large deficit and ensures maintaining service.

I urge you to ensure that the transit measure meets these four principles:

1. Generate enough revenue to grow current service by 10% so we can have less crowded buses and more buses where we need them the most.

2. Be structured fairly, with a variable rate so smaller properties pay less and larger properties pay more.

3. Wherever possible, do not pass through additional costs to tenants.

4. Scale with inflation and rising costs so the money from this measure will keep pace with inflation and we will have the same value in transit hours in ten years as we do next year.

California

Item 21

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); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	17 Letters regarding File No. 251080
Date:	Thursday, October 30, 2025 1:48:00 PM
Attachments:	17 Letters regarding File No. 251080.pdf

Hello,

Please see attached for 17 letters regarding File No. 251080.

> File No. 251080: Ordinance appropriating $3,500,000 from the General Reserve to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to expand access to existing coordinated immigrant legal and community response services in Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2026. (Chan, Fielder, Mahmood, Chen, Walton, Melgar)

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: Crystal Van
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Public Comment - Support for $3.5 Million Supplemental Budget for Immigration Legal Resources in SF
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 6:31:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Crystal Van and I am the Senior Program Manager for the Civic Engagement team at Chinese for Affirmative Action (CAA). This year, I have also been trained to be a dispatcher with the San Francisco Rapid Response Network hotline due to the influx of calls seeking consultation for immigration resources and legal services.

Immigrant service providers and community members across the Bay Area are facing an unprecedented threat from the current federal administration. Lawyers and legal practitioners are witnessing the unlawful arrest and detention of Bay Area residents right here in San Francisco. People who are following the legal process to live in this country are being taken into custody and deported after simply showing up for check-ins or court hearings.

I've heard from multiple residents throughout the Bay Area and across California who are terrified after receiving letters ordering them to appear in San Francisco. They've heard that others in the same situation have been detained and deported, and are seeking urgent guidance and assistance. These are targeted, strategic actions designed to mass deport our neighbors and families. Many are being removed without access to proper legal consultation or even knowing their basic constitutional rights.

Thankfully, because of decades of work by trusted immigrant rights organizations like SFILEN, SFILDC, and RRN, we have strong networks in place to provide emergency support. But with immigration-related detentions increasing by 900% (from 300 per day in 2024 to 3,000 per day in 2025 nationally) our networks are stretched to the limit. There's simply not enough staff and resources to provide comprehensive legal response, accompaniment, and emergency support with the current demand.

Last night at the IRC hearing, we heard from the Public Defender's Office that people are even being detained at 630 Sansome Street for more than 24 hours, and sometimes up to 72 hours. These holding cells are not meant for long-term detention and are unsafe for our residents. We need more support to combat these unjust tactics.

Therefore, I'm calling on the Board of Supervisors to invest in immigrant legal services and resources here in San Francisco by allocating $3.5 million funds to SFILEN, SFILDC, and

RRN in response to these reprehensible federal directives. We need more lawyers, more capacity, and stronger infrastructure to defend our communities. When the federal government violates constitutional rights, local and state governments must step up and protect our residents.

I urge you to stand firm in our commitment as a Sanctuary City, a home to vibrant, diverse immigrant communities, and to continue the fight against authoritarianism. Please fund our communities, fund our legal networks, and citywide immigrant rights collaborative.

Thank you President Mandelman, Budget Chair Chan, Supervisor Fielder, and other Supervisors for already spearheading these efforts!

--



Crystal Van | 文思

Chinese for Affirmative Action

Civic Engagement Program Manager

华人权益促进会 | 社区参与项目经理

she/her/她 | (415) 738-3354

cvan@caasf.org

CAA has multiple open positions. Apply now!

From: Annette Wong
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Public Comment re: Board of Supervisors Full Board Meeting 10/28/25
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:20:00 PM

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

Dear Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

Please accept my public comment below, in support of the city's investment of $3.5million in the San Francisco Immigrant Legal and Education Network, Rapid Response Network, and San Francisco Immigrant Legal Defense Collaborative:

Good afternoon, Supervisors,

My name is Annette Wong with Chinese for Affirmative Action, a founding member of the San Francisco Immigrant Legal and Education Network and partner on the San Francisco Rapid Response Network.

First, I want to acknowledge the moment. I think we're all breathing a sigh of relief that we are not a militarized war zone today. We want to thank the City and all the CBO partners in the house today for moving quickly and standing firm in response to last week's threats of federal troop deployment in San Francisco. The public statements, coordination, and outreach helped reassure immigrant communities that our city continues to stand with immigrants—especially in moments of fear and uncertainty.

But as we all know, this moment isn't over. The threat of heightened immigration enforcement in San Francisco and across the Bay Area remains real. People are still being harassed, detained, and deported every single day. Each day, we receive calls from community members who are afraid, they're afraid to go to work, they're hearing rumors of raids, and they're living in constant fear.

That's why this $3.5 million budget supplemental is so essential. These funds will strengthen the city's immigrant protection infrastructure so we can meet this crisis with coordination, compassion, and readiness.

Through these networks, we ensure that San Franciscans—no matter their language, income, or immigration status—have access to legal consultations and representation, trusted information, and on-the-ground response when enforcement occurs. These systems were built over years of partnership between community organizations and the City, and today they remain our first line of defense.

San Francisco's leadership has always shown the country what a true sanctuary city looks like—not just in name, but in action. This investment will help us continue that legacy: protecting families, safeguarding workers, and keeping our communities strong and united

in the face of federal overreach.

This supplemental reaffirms that in San Francisco, we don't turn our backs on immigrants—we stand together and we fight back.

Thank you to President Mandelman, Budget Chair Chan, Supervisor Fielder, and all the supervisors leading and supporting this effort.

Thank you!

-- Annette

--

Annette Wong | 王浩儀

Chinese for Affirmative Action

Managing Director of Programs

华人权益促进会 | 項目主任

(415) 274-6750x301

AWong@caasf.org

华促会现在有多个岗位开放招聘，欢迎申请！

From:	Adlah
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Birth Companions Community Center; verfre1@yahoo.com
Subject:	Corrected version: Public comment for increase spending immigration services SFILDC
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:20:33 PM

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

Please use this version:

Hello Supervisors,

I, Veronica Fregoso, Executive Director of the Birth Companion Community Center and doulas of BCCC, we are urging you to increase funding for immigration services and immigration legal services.

This funding is essential for immigrant families we support every day through free doula care, which improves maternal health, reduces stress during pregnancy, and strengthens family stability. Families navigating immigration challenges while preparing to welcome a baby deserve real support and not barriers.

This investment also creates career pathways for immigrant women to become trained doulas, providing culturally-rooted care within their own communities while earning a sustainable income.

When we fund immigration services, we fund health, dignity, and economic opportunity for families who are the backbone of San Francisco. We ask you to protect and expand this critical support. Thank you.

From:	Adlah
To:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc:	Birth Companions Community Center; verfre1@yahoo.com
Subject:	Public comment for increase spending immigration services SFILDC
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 4:16:19 PM

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

Hello Supervisors, my name is Adlah Chisti, and on behalf of Veronica Fregoso, Executive Director of the Birth Companion Community Center. We are urging you to increase funding for immigration services and immigration legal services.

This funding is essential for immigrant families we support every day through free doula care, which improves maternal health, reduces stress during pregnancy, and strengthens family stability. Families navigating immigration challenges while preparing to welcome a baby deserve real support and not barriers.

This investment also creates career pathways for immigrant women to become trained doulas, providing culturally-rooted care within their own communities while earning a sustainable income.

When we fund immigration services, we fund health, dignity, and economic opportunity for families who are the backbone of San Francisco. We ask you to protect and expand this critical support. Thank you.

From: Brian Huttenburg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support for funding for immigration legal services
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 3:31:30 PM

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

Good afternoon,

I am writing to express my strong support for the budget supplemental that would provide additional funding for legal services for the immigrant community. Please vote for the supplemental so our community can feel safe and protected from the attacks from the current administration in the White House. As a SF resident, I wholeheartedly support providing this additional funding.

Thank you,
Brian Huttenburg
3927 Lincoln Way
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: Chad Nico Hiu
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Public comment for BOS re: immigration
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:50:57 PM

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

Hello! Wanted to send a message speaking in favor of supplemental funding for immigration support services for public comment within the board of supervisors meeting/hearing that believe is taking place today. Thank you!

Chad Nico Hiu
+1 312 835 3842
@ChadNico

From: CuevasElvira, Alejandro
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Immigration Support Now
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 2:35:22 PM

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

To whom this may concern,

These funds and support were needed last year. With the recent news and often misinformation from our fed. government families are continuously living in anxiety and fear. As an educator and community school coordinator supporting families in this time has been challenging. Our school has had to collaborate on its own because of the lack of leadership from the district to the city. We need support now, support our families financially, support with access to quality lawyers and provide mental health services for our community. When we say we are sanctuary we need to mean it, we need a rapid response network that works. I hope we listen to the supervisors who are taking action in supporting our families and community for the better.

--
In Lak Ech,
Alejandro Cuevas
(he, him)
Community Schools Coordinator
Dolores Huerta Elementary
SFUSD

From: Fong, Brendan
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: SFUSD Educator Asking for Immigration Services
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:21:12 PM

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

Hello Board,

I strongly urge you to increase the funding for immigrant legal services in SF. As a lifelong D11 resident and current D11 public school educator, I know how critical immigrants are to our community. Everyone deserves the right to a lawyer including our vulnerable students and their families.

Please support the expansion of legal services in SF.

Thanks,
Brendan Fong

--



Brendan Fong (He/Him), Classroom Teacher
World History & Ethnic Studies
June Jordan School for Equity
325 La Grande Ave.
Occupied Ramaytush Ohlone Land
94112
fongb4@sfusd.edu

From: Philip von Furstenberg
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Funding legal resources
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 12:11:26 PM

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

Dear Board,
I am in my 20th year as a social worker with sfusd. Since the con-mander-in chief took office the requests I am receiving for legal services are growing. The access to affordable and free resources
however is dwindling. Please fund these organizations so our families can navigate the complex legal system in this country!!!

thanks!
Philip von Furstenberg

From: Jodi Tsapis
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Increase funding for immigrant families in SF
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:29:44 AM

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

Good morning!
I am a public high school social worker in San Francisco. Please know that many of our students and staff, along with families and residents all over the Bay Area, lived in fear when the current administration sent their troops to raid and terrorize our cities. Our attendance actually went down and we mobilized as a staff to provide resources to our community.

We need more viable and sustainable resources to support hard working youth and families who are here to live the "dream", work, study and live in peace.
I support increase funding to support immigrant families legally and with the RR hotline and services.
If the government in DC can not keep us safe and furthermore, profile and terrorize our communities, the City of SF will have to step in

Thank you for your time
Jodi Tsapis

--
Jodi Tsapis, LCSW, PPSC

From: Santarosa, Summer
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Need funding now!!
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:30:55 AM

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

We have a number of families very worried about being deported and are asking the teachers to take guardianship of the students to prepare. We need more support so that we can provide the peace of mind to families that this city is fighting for them and wants them to stay together with their children!! Please consider what it would be like for you to ask your student's teacher to be their guardian should something happen to you.. we need support!!

--
Summer Santarosa, LCSW, PPSC
(She, her, hers)
School Social Worker
Harvey Milk Civil Rights Academy
P: 415) 241-6276 Ext. 35753

Resources

If you are experiencing an emergency and need immediate support, please call 911.
SFUSD Family Resource Link Line: 415-340-1716, Monday thru Friday, 9am - 1pm
For Families experiencing homelessness contact one of the city's Access Points:

- Central City Access Point- 415-644-0504
- Bayview Access Point- 415-430-6320
- Mission Access Point - 415-972-128

San Francisco Comprehensive Child Crisis: (415) 970-3800
The 24/7 Safe & Sound TALK Line: 415-441-KIDS (415-441-5437)
Crisis Hotline / SF Suicide Prevention Hotline: 988

From: Rugama, Candida
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Immigrant Legal Services
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 10:21:17 AM

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

Please provide desperately needed increase for the costs of immigration legal services fees for our immigrants who chose this sanctuary city as a place of refuge. Immigrants are the foundation of this country and they contribute to all communites on a micro and macro level. They care for our children, put food on our table, and provide essential services for the betterment of everyone. Legal services for immigration leave many of these families with debt for many years and in an impoverished state. Many work several jobs just to stay above water. Please consider providing more funds towards immigration legal services to support our immigrants.

--In community,

Candida (Karla) Rugama, ASW, PPSC
School Social Worker
Marina Middle School
3500 Fillmore Street
San Francisco, Ca 94123
Main Office: 415-749-3495

CONFIDENTIAL STUDENT INFORMATION

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the designated SFUSD recipient(s) with a legitimate educational interest and may contain legally confidential information protected by the Family Education Rights Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 USC 1232g. Any unauthorized review, use, distribution or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply by email and destroy all copies of the original message. This email cannot be produced for a records request.

Crisis Services-
If you or someone you know is experiencing a mental health crisis
needing immediate assistance please reach out to one of the following:

Servicios de Crisis:
Si usted o alguien que usted conoce está pasando por una crisis de salud mental y si necesita asistencia inmediata, comuníquese con uno de los siguientes:

危机服务
如果您或您认识的人正经历心理健康危机，
需要立即援助，请联系以下资源之一：

- *Child Crisis:* ***415-970-3800 or 415-970-4000***
- *Crisis Hotline / SF Suicide Prevention Hotline:* ***(415) 781-0500***
- *Crisis TEXT Line: text* ***HOME to 741-741***
- Seneca Mobile Crisis Response: **(877) 441-1089**
- *National Suicide Prevention Hotline:* ***1-800-273-8255***
- *24-hr Child Protective Services (CPS) Hotline:* ***800-856-5553***
    - *Parents can self-report or just seek consultation*

- *The Safe & Sound TALK Line:* ***415-441-KIDS (415-441-5437)***
    - *Provides 24-hour parental stress phone support*
- *SAMHSA Disaster Distress Helpline:* ***1-800-985-5990 or text TalkWithUS 66746”***

- ***Rapid Response Network: 415-200-1548/Website:http//sfilen.org/ Support for immigrant families facing immigration enforcement actions.***

From: Delallana, Romyl
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support for Increased Funding for Immigrant Legal Services
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:55:45 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want to express my full support for increasing funding for immigrant legal services in San Francisco. As a school social worker, I witness firsthand the deep impact that immigration-related fears have on our students and their families.

When students worry about their family members' safety or possible separation, their anxiety levels rise significantly. This affects their ability to focus, learn, and feel secure in the classroom. Many of our young people carry the weight of uncertainty about their loved ones' future — an emotional burden that no child should have to bear.

Our immigrant legal services, including the rapid response hotline and access to free attorneys, provide critical stability and reassurance to families during times of crisis. These services are not just about legal representation; they are about preserving the sense of safety and belonging that every child needs to thrive.

I urge you to support the proposed supplemental funding for immigrant legal services and to continue standing with immigrant youth and their caregivers. Your leadership can make a direct, tangible difference in the emotional well-being and academic success of countless students across our city.

Thank you for your time and continued commitment to equity and justice for our immigrant communities.

In community,

--
Romyl De la Llana
Civic Center Secondary School
727 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-504-1506

School Social Worker | SFUSD/SFCOE | 415.504.1506
"I am no longer accepting the things I cannot change. I am changing the things I cannot accept".
— Angela Davis

CONFIDENTIAL STUDENT INFORMATION:
This e-mail message is for the sole use of the designated SFUSD recipient(s) with a legitimate educational interest and may contain legally confidential information protected by the Family Education Rights Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 USC 1232g. Any unauthorized review, use, distribution or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. This email cannot be produced for a records request.

From: Woehl, Dawn B.
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Supporting Legal Services for Immigrants
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:35:32 AM

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

Dear members of the Board of Supervisors,

I'm a school social worker in SFUSD, and I work closely with students and families who are part of our city's immigrant community. Every day I see how much these families contribute to our schools and neighborhoods, and also how challenging it can be for them to navigate complex systems on their own.

At our school, we share information about the rapid response hotline and immigrant legal services so families know where to turn if they need trusted legal help or support in an emergency. We view this as an important safety measure that helps families feel more informed and connected.

These services make a real difference in reducing fear and uncertainty, allowing kids to stay focused on learning and families to remain stable and supported. Strengthening this kind of help is one of the most direct ways our city can promote the wellbeing and success of young people.

I hope you'll consider increasing funding for these programs so more families can access the help they need.

Thank you for your time and for your commitment to our community.

Sincerely,

--
Dawn Woehl, MSW, PPSC, NBCT
Wellness Coordinator
San Francisco International High School
655 De Haro Street
San Francisco CA 94107
(415) 695-5781 x 1216 | Phone
My Pronouns: She/her



SFI Wellness Referral Form 2025-26

RESOURCES:

If you or someone you know is experiencing a mental health crisis, please reach out:

- The Safe & Sound TALK Line: 415-441-KIDS (415-441-5437)
- 24-hr Child Crisis: (628) 217-7000 only de-escalation and hospitalization (no welfare checks)
- National Suicide Prevention Hotline: 1-800-273-8255

CONFIDENTIAL STUDENT INFORMATION:
This e-mail message is for the sole use of the designated SFUSD recipient(s) with a legitimate educational interest and may contain legally confidential information protected by the Family Education Rights Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 USC 1232g. Any unauthorized review, use, distribution or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. This email cannot be produced for a records request.

From: Jackson, Fiona
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Support for increased funding for immigration legal services
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:03:55 AM

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

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my support of increasing funding for immigration legal services. I work in an elementary school and see directly how important it is to provide critical support to youth and families at this time. Services like the rapid response network and legal support are extremely necessary, and I hope the increased funding is approved.

Thank you,

--
Fiona Jackson, MSW, PPSC (she/they)
School Social Worker
Sherman Elementary
+1 628-900-4497
1651 Union St, San Francisco, CA 94123

SFUSD Family Resource Link
familylink@sfusd.edu, 415-340-1716, M-F 9am-1pm

Food, Shelter & Medical Resources
Dial 3-1-1 (within SF) or 415-701-2311 (TTY 415-701-2323), 24 hours/365 days. 你需要中文幫助嗎？撥打3-1-1 ¿Necesitas ayuda en español? Telefonear 3-1-1

Crisis Services
In case of emergency, call 911. If you or someone you know is experiencing a mental health crisis and in need of assistance, please contact one of the following:

- Child Crisis: 415-970-3800 for de-escalation or hospitalization
- Crisis Hotline / SF Suicide Prevention Hotline: 415-781-0500
- National Suicide Prevention Hotline: 1-800-273-8255
- Safe & Sound Parent TALK Line: 415-441-KIDS (5437)
- SAMHSA Disaster Distress Helpline: 1-800-985-5990 or text TalkWithUS 66746

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email is for the sole use of the designated SFUSD recipient(s) with a legitimate educational interest and may contain legally confidential information protected by the Family Education Rights Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 USC 1232g. Any unauthorized review, use, distribution or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original email. This email cannot be produced for a records request.

From: Eli Rico Mosby
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Supplemental Funding for Immigration Services_RICO MOSBY, ELIZABETH
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 10:39:07 PM
Attachments: Outlook-od5ibxb1.png
Outlook-mobilePhon.png
Outlook-emailAddre.png
Outlook-website.png
Outlook-address.png

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Elizabeth (Eli) Rico Mosby, and I am writing to express my strong support for the $3.5 million supplemental funding request for immigration services. This funding will allow immigrant-serving organizations to continue providing critical legal representation, community education, and emergency response; services that keep families together and uphold San Francisco's long-standing sanctuary commitment.

I have worked in immigration law in San Francisco for over seven years, supporting immigrant families who continue to fight for the same safety and dignity that so many of our own families once hoped for. Through my work with La Raza Community Resource Center as a DOJ Accredited Representative and Legal Coordinator, and now with Mission Action as a Defensive Immigration Intern, I have seen firsthand how this work is made possible through the City's investment in SFILEN, SFILDC, and the San Francisco Rapid Response Network. These programs make it possible for allies and advocates like myself and many others to continue helping families access protection, legal representation, and hope.

The organizations that make up SFILEN, Rapid Response, and SFILDC provide direct legal representation and critical support to hundreds of immigrants and their families each year. Together, they handle cases involving asylum, deportation defense, family petitions, U visas for survivors of violence, and work authorization applications, amongst others. They are the backbone of San Francisco's safety net for immigrant families, ensuring that when someone is detained there is an attorney ready to respond, when a family receives a Notice to Appear there is someone who can explain their rights, and when a child faces separation from their beloved parents there is a team working to keep them safe and together.

However, resources are stretched to the limit. Caseloads have grown while funding has not kept pace with the urgent need. Limited funding restricts the ability of our

organizations to maintain stable staffing and infrastructure at a time when the demand for immigration representation continues to grow with each new set of procedural and policy changes issued by the Department of Homeland Security and United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. These changes are occurring with unprecedented speed, creating new requirements, deadlines, and filing obligations that make each case more complex and time-intensive. Without adequate funding, our legal teams struggle to maintain the level of responsiveness and preparation that these developments require, weakening the city's coordinated response and leaving many families without the representation they urgently need.

The proposed $3.5 million in supplemental funding will make a tangible difference by strengthening organizational capacity through competitive and equitable staff compensation, retention of experienced attorneys and paralegals, and the addition of essential administrative support to improve coordination and compliance. It will also help ensure that legal and education partners can continue providing consistent outreach, community workshops, and high-quality representation that hundreds of San Franciscans rely on each year. This investment will safeguard and bolster the city's immigrant legal infrastructure and ensure its long-term stability and effectiveness.

This support not only provides safety and stability for immigrant families but also gives them the freedom to live without fear, to step out of the shadows, and to fully contribute to the social, commercial, and economic success of San Francisco. Our city thrives when immigrants are able to work openly, build businesses, and participate in civic life. When we invest in immigrant protection, we invest in the strength and prosperity of San Francisco itself.

I want to thank all the Board of Supervisors members for continuing to stand with our immigrant community and for defending the values that make this city a true sanctuary. Supporting this funding means supporting the families, workers, and students who make San Francisco thrive. It also builds lasting civic trust and goodwill among communities who see and remember which leaders stand with them. That trust strengthens not only our neighborhoods but the shared future we all build together.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your continued commitment to immigrant justice.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth (Eli) Rico Mosby

Eli Rico Mosby

Paralegal Intern

(415) 413-7825

eli.ricomosby@missionaction.org

https://www.missionaction.org

938 Valencia St., San Francisco, CA 94110

New Name, Same Mission. Dolores Street Community Services is now Mission Action.

From: Brandon Vesely
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Please increase funding for immigration legal services
Date: Monday, October 27, 2025 5:11:50 PM
Attachments: 16394899528995018057.png
5643593872609491825.png
18271497119923800441.png
680551313875240095.png
4855043102770798438.png

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

My name is Brandon Vesely, and I am an immigration attorney with Mission Action, a non-profit organization located in District 9.

I write to express my strong support for the supplemental budget request for immigration legal services co-sponsored by Supervisors Chan, Chen, Walton, Fielder, and Mahmood. City funding enables Mission Action, alongside a robust network of non-profit organizations, to provide a wide range of services to San Francisco's immigrant community, including but not limited to, full-scope representation for residents at risk of deportation and emergency legal interventions for San Francisco residents that are arrested by ICE. Several weeks ago, a colleague and I raced to ICE's offices on 630 Sansome Street after ICE kidnapped one of our neighbors at a routine immigration court hearing, despite his pending application for asylum. As part of our network's response, a partner organization filed a habeas petition and secured his release the same day.

Nonetheless, existing funding levels are not adequate to sustain the level of services that this moment requires. The dedicated team of legal advocates that I work with are increasingly struggling to meet the overwhelming need for immigration legal services and interventions amidst the Trump administration's escalating attacks on immigrants. The stakes have never been higher for our immigrant neighbors. Just last week, the administration threatened to unleash masked ICE officers, supported by the national guard, on the streets of San Francisco harass and detain immigrant community members. Please meet the urgency of this moment and stand up for San Francisco's most vulnerable residents by approving this important supplemental budget request.

Sincerely,
Brandon Vesely

Brandon Vesely

Senior Attorney

(415) 857-7765

brandon.vesely@missionaction.org

https://www.missionaction.org

938 Valencia St., San Francisco, CA 94110

New Name, Same Mission. Dolores Street Community Services is now Mission Action.

Item 22

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Do You Believe it"s Right for San Francisco to Take Half a Century to Construct Curb Ramps at All Required Locations?
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:33:00 AM
Attachments:	CurbRamps - Capital Budget Memo 6-19-20_Redacted.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Howard Chabner regarding curb ramps.

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: Howard Chabner <hlchabner@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 5:55 PM
To: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Burke, Robyn (BOS) <robyn.burke@sfgov.org>; SherrillStaff <SherrillStaff@sfgov.org>; Del Rosario, Mick (BOS) <mick.delrosario@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <Stephen.Sherrill@sfgov.org>; SauterStaff <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; Nagano, Tomio (BOS) <tomio.nagano@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; MahmoodStaff <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Logan, Samantha (BOS) <sam.logan@sfgov.org>; FielderStaff <FielderStaff@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; ChenStaff <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Li.Lovett@sfgov.org; Snyder, Jen (BOS) <jen.snyder@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Quan, Daisy (RET - Contractor) <daisy.quan@sfgov.org>; Fregosi, Ian (BOS) <ian.fregosi@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; Romaidis, John (REC) <john.romaidis@sfgov.org>; Jensen, Kevin (DPW) <Kevin.W.Jensen@sfdpw.org>; Kaplan, Debby (HSA) <deborah.kaplan@sfgov.org>; MDC (ADM) <MDC@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Pearman, Rick

(DPW) <Rick.Pearman@sfdpw.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Gelardin, Eli (HSA) <eli.gelardin@sfgov.org>; Smolinski, Helen (HSA) <helen.smolinski@sfgov.org>; Macfie, William (BOS) <william.macfie@sfgov.org>; Jones, Ej (MYR) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>; Slaughter, Staci (MYR) <staci.slaughter@sfgov.org>; Chu, Carmen (ADM) <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>; Short, Carla (DPW) <Carla.Short@sfdpw.org>; Petrucione, Katharine (ADM) <katharine.petrucione@sfgov.org>; Gelardin, Eli (HSA) <eli.gelardin@sfgov.org>
Cc: tkpendergast@live.com; jd.morris@sfchronicle.com; fenston@wamu.org; rswan@sfchronicle.com; nora.mishanec@sfchronicle.com; ricardo.cano@sfchronicle.com; michael.barba@sfchronicle.com; PHartlaub@sfchronicle.com; 'Howard Chabner ' <hlchabner@comcast.net>; 'Cabanatuan, Michael' <mcabanatuan@sfchronicle.com>; 'Douglas L Comstock' <dougcomz@mac.com>; Tim@48Hills.org; tips@sfstandard.com; han@sfstandard.com; ggreschler@sfstandard.com; knguyen@sfstandard.com
Subject: FW: Do You Believe it's Right for San Francisco to Take Half a Century to Construct Curb Ramps at All Required Locations?

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

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors President Mandelman, Supervisors, and City employees:

Please see my email below. **Per the curb ramp dashboard linked below, at the current rate, all of the required curb ramps will be completed 14 to 23 years from 2025. That's just not right.**

Over the years I've met with DPW curb ramp program staff. A number of years ago I was told by a couple of them who are now retired that the headcount for the curb ramp program had been severely cut. They were justifiably frustrated, to say the least. It's my understanding that the curb ramp budget and staffing have increased this year or will increase in the coming fiscal year to around $6 or $6.5 million. I believe that it went down to $2 million or $3 million during some of the London Breed years, which was a pittance. So although the percentage increase may be high, that's like saying that a two celled organism that has divided and become a four celled organism has grown tremendously. The absolute number is still small. It's only a four celled organism. The curb ramp budget was about $6 million seven or eight years ago, so on an inflation-adjusted basis, the new budget is still lower.

From the 2024 Capital Plan webpage (link below):

“The estimated cost to continue the current curb ramp program is $115.6 million over the next 10 years. The Plan recommends $48.9 million from the General Fund towards this need. An additional $17.9 million is expected from State and Prop K funding.”

My comments: How many curb ramps can $11.5 million buy each year? And these numbers indicate there will be a shortfall of around $48 million. How does CCSF propose to fill the gap? Also note that the five-year plan anticipates large budget shortfalls for the next five years. CCSF should set aside money in a trust or escrow to be used only for curb ramps.

"As Public Works develops an overarching strategy to tackle the most structurally complex curb ramp locations, some planning and design work has begun for curb ramps with sub-sidewalk basements (over 100 confirmed locations citywide, with hundreds more under investigation), which are significantly more challenging and expensive to address than those in the standard curb ramp program."

"The estimated cost for curb ramps with sub-sidewalk basements is $107 million over the next 10 years, which will be addressed as funds allow from the General Fund Pay-Go Program."

My comments: I and others were told at least 10 years ago that they developed a strategy for corners with sub-sidewalk basements, and that funds would be set aside every year. From personal experience and from meetings and other communications with DPW curb ramp program staff, I believe that most locations with sub-sidewalk basements are in the financial district (especially on Kearny) and North Beach. Dozens of locations where I requested curb ramps 10 years ago or more have been inspected and determined to have sub-sidewalk basements. My strong hunch is that there are not "hundreds" that have not yet been identified. Also, it seems that the pay-go program is essentially "if we have money left over" – meaning there is no real commitment. There is no way to address disability civil rights. DPW did a great design and project management job at Sutter/Stockton where there are sub-sidewalk basements, but it took seven years from my most recent complaint and, given the extremely high volume of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, it should have been one of the highest priority locations in the City decades earlier. In my experience, DPW's curb ramp designs are excellent. The problem is that curb ramps are and have been a very low priority for the mayors and Board of Supervisors.

https://onesanfrancisco.org/cap-plan-2024/infrastructure-streets-enhancement-projects#:~:text=The%20estimated%20cost%20to%20continue%20the%20current,expected%20from%20State%20and%20Prop%20K%20funding.

The attached Capital Budget Memo dated June 19, 2020, indicates reductions in various programs and projects for fiscal years 2021 and 2022. The high scenario (highest budget and lowest reduction of the scenarios presented) for curb ramps, potholes, structures, and sidewalks is a proposed amount of around $18.4 million, which is 50% of the original request. The memo doesn't break down the dollars into the four areas, nor does it say what a "structure" is. It's not entirely clear, but it appears that the $18.4 million figure is for both years together, not individually.

As an aside: The low scenario eliminates the following altogether: City Hall

wheelchair lift, 1235 Mission elevator, and MOD planning. MOD/ODA planning should never be on the chopping block, even in a low-budget scenario.

Disabled individuals, including myself, have been complaining for years about the broken wheelchair lift at the main entrance to City Hall. Most recently I complained on July 27, 2024. ODA (formerly MOD) put me in touch with the City's District Project Director, who is coordinating a project to install a new wheelchair lift. He shared rough plans and details of the lift with me; in my view they chose a good make and model and the plans look good. Historic preservation work is required. Completion is expected in June 2026. The lift had been broken on and off for at least 10 years and repairs never lasted long; it was probably out of service far more than in service. (I've asked about this but never received an answer.) Although there are accessible entrances at Van Ness and at Grove, ensuring that the main, ceremonial, and grand entrance to SF's magnificent City Hall remains accessible to people with mobility disabilities should have been a priority; unfortunately it wasn't. As a volunteer tour guide for 12+ years, I know how beloved the building is and what a wonderful first impression the main entrance makes. Everyone should have the opportunity to experience it.

Please treat curb ramps as the disability civil right they are, take them seriously, and do the things requested in the last paragraph below.

Sincerely

Howard Chabner

From: Howard Chabner <hlchabner@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 10:51 PM
To: 'daniel.lurie@sfgov.org' <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; 'Robyn.Burke@sfgov.org' <Robyn.Burke@sfgov.org>; 'sherrillstaff@sfgov.org' <sherrillstaff@sfgov.org>; 'Mick.DelRosario@sfgov.org' <Mick.DelRosario@sfgov.org>; 'stephen.sherrill@SFgov.org' <stephen.sherrill@SFgov.org>; 'SauterStaff@sfgov.org' <SauterStaff@sfgov.org>; 'Tomio.Nagano@sfgov.org' <Tomio.Nagano@sfgov.org>; 'Danny.sauter@sfgov.org' <Danny.sauter@sfgov.org>; 'MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org' <MahmoodStaff@sfgov.org>; 'bilal.mahmood@SFgov.org' <bilal.mahmood@SFgov.org>; 'Sam.Logan@SFgov.org' <Sam.Logan@SFgov.org>; 'fielderstaff@sfgov.org' <fielderstaff@sfgov.org>; 'jackie.fielder@sfgov.org' <jackie.fielder@sfgov.org>; 'Jennifer.Ferrigno@sfgov.org' <Jennifer.Ferrigno@sfgov.org>; 'ChenStaff@sfgov.org' <ChenStaff@sfgov.org>; 'chyanne.chen@SFgov.org' <chyanne.chen@SFgov.org>; 'Jackie.Prager@sfgov.org' <Jackie.Prager@sfgov.org>; 'Lauren.L.Chung@sfgov.org' <Lauren.L.Chung@sfgov.org>; 'Li.Lovett@sfgov.org' <Li.Lovett@sfgov.org>; 'Jen.Snyder@sfgov.org' <Jen.Snyder@sfgov.org>; 'Kyle.Smeallie@sfgov.org' <Kyle.Smeallie@sfgov.org>; 'chanstaff@sfgov.org' <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; 'Daisy.Quan@sfgov.org' <Daisy.Quan@sfgov.org>; 'Ian.Fregosi@sfgov.org' <Ian.Fregosi@sfgov.org>; 'Natalie.Gee@sfgov.org' <Natalie.Gee@sfgov.org>; 'Connie.Chan@sfgov.org'

<Connie.Chan@sfgov.org>; 'rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org' <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; 'shamann.walton@sfgov.org' <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; 'Myrna Melgar' <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; 'melgarstaff@sfgov.org' <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; 'joel.engardio@sfgov.org' <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; 'matt.dorsey@sfgov.org' <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; 'Madison.R.Tam@sfgov.org' <Madison.R.Tam@sfgov.org>; 'alisa.somera@sfgov.org' <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; 'Ginsburg, Phil (REC)' <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; 'recpark.commission@sfgov.org' <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; Romaidis, John (ADM) <john.romaidis@sfgov.org>; Jensen, Kevin (DPW) <Kevin.W.Jensen@sfdpw.org>; 'Kaplan, Deborah (ADM)' <deborah.kaplan@sfgov.org>; 'MDC (ADM)' <MDC@sfgov.org>; 'Board of Supervisors' <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>; 'Pearman, Rick (DPW)' <Rick.Pearman@sfdpw.org>; 'engardiostaff@sfgov.org' <engardiostaff@sfgov.org>; 'DorseyStaff@sfgov.org' <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; 'waltonstaff@sfgov.org' <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Gelardin, Eli (HSA) <eli.gelardin@sfgov.org>; Smolinski, Helen (HSA) <helen.smolinski@sfgov.org>
Cc: 'tkpendergast@live.com' <tkpendergast@live.com>; 'jd.morris@sfchronicle.com' <jd.morris@sfchronicle.com>; 'fenston@wamu.org' <fenston@wamu.org>; 'rswan@sfchronicle.com' <rswan@sfchronicle.com>; 'nora.mishanec@sfchronicle.com' <nora.mishanec@sfchronicle.com>; 'ricardo.cano@sfchronicle.com' <ricardo.cano@sfchronicle.com>; 'michael.barba@sfchronicle.com' <michael.barba@sfchronicle.com>; 'PHartlaub@sfchronicle.com' <PHartlaub@sfchronicle.com>; 'Howard Chabner ' <hlchabner@comcast.net>; 'Cabanatuan, Michael' <mcabanatuan@sfchronicle.com>; 'Douglas L Comstock' <dougcomz@mac.com>; 'Tim@48Hills.org' <Tim@48Hills.org>; 'tips@sfstandard.com' <tips@sfstandard.com>; 'han@sfstandard.com' <han@sfstandard.com>; 'ggreschler@sfstandard.com' <ggreschler@sfstandard.com>; 'knguyen@sfstandard.com' <knguyen@sfstandard.com>
Subject: Do You Believe it's Right for San Francisco to Take Half a Century to Construct Curb Ramps at All Required Locations?

Dear Mayor Lurie, Board of Supervisors President Mandelman, Supervisors, and City employees:

You may be tired of my emails about curb ramps and other disability access/disability rights issues regarding the public right-of-way. Be assured, I'm orders of magnitude more tired of having to send them.

Half a Century. According to the most recent DPW Curb Ramp Fact Sheet/Dashboard (run date June 10, 2025), as of March 12, 2025, only 77 % of existing or potential locations in San Francisco had curb ramps in good condition. 6,209 buildable locations comprising 15% of buildable locations had no curb ramps at all (and never have had), 2,277 (5%) of existing curb ramps were in poor condition, and 1,209 (2%) were in fair condition. This, 33 years after the 1992 effective date of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. At the rate of 1% to 2% progress per year for the past several years as shown on the report, it would take an additional 11 to 23 years from 2025 to complete the remaining 23% of locations. **In other words, an individual born in 1992 would be between 44 and 56 years old when all locations have curb ramps in good condition! Do you think that's**

right?

Moreover, I don't know how often curb ramps are inspected, but based on my frequent observations over many years, it's quite likely there are more in poor or fair condition than stated in the report.

Per the report, the largest source of curb ramp construction and funding by far is the Street Resurfacing Program. The Curb Ramp Program has constructed and funded an average of only around 154 curb ramps per year in the past five years. The goal for the current year is 145. A standard intersection of two streets has four corners, and two curb ramps are required at each corner. If eight new curb ramps are constructed at an intersection, that means only about 18 intersections would be done in the current year under the Curb Ramp Program. The number might be somewhat higher because fewer than eight are needed at intersections where one or more corners already have good curb ramps.

The report is at DPW's Curb Ramp Program webpage: go to Learn More toward the bottom of the page and click on Curb Ramp Program Facts and Figures.
https://sfpublicworks.org/index.php/services/curbrampprogram

The Curb Ramp Program includes curb ramps constructed in response to requests/complaints from the public and those constructed on the program's own initiative. Other sources of curb ramp funding and construction include transportation, sewer, streetscape, and private projects (when a new building is built or an existing one undergoes major renovations, the owner is required to construct or fund curb ramps on the corners adjacent to the project). It certainly makes sense to try to have curb ramps constructed and/or funded by these sources when feasible, killing two birds with one stone and avoiding duplication of effort, but not when that means allowing dangerous, unequal, and unlawful conditions to fester and worsen for many years.

Sutter/Stockton. On April 19, 2012 I complained about this intersection; my email to DPW stated in relevant part: "Sutter and Stockton – SW, SE and NW corners. Each of these corners has only one curb ramp, and the curb ramp is either in disrepair or is too steep. All three of these corners need two new curb ramps."

I was almost hit by a bus on July 6, 2018 because there was no curb ramp in the direction I was crossing at one of the corners mentioned above. I previously forwarded you my email of July 8, 2018 entitled "Almost hit by a bus on Friday because of no curb ramp" that described what happened. In response to my recent inquiry, DPW told me that new curb ramps at all four corners were completed in May 2025 and as of early June there were still some small punch list items. I haven't been there recently but from the photos they sent, the new curb ramps look terrific.

A block from Union Square, Sutter/Stockton has heavy pedestrian and vehicular traffic. It's probably one of the busiest pedestrian intersections in San Francisco. At one corner is a pedestrian and vehicular entrance/exit to the City-owned 1,800+ vehicle capacity Sutter – Stockton Garage; the street/crosswalk is (or,

possibly until the recent work, was) steeply sloped near that corner. The Grand Hyatt is at another corner. The entrance/exit to the Stockton vehicular and pedestrian tunnel is less than half a block away; vehicles and pedestrians entering/exiting the tunnel have to pass the intersection or turn there. In the middle of the block from where I approached is 450 Sutter, a 26-floor dental/medical building with hundreds of dental and medical professionals and staff visited by thousands of patients daily. Having two safe, well-maintained, code-compliant curb ramps at each of the four corners should have been a high priority for the City decades ago even if no one had made a complaint or had nearly been hit by a vehicle.

The corner where I was almost hit has a sub-sidewalk basement, which makes constructing a curb ramp more complex and expensive than at a typical corner. Some buildings in downtown San Francisco have basements beneath the sidewalk, protruding beyond the building envelope above, which means the basement must be reinforced and sometimes modified in order to construct a curb ramp at the corner. Each basement is unique and the engineering can be challenging. The City has a special fund for curb ramps at sub-sidewalk basements, but obviously the fund is not well-funded. The City also tries to get the property owner to pay for some or all the cost of reinforcing and modifying the basement, which can entail a period of negotiations. Nevertheless, there is simply no justification for allowing this intersection to remain unsafe for literally decades, nor for taking nearly seven years to construct accessible, code compliant curb ramps after a pedestrian was almost hit by a bus and 13 years after a complaint was made.

JFK Drive. As you know, early in 2020, the eastern half of JFK Drive was closed to motor vehicles 24/7 by order of then-Mayor Breed in order to provide more space for social distancing and encourage people to spend time outdoors, as a response to Covid 19. On October 7, 2021, I sent an email entitled “Curb ramps needed on JFK Drive; driveway on Stanyan creates too steep a cross slope” to San Francisco officials and employees that stated:

“New curb ramps are needed at the intersection of JFK Drive and Conservatory Drive East (all corners), and the intersection of JFK Drive and Conservatory Drive West (all corners). The existing curb ramps are in disrepair, lack the required yellow textured dome surface, and, in some cases, are too steep. Also, the crosswalks at these intersections are in terrible condition and dangerous, and need to be resurfaced. The areas where the old curb ramps hit the street surface are particularly dangerous…The intersection of JFK Drive and Pompeii Circle (the street leading to the Dahlia Garden) should be inspected to see whether the curb ramps are compliant.”

These bad conditions had existed for quite a while, and I mistakenly thought I’d already requested new curb ramps and crosswalk resurfacing, which is why I hadn’t complained earlier. But even though I hadn’t (although perhaps others did – the City wouldn’t have informed me if they’d received other complaints), the Recreation and Parks Department, which has jurisdiction over streets, sidewalks, curb ramps, etc. in parks, should have installed new curb ramps and resurfaced the crosswalks on its own initiative several years before my complaint.

RPD inspected and acknowledged that the curb ramps need to be replaced and the crosswalks resurfaced, but stated that it hadn't identified a source of funds. Per a November 29, 2021 email from Alexis Ward, Project Manager, Capital Improvement Division of RPD:

"We do not yet have a funding source identified and this will be the main hurdle to initiating the project. **RPD has a number of outstanding ADA improvement projects and we have a small annual allocation of funding to put towards these.** (Emphasis added.) As I mentioned in my letter, we prioritize the projects with help from MOD [Mayor's Office on Disability] leadership."

"I understand that the crosswalks on JFK are not in great shape. I'm still trying to hear from our Operations team on how re-paving these is usually handled."

In the ensuing years, there were emails back and forth between RPD and myself, including a detailed description of the project (which includes other overdue access items I will tell you about in another email) from RPD and an email of March 29, 2024 from RPD indicating it hoped to begin construction by the end of 2024. The timeline has slipped. On June 17, 2025 Omar Davis, the new project manager, emailed me that RPD is almost ready to go out to bid and anticipates beginning construction in late summer or early fall of 2025. This means that, if the schedule doesn't slip further, the best-case scenario is that the project will be completed in late 2025 – four years after my complaint, three years after the Mayor's Disability Council resolution about curb ramps on JFK Drive (see below), and many years after it should have been done.

In her emergency order, Mayor Breed stated that the ban on motor vehicles on the eastern half of JFK Drive was a temporary response to Covid, but she and RPD extended the ban indefinitely as part of a program they dubbed – without irony and, if one gives them the benefit of the doubt, without deliberately trying to be Orwellian, but factually inaccurately because it actually reduced disability access – the "Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program."

In March 2022, after hearing several hours of testimony from dozens of seniors, people with disabilities, and their families, and reviewing many letters, about how the vehicle ban drastically reduced their access to that essential and beautiful part of Golden Gate Park or even eliminated it entirely, and how it reduced their safety, the Mayor's Disability Council adopted Resolution #2022 – 01, MDC Resolution on Accessibility of Golden Gate Park and Closure of JFK Drive. The resolution noted that the closure to vehicles "posed significant barriers to and sometimes prevented people with disabilities from being able to access the park and its amenities as they had been able to do in the past." The resolution stated that permanent closure of JFK Drive to vehicles should not be considered unless 20 specified access improvements and safety measures were implemented, including "existing curb ramps must comply with current code requirements and be in good repair" and "crosswalks in good condition."

But despite most of these improvements and safety measures not having been implemented or even committed to, Mayor Breed and other elected officials, including some Supervisors, put an initiative on the November 2022 ballot to close the eastern half of JFK Drive to vehicles permanently. The voters approved it.

In the more than five years since the ban, RPD has spent a lot of money on removing lane markings, painting murals on the pavement, art installations including restored vintage Doggy Diner heads, repaving the rollerskating/rollerblading area, installing dozens of Adirondack chairs, and hosting beer gardens, food trucks, and parties. Much of this was done in the weeks before the November 2022 election in order to influence voters (among other reasons). Yet RPD hasn't found funds to replace curb ramps and repave crosswalks. For several reasons including speeding cyclists and scooter riders, many people, especially seniors and those with disabilities, prefer to use the sidewalks even though there are no cars on the street, so it's still important and legally required to have safe, code compliant curb ramps and crosswalks.

Other locations. Over the years I've requested curb ramps at hundreds of locations. DPW actually created a spreadsheet listing my requests and progress on them; to my knowledge it hasn't been updated since 2020.

As of late 2024, many corners on California Street in the Financial District had curb ramps that were dangerously steep and in disrepair, conditions which existed for many years. I and others have complained about these locations for years and years. Conditions may be similar in the nearby streets; I haven't been there recently.

Conclusion. Having had numerous in-person, email, and phone interactions over many years with DPW's ADA Coordinators and Curb Ramp Program staff, I know they are talented, diligent, and professional. Some are indeed gifted. They care. The problem is that they haven't been allocated enough resources – human, financial, and otherwise – or attention – by San Francisco elected officials and senior executives.

I haven't interacted with DPW senior executives and don't know how much funding they've requested over the years for curb ramps. Their priorities were probably elsewhere for a long time. As you know, former DPW director Mohammed Nuru is currently in prison for bribery and money laundering, and several other former DPW officials were convicted of, or pled guilty to, similar crimes. Such was the mindset that a deputy director even used official DPW letterhead for a letter to the judge in Nuru's case asking for leniency. The corruption went on in plain sight for many years.

As mentioned above, RPD told me in an email of November 29, 2021 that **"RPD has a number of outstanding ADA improvement projects and has a small annual allocation of funding to put towards them."** (Emphasis added.)

In a May 8, 2024 press release from Mayor Breed and City Administrator Carmen Chu announcing the departure of MOD Director Nicole Bohn, one of Ms.

Bohn's key accomplishments they cited was having developed "Anti-Ableist Strategies Training, now available citywide, to help staff recognize and subvert unconscious bias toward people with disabilities and incorporate accessible and anti-ableist strategies into program design and service delivery."

I have said in the past and continue to believe that trendy word salad politically correct virtue signaling programs such as Anti-Ableist Strategies Training should be de-prioritized, and far less staff time should be spent on feel-good bureaucratic interdepartmental groups and task forces. It doesn't require Anti-Ableist Strategies Training to recognize that the lack of code compliant curb ramps in good condition, and that sidewalks, streets, and crosswalks in poor condition, are especially dangerous, discriminatory, and limiting for disabled people and seniors. The availability of Anti-Ableist Strategies Training to San Francisco City employees hasn't resulted in the construction or repair of a single curb ramp.

A January 22, 2025 video (link below) by Ben Kawaller of The Free Press entitled "Is San Francisco Ready to Govern Again?" illuminates the priorities of several elected officials whose terms ended in January. Beginning around 0:47 are 2021 clips of three then-Supervisors describing their priorities for their terms that began in 2021. Supervisor Hillary Ronen emphatically declared: "We **will** close down the County Jail floor." Dean Preston, the Supervisor for my district at the time who never replied to requests about curb ramps, sidewalks, or any other disability access matter, made his priorities clear, stating: "To work toward replacing capitalism is really a privilege."

https://www.thefp.com/p/watch-is-san-francisco-ready-to-govern-ben-kawaller

Beginning around 0:56 of that video are clips of newly inaugurated Supervisors Fielder, Mahmood, and Sherrill, and of Supervisor Chan, asserting that clean and safe streets are among their highest priorities, and of Board President Mandelman describing how he has come to learn over his years on the Board that the efficient provision of basic government services – although boring in his opinion – is really important. I will not be going out on a limb by saying that these statements are welcome news to the overwhelming majority of San Franciscans.

From time to time, I've asked about the amount of dollars budgeted for curb ramps. Relative to San Francisco's gargantuan budget – $15.9 billion this year – the amount is a pimple on an elephant, a rounding error of a rounding error.

Although today's circumstances are different, it's still fruitful to consider that it took one year and 45 days to build the Empire State Building, two years and two months to build the Eiffel Tower, and less than two years to design and build the first Douglas DC-3 airplane. There's more to designing and building a curb ramp than meets the eye, but it's a well-worn path. DPW has various sets of excellent curb ramp plans and specifications, which they usually use as a starting point for designing curb ramps at a particular location. Curb ramps don't require in-licensing intellectual property, sophisticated or specialized technology, scarce materials, hazardous materials, large labor crews, highly skilled labor, or expensive tools and equipment. No EIR is required. Those above sub-sidewalk basements are more complex, but

only a very small percentage of locations that require curb ramps have sub-sidewalk basements below them, and even for those, the construction is on a small scale.

The gating item in the City's ability to construct more curb ramps more quickly is simply resources – financial and human (which are a function of financial resources). These are simply a matter of priorities. If the Mayor and Board of Supervisors had cared more about equal and fair access to the public right-of-way over the past eight to 10 years, they would have allocated much more resources. Mayor Lurie and Supervisors Chen, Engardio, Fielder, Mahmood, Sauter, and Sherrill, this is not a criticism of you, as you were inaugurated in January of this year and have not yet had time to change San Francisco's curb ramp policy. Mayor Lurie and all Supervisors, you have an opportunity to change course, to walk the walk.

Triple. San Francisco government doesn't need more virtue signaling or self-congratulation. It needs immediately to devote significantly more financial and human resources toward curb ramps which, after all, are a basic civil right and essential safety measure. I request that, within one year, San Francisco government triple the curb ramp budget for every department or agency with responsibility for curb ramps, triple the number of employees or consultants in the DPW Curb Ramp Program, and add a Deputy Director for Physical Access position at the Office on Disability and Accessibility whose duties would include direct work and advocacy on curb ramps with DPW (such a position existed at the Mayor's Office on Disability for many years). Consider all of this analogous to deferred maintenance. Consider it prudent risk management.

Sincerely

Howard Chabner

TO: Mayor London Breed, City Administrator Naomi Kelly
FROM: Heather Green, Capital Planning Director
RE: FY21 & FY22 Capital Budget Scenarios Briefing
DATE: June 19, 2020

In an effort to mitigate the significant costs to the City in light of the COVID-19 emergency, the Capital Budget General Fund (GF) targets, exclusive of SB1 Street Repaving, have been reduced to:

	High ($M)		Mid ($M)		Low ($M)	
	FY21	FY22	FY21	FY22	FY21	FY22
Capital Plan Level	144.2	155.5	144.2	155.5	144.2	155.5
Reduced Targets	**69.1**	**74.6**	**47.0**	**74.6**	**47.0**	**46.3**
Difference/Savings	*-75.1*	*-80.9*	*-97.2*	*-80.9*	*-97.2*	*-109.2*

Basics

- $23.3M for REC and $10.9M for Street Trees Maintenance set-aside over two years
- Facilities Maintenance is funded at 5% annual growth for almost all departments
- Accessibility, compliance, fire life safety systems, and healthy workplace priorities, such as:
  - City Hall HVAC ($3M)
  - Hall of Justice Elevators ($2.6M)
  - ZSFG Childcare Center ($1M, labor settlement)
  - Moscone ($1M each year)
  - Fiber to Affordable/Public Housing ($2.9M High and Mid, $1.5M Low)
- DPW Programs variable levels ($42.9M High, $31.8M Mid, $25.4M Low)

High Scenario

- Street Repaving $21.4M, about 30% of original request
- Curb Ramps, Potholes, Structures, and Sidewalks at $18.4M, about 50% of original request
- Fire Safety Systems largely addressed in FY21 ($3.4M)
- County Jail #2 Housing Improvements ($1.9M)
- Major unfunded projects (highlights):
  - African American Art and Culture Complex Retrofit ($3.4 - 15M)
  - City Hall Elevators ($3.4M) and Dome ($25.8M)
  - Davies Hall Elevator Modernization ($2.2M) and Opera House Roof ($8.6M)
  - de Young Tower Exterior ($4M need) and Legion of Honor HVAC ($1.3M)
  - Mission Bay Ferry Terminal ($5 - 12.9M)
  - ZSFG Energy Efficient Lighting ($3.8M)
  - Outdoor Public Warning System ($2.6M)
- Fire and Police receive Facilities Maintenance and essential auxiliary maintenance only

Mid Scenario

- Funded but delayed from FY21 to FY22 (highlights):
  - Fire Systems at Asian Art Museum, 1SVN, 1099 Sunnydale, 25VN, 1650 Mission, HOJ
  - HVAC at 1SVN, 1099 Sunnydale, 25VN, 1650 Mission, 1011 Turk
  - ZSFG and Laguna Honda Emergency Power for Critical Systems
  - Basic repairs at fine arts facilities and civic art collection preservation
- Unfunded (highlights):
  - Electric Vehicles Infrastructure (-$750K)
  - 1SVN Elevator/Escalator, Boiler, Security System, and Server Room Cooling (-$2M)
  - Youth Guidance Center Boiler (-$405K)
  - Fire Underground Storage Tank Maintenance (-$850K)
  - Harvey Milk Plaza (-$150K)
- Reductions from the High to:
  - DPW programs (-$11M)
  - County Jail #2 Housing Improvements (-$1.6M)

Low Scenario

- Projects funded in the Mid but cut altogether in the Low (highlights):
  - Laguna Honda Emergency Power (-$5.7M) and Cooling Center (-$850K)
  - Fire Systems (-$3.8M): Asian Art Museum, 1SVN, 1099 Sunnydale, 25VN, 1650 Mission, HOJ, Laguna Honda Admin, Bill Graham Civic Auditorium, de Young, County Jails
  - HVAC (-$2.5M): 1SVN, 1099 Sunnydale, 25VN, 1650 Mission, 1011 Turk, Mission Cultural
  - Accessibility (-$1.2M): City Hall Wheelchair Lift, 1235 Mission Elevator, MOD planning
  - Legion of Honor sump pumps and electrical work (-$300K)
  - County Jail #2 improvements (-$400K)
- Reductions to DPW programs (-$6.4M)

Complementary Certificates of Participation (COPs)

The FY2020-29 Capital Plan includes $60M in FY22 and another $60M in FY23 COPs for Recession Allowance Critical Repairs. [redacted]

Capital Planning Committee

Capital Budget is slated to be heard at Capital Planning Committee on Monday, June 29.

encl: Scenarios Overview Table
Scenarios Spreadsheet Detail

Item 23

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Support for Bill to Transform Vacant Strip Malls into Affordable Housing
Date:	Tuesday, October 28, 2025 9:34:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Rebuild the Bay regarding conversion of strip malls into affordable housing.

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: Vyan Kumar <vyankmr@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 6:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Rebuild the Bay <rebuildthebay@gmail.com>
Subject: Support for Bill to Transform Vacant Strip Malls into Affordable Housing

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

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I hope this email finds you well!

My name is Vyan Kumar, and I'm writing on behalf of Rebuild the Bay, a youth-led urban development advocacy organization based in Fremont, California. I'm reaching out to ask for your support of our proposed federal legislation, which is under consideration by Congressman Ro Khanna's office. It would fund the transformation of underutilized strip malls into affordable housing, without displacing residents or acquiring new land.

This proposal would appropriate $50 million in federal grants to local governments, providing incentives for developers to construct affordable housing on former vacant properties. With hundreds of strip malls sitting empty across the Bay Area, this bill proposes a scalable, low-disruption solution to help cities like San Francisco meet their housing goals.

Building on our momentum, we've floated the proposal with CA State Treasurer Fiona Ma and

sparked interest from local government stakeholders, including members from the Milpitas Planning Commission, Congressman Garmendi, Congressman Mullin, President of the California League of Cities (Gabriel Quinto), and the Santa Clara Board of Supervisors, as well as Congressman Cleaver, who initially wrote and proposed the bill. We've also been working with EAH Housing and Destination Home to advance our proposal.

We'd love to schedule a brief meeting with you at your convenience this week or next to share our proposal and receive advice for our bill. Your input will help further our efforts to introduce the bill in Congress.

We're flexible on timing — please let us know what works best for you. I've also included the proposed bill text and policy brief for your reference. Thank you so much for your time and support.

Best regards,
Vyan Kumar
Rebuild the Bay
vyankmr@gmail.com
(510) 990-9822
www.rebuildthebay.org

Item 24

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Jalipa, Brent (BOS)
Subject:	FW: File 250872 - Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Fund
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:57:00 AM
Attachments:	Small Business Forward 10_28_25.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Small Business Forward regarding File No. 250782, which is Item No. 1 on today's Budget and Finance Committee agenda.

> **File No. 250782:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to create the Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Program ("Program") to provide financial support, including grants and loans, to businesses impacted by construction relating to the City residential rezoning program adopted in 2025-2026; establishing the Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Fund ("Fund") to receive monies for the Program; designating the Office of Small Business and Office of Economic and Workforce Development to administer the Fund and the Program and promulgate rules and regulations in furtherance of the Program; and amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to allow taxpayers to designate a portion of their gross receipts taxes for deposit in the Fund. (Melgar, Sherrill, Sauter)

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: Small Business Forward <smallbusinessforward@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:59 AM
To: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <Chyanne.Chen@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>; Chen, Lisa (CPC) <lisa.chen@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (ECN) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Birnbach, Kerry (ECN) <kerry.birnbach@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Justin Dolezal <justin.t.dolezal@gmail.com>; yolanda@verasf.com; Nick Parker <mercurycoffee@gmail.com>; christin@booksmith.com; Gwen McLaughlin <gmclaughlin415@gmail.com>
Subject: File 250872 - Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Fund

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

To the Budget & Finance Committee:

Please find the attached letter from Small Business Forward regarding the need to mitigate the impacts of the Family Zoning Plan on small businesses.



smallbusinessforward.org

Small Business Forward

October 28, 2025

To: Budget and Finance Committee

Subject: File 250872 - Small Business Rezoning Construction Relief Fund

We, the Steering Committee Members of Small Business Forward, would like you to know that we were disappointed that AB 2011 style payments (those paid by developers directly to commercial tenants) were not deemed feasible by the City Attorney. If the State can mandate developer relocation payments to small businesses displaced for new housing construction, then the City should be allowed to mandate the same payments commensurate with the commercial tenants' length of tenancy. After all, it is the hard work of those small business workers that carried the cost of that building for the years that the business paid rent. And without adequate location assistance, there is a loss to the community of small businesses that provide products & services the community uses & needs.

Displacement of long-term neighborhood-serving small businesses is real and is already happening because of the Mayor's proposed Family Rezoning Plan. Recently a bicycle shop on Haight Street decided to close their location when their overseas landlord refused to give them a new lease hoping to sell his vacant building for $7million plus. What was the point for them to remain month-to-month and spend their limited marketing dollars to market a location that they might not be in in 30 days?

If the city has decided that small businesses are best assisted through a dedicated fund administered by the Office of Small Business, then it is our ask that there be an initial appropriation to that fund.

Today, we are asking for the appropriation of $2 to $3 million on an emergency basis, no later than the mid year appropriation, to provide relocation assistance to those businesses impacted by non-renewal of lease due to proposed housing construction projects. Legacy business Joe's Ice Cream is at imminent threat of a non renewal of their lease due to a proposed housing development their landlord has already submitted to the city. We need the funds in the fund immediately to support this business' successful relocation.

A $2 to $3 million appropriation is a starting point. We ask that there be a regular report back to the Board of Supervisors on the financial need for small businesses impacted by displacement for new housing construction.

We feel this modest appropriation will give some runway for the additional measures we've also previously given our support:

- That for the next State legislative session, City representatives propose a change in state law to allow for the city to mandate relocation payments paid directly by developers to small business tenants (similar to AB2011)
- Adopt Supervisor Chan's proposed amendments to the Family Zoning Plan which would allow for a nexus study and the collection of developer impact fees and/or demolition fees which can be allocated to the small business relocation fund.
- Extend the Conditional Use requirement for sites where Legacy Businesses have been displaced

Thank you for your consideration of these requests.

Sincerely,

The Steering Committee of Small Business Forward

Justin Dolezal, Co-owner Bar Part Time
Christin Evans, Co-owner Booksmith and Alembic
Nicholas Parker, Owner Mercury Cafe
Yolanda Porrata, Owner VERA Skin Studio
Gwen McGlaughlin, Coordinator Small Business Forward

Item 25

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: To the Mayor"s Office and SF Board of Supervisors
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:13:00 AM
Attachments:	Mayor & BOS_Re-Felton Institute_10.22.25.pdf Felton worker petition 2025.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from SEIU Local 1021 regarding File No. 230463.

> **File No. 230463:** Hearing of the Board of Supervisors to sit as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, April 25, 2023, at 3:00 p.m., to hold a public hearing on the operational impact of labor disputes at the Felton Institute on the employees, patient services, compliance with written agreements, and workplace harmony; and requesting the Felton Institute administrators, representatives from SEIU 1021, and unaffiliated workers to attend; to be scheduled pending approval of the Motion contained in File No. 230462, to be considered on April 25, 2023.

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: XiuMin Li <XiuMin.Li@seiu1021.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:25 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Lurie, Daniel (MYR) <daniel.lurie@sfgov.org>
Cc: David Canham <david.canham@seiu1021.org>; Chema Hernández Gil <chema@seiu1021.org>; Zach Goldman <zach.goldman@seiu1021.org>; Josie Mooney <Josie.Mooney@seiu1021.org>; Daniela Gonzalez <Daniela.Gonzalez@seiu1021.org>
Subject: To the Mayor's Office and SF Board of Supervisors

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

Dear Honorable Mayor Lurie and SF Board of Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter and petition sent on behalf of David Canham, Executive Director of SEIU 1021 and Family Development Center union members of the SF Felton Institute.

Regards,

XiuMin “Xiu” Li (She, Her)
Field Supervisor

Stop Airbnb Greed, Save Public Services!
https://www.boycott-airbnb.org/pledge

Direct #: 415 848 3686
Member Resources Center: 1-877-687-1021

Sign up to become a Union Member!Together We Rise Up!
http://join1021.org?LUID=Xli

Check out other SEIU Member Benefits: https://www.seiumb.com/

Sign up for text updates from the union. https://www.seiu1021.org/text-me

Work or intern with SEIU 1021 and help build a strong union!

https://www.seiu1021.org/jobs

https://www.seiu1021.org/member-internship-program

LOCAL 1021
SEIU
Stronger Together

Theresa Rutherford
President

Tiffany Abuan
Secretary

Mary Duncan
Treasurer

Jennifer Esteen
VP of Organizing

Ramsés Teón-Nichols
VP of Politics

Nicole T. Germain
VP of Representation

Elizabeth Harrison
VP Region A (North Central)

Travis Balzarini
VP Region B (North Coast)

Derrick Boutte
VP Region C (East Bay)

Kristin Hardy
VP Region D (San Francisco)

Taffie Walter
VP Region E
(Amador/Calaveras/San Joaquin)

Executive Board
Blessing Augustus
Maria Betancourt
Antoinette Blue
David Cameron
Sheleka Carter
Charito Casanas
Kasha Clarke
Desiree Collins
Evelyn Curiel
Tina Diep
Jeffery Dix
Debbie Dobson
Ray Fields
Kevin Godwin
Phelicia Jones
Greg Marro
Shelly Martin
Judy A. Martinez
Anthony Mills
John Pearson
Alicia Ramirez
Sharon Richardson
Maria Salazar-Colón
Mariette Shin
Sandy Sigala
Layla Spears-Griffin
Kevin Tisdell
Jeffrey Weston

Executive Board & Budget & Finance Committee
Trevor Adams
Tazamisha Alexander
John Arantes
Monique Baca
Steven Desalvo
Amanda Hubbell
Cynthia Johnson
Andy La Torre
Patricia Orey
Kevin Zhu

October 22, 2025

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

And

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

Re: Felton Institute

Dear Mayor Lurie and San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

San Francisco Felton Institute is one of the oldest nonprofits in the City and County of San Francisco. Over 96% of its funding is from governmental sources, over 60% of which is city funding. Felton has expanded significantly over the years with dozens of programs and over 500 employees across the Bay Area.

Felton Institute was called to a hearing at the Board of Supervisors about their anti-worker and anti-union practices two years ago. Felton management refused to attend the hearing and sent in a public relations consultant who failed to answer any questions or show accountability for their actions.

Felton recently had to settle a class action lawsuit for over $1.1 million dollars in Cofield v. Felton for several wage and hour violations: for failing to properly pay overtime, minimum wage, provide meal breaks to employees, etc.

Despite the generous support of the city, other state departments, and private funders and donors, these nonprofits have not shared that same generosity and support with their workers. Felton CEO Al Gilbert makes almost $190/hour, while the average teacher who provides frontline child education services to vulnerable communities is making an average of $30 an hour. A review of Felton's budget shows an additional 1.4 millions allocated for "Professional consultant and Attorney Fees", clearly money used to hire union-busting law firms and spin doctors.

These patterns of misuse of government funds to engage in anti-worker, union busting actions and exorbitant CEO compensation packages are contributing to and exacerbating poverty wages, high turnover, low morale and economic hardships among nonprofit workers while also taking away resources that should have gone to services for the community in San Francisco. The issue is well documented in the media and was recently reported by the Washington Examiner and SF Chronicle.

SEIU 1021 has been in protracted contract negotiations with SF Felton Institute for several years now. Despite a projected surplus of $1.37 million in fiscal year 2025/2026 alone, Felton has offered a mere 2% annual increase as their Last, Best and Final wage

offer to these frontline workers while denying basic union protections. A 1% increase for the entire bargaining unit would cost $30k annually.

Felton has continued to be anti-worker, anti-union, and undemocratic. Felton has multiple proposals seeking to deny workers' rights to have a voice on the jobs. They have proposals on the table that would take away the workers' rights to representation and negotiation when their job duties get changed or their positions or programs get eliminated, and force workers to work in locations they never signed up for, among other things. To add insult to injury, in response to a union proposal to provide severance to workers in the event of a layoff, Felton's chief negotiator told workers to use their own union dues to pay for their own severance.

Attached, please find petitions signed by Felton workers demanding pay equity and a fair contract. We are asking for your intervention and support to call on Felton CEO Al Gilbert to do better and do right by the workers. You may contact him via email at agilbert@felton.org.

Sincerely,

David Canham
Executive Director, SEIU Local 1021

Attachment: Petitions

LOCAL 1021 SEIU Stronger Together

Petition to Felton Board of Directors, TODCO Board of Directors & SF Board of Supervisors

Please intervene to help Felton Institute workers get a fair contract now.

Dear Directors and Supervisors:

We the undersigned employees at Felton respectfully request your intervention at Felton Institute to help us frontline employees — including teachers, teacher assistants, janitors, food service workers, and others serving the most vulnerable communities in San Francisco — to get a fair contract that honors our experience, dedication, and tireless work.

We've been bargaining weekly with Felton since June 2025. To date, Felton has offered us an insulting 1% increase and refuses to give us a voice in our working conditions through having a say in our work assignments or to give us real protection by limiting contracting out of our work and the use of temp agencies. Instead, they are proposing to make unilateral decisions to eliminate our jobs and drastically change our working conditions without bargaining with the union.

Meanwhile, Felton CEO Al Gilbert is making almost $400k a year as reported in recent news articles and public data. This is outrageous. The City should not keep funding so-called nonprofits that enrich the CEOs by impoverishing the frontline workers who do the real work serving San Francisco's most vulnerable residents day in and day out.

We deserve equity, fairness and respect! Please reach out to CEO Al Gilbert and tell him to do the right thing: remove Felton's anti-union, anti-worker proposals and settle a fair contract with workers NOW.

Signed:

Signature: _____ Print name: Xochitl Zamora

Date: 09/17/25 Classification: ETTA

Signature: _____ Print name: Charlotte Pinkney

Date: 9/17/25 Classification: Teacher Float Asst

Signature: _____ Print name: ROXANA ALBAY G

Date: 9/17/25 Classification: T.A.F

Signature: _____ Print name: Yasmina Merrouche

Date: 9-17-25 Classification: TAF

Signature: _____ Print name: Patricia Recinos

Date: 09-17-25 Classification: T.A.F.

Signature: _____ Print name: Liliana Flores

Date: 09-17-25 Classification: Lead Teacher

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: 9/17/25 Classification: Teacher

Signature: _____ Print name: Arecely Duran

Date: 9.17-25 Classification: T AF

Signature: _____ Print name: Tam Hong

Date: 9/17/25 Classification: T

Signature: _____ Print name: Ann Douglas

Date: 9-18-25 Classification: TF

Signature: Monica Marquez Print name: Monica E. Marquez V.

Date: 9-18-25 Classification: Costodian/Kichen

Signature: _____ Print name: Saidy Rebaqui

Date: 9-18-25 Classification: Tenchen

Signature: _____ Print name: Kemonni Pitre

Date: 9/18/25 Classification: T.A.F

Signature: _____ Print name: Nayeli Herrera

Date: 9/19/25 Classification: T

Signature: Tathiana Print name: Tathiana Menjivar

Date: 09-29-25 Classification: T.A.F

Signature: _____ Print name: Angie Ly

Date: 9/29/25 Classification: T

Signature: _____ Print name: Yasmina Merrouche

Date: 09-29-25 Classification: b bee

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

LOCAL 1021
SEIU
Stronger Together

Petition to Felton Board of Directors, TODCO Board of Directors & SF Board of Supervisors

Please intervene to help Felton Institute workers get a fair contract now.

Dear Directors and Supervisors:

We the undersigned employees at Felton respectfully request your intervention at Felton Institute to help us frontline employees — including teachers, teacher assistants, janitors, food service workers, and others serving the most vulnerable communities in San Francisco — to get a fair contract that honors our experience, dedication, and tireless work.

We've been bargaining weekly with Felton since June 2025. To date, Felton has offered us an insulting 1% increase and refuses to give us a voice in our working conditions through having a say in our work assignments or to give us real protection by limiting contracting out of our work and the use of temp agencies. Instead, they are proposing to make unilateral decisions to eliminate our jobs and drastically change our working conditions without bargaining with the union.

Meanwhile, Felton CEO Al Gilbert is making almost $400k a year as reported in recent news articles and public data. This is outrageous. The City should not keep funding so-called nonprofits that enrich the CEOs by impoverishing the frontline workers who do the real work serving San Francisco's most vulnerable residents day in and day out.

We deserve equity, fairness and respect! Please reach out to CEO Al Gilbert and tell him to do the right thing: remove Felton's anti-union, anti-worker proposals and settle a fair contract with workers NOW.

Signed:

Signature: Myra DeLeon Print name: Myra DeLeon
Date: 9/12/25 Classification: Acting Lead teacher

Signature: [illegible] Print name: Margarita Garcia
Date: 9/12/25 Classification: Teacher

Signature: Reyna Ferreira Print name: Reyna Ferreira
Date: 9-12-25 Classification: Lead Teacher

Signature: Adamaris Beltran Print name: Adamaris G Beltran Lavich
Date: 09/12/25 Classification: EITA

Signature: Yolanda Banaca Print name: Yolanda Banaca
Date: 9/12/25 Classification: TAF

Signature: Celia Villalobos Print name: [illegible]
Date: 9/12/25 Classification: Lead Teacher

Signature: Rosaura Ramos Print name: Rosaura Ramos

Date: 9-12-25 Classification: teacher Asst

Signature: Digna Arevalo Print name: DIGNA AREVALO

Date: 9-12-25 Classification: TAF

Signature: Roxana Alforo Print name: ROXANA ALFORO

Date: 9/12/25 Classification: T.A.F.

Signature: Gabriela Gonzalez Print name: Gabriela Gonzalez

Date: 9-12-25 Classification: TAF

Signature: [illegible] Print name: Baraka Gambe

Date: 9-12-25 Classification: H.T.

Signature: Anabela Perez Print name: Anabela Perez

Date: 9-12-25 Classification: H.T.

Signature: [illegible] Print name: ADRIANA BRINOLO

Date: 9/18/25 Classification: Head Teacher

Signature: [illegible] Print name: Liliana Romero-C

Date: 9/18/25 Classification: Custodian

Signature: Nayeli Patricio Print name: Nayeli Patricio

Date: 9-18-25 Classification: Custodian

Signature: Pam Cheung Print name: Pam Cheung

Date: 9/18/25 Classification: Admin. Assistant

Signature: Ana Diaz Print name: Ana Diaz

Date: 9-22-25 Classification: Substitute

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

Signature: _____ Print name: _____

Date: _____ Classification: _____

LOCAL 1021 SEIU Stronger Together

Petición a la Junta Directiva de Felton, la Junta Directiva de TODCO y la Junta de Supervisores de SF

Por favor, intervenga para ayudar a los trabajadores del Instituto Felton a conseguir un contrato justo ahora.

Estimado Directores y Supervisores:

Nosotros el abajofirmante empleados en Felton respetuosamente pedido su intervención en Felton Instituto Para ayudarnos a los empleados de primera línea, incluidos maestros, asistentes de maestros, conserjes, trabajadores de servicios de alimentos y otros. servicio el mayoría vulnerable comunidades en San Francisco — a conseguir a justo contrato eso honores nuestra experiencia, dedicación, y incansable trabajar.

Hemos estado negociando semanalmente con Felton desde junio de 2025. Hasta la fecha, Felton nos ha ofrecido un insultante 1%. aumentar y se niega a dar a nosotros a voz en nuestro laboral condiciones a través de teniendo a decir en nuestro Asignaciones de trabajo o para brindarnos protección real limitando la subcontratación de nuestro trabajo y el uso de agencias de trabajo temporal. En cambio, proponen tomar decisiones unilaterales para eliminar nuestros empleos y cambiar drásticamente... nuestro laboral condiciones sin negociación con el unión.

Mientras tanto, Felton Director ejecutivo Alabama Gilbert es haciendo casi $400 mil a año como reportado en reciente noticias artículos y datos públicos. Esto es indignante. La ciudad no debería seguir financiando a las llamadas organizaciones sin fines de lucro que enriquecen a los directores ejecutivos. empobreciendo el primera línea trabajadores OMS hacer el real trabajar servicio San Francisco mayoría residentes vulnerables día en y día afuera.

¡Merecemos equidad, justicia y respeto! Por favor, contacten al director ejecutivo Al Gilbert y pídanle que haga lo correcto: eliminar Felton's anti-sindical, antiobrero propuestas y asentarse a justo contrato con trabajadores AHORA.

Firmado:

Nombre: Selena Cubas Firma: selenac

Clasificación: ~~Teacher~~ EITA ~~EETA~~ Fecha: 9-12-25

Nombre: Priscilla Tran Firma:

Clasificación: EITA Fecha: 9/12/25

Nombre: Teresa Leung Firma: [signature]

Clasificación: T.A.F Fecha: 9/12/25

Nombre: Hui Fen Zhu (Judy) Firma: [signature]

Clasificación: T.A.F Fecha: 9/12/25

Nombre: Charmaine Chandler Firma: [signature]

Clasificación: Lead Teacher Fecha: 9/12/25

Nombre: Roxana Guardado Firma: R. G.

Clasificación: T.A.F. Fecha: 9/12/25

Nombre: Ruth Barrera Firma: R.B

Clasificación: T.A.F Fecha: 9/12/25

Nombre: Ludisa Argueta Firma: [signature]

Clasificación: TAF. Fecha: 09/12/25

Nombre: Rosa Martinez Firma: Martinez Sanchez Rosa

Clasificación: T.A.F Fecha: 09/12/25

Item 26

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Child Attacked at Polo Fields Bathroom
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 9:29:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Rebecca Eddy regarding a reported assault of a child in a Golden Gate Park restroom.

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: Rebecca Eddy <rebeccaebrock@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:46 AM
To: RPDInfo, RPD (REC) <rpdinfo@sfgov.org>; SFPD Richmond Station, (POL) <sfpdrichmondstation@sfgov.org>; SFPD Taraval Station, (POL) <SFPDTaravalStation@sfgov.org>; info@sfyouthsoccer.com; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chris Eddy <ccolliereddy@gmail.com>
Subject: Child Attacked at Polo Fields Bathroom

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

Hello,

I am a parent of a third grade daughter who plays in the SFYS league. I just heard on the news about the attack on a child last week in the Polo Fields Bathroom in Golden Gate Park during soccer practice. This is extremely frightening. I had not heard about this and was able to find a few articles about the incident with limited information. I am extremely concerned about the following:

1) As a parent I have heard nothing from SFYS about the attack and apparent measures

they have taken based on the articles for safety. Perhaps as it is limited to players that practice in the Polo Fields and play at the Beach Chalet fields. I think however it is important for the entire community to hear about. Personally we live in D4 and are very close to the park.

2) I am concerned that based on the article that increased police presence was only on the Richmond side of the park. Why not the Sunset side? Is this due to us currently not having a supervisor or representation?

3) The articles also mentioned a park ranger would be in the area from 3-5 during weekdays. The attack apparently happened at 5:30 PM. Outside of those hours. Why not until 6 or dark or when practices are over?

As a parent and community member this is extremely worrisome and there needs to be more awareness for the community.

Thank you,
Rebecca Eddy

Rebecca B Eddy
Rebeccaebrock@gmail.com
617-271-4369

Item 27

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors; BOS Legislative Aides
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations; BOS Legislation, (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS)
Subject: FW: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public
Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025 10:51:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Doug Bright regarding File No. 240967, Ordinance No. 268-24.

> **File No. 240967, Ordinance No. 268-24:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the E-Bike Incentive Fund to support implementation of an electric bicycle (or "e-bike") incentive program administered by the Department of the Environment. (Peskin, Preston, Melgar, Mandelman, Dorsey)

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: Doug Bright <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 3:15 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please fund the e-bike incentive program to help families, working people, and all San Franciscans shift trips to bikes, reduce car traffic, demand for parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and fatalities/injuries, while increasing public s...

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to fund the E-Bike Incentive Program, which will help more families, workers, and other people shift trips from cars to bikes, increasing safety, affordability, and equity, while reducing car traffic, demand for car parking, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, roadway construction and maintenance costs, and roadway crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Please work with the advocates behind the original program proposal to secure funding for the program from City, SFCTA, MTC, state, federal, and other funding sources (e.g. philanthropic foundations, wealthy individuals).

The e-bike incentive program — inspired by, and modeled off, effective programs in Denver, Colorado, Austin, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia — will reduce the financial burden for families, workers, and other people who want to use bikes for transportation, with a larger incentive for low-income individuals and families who qualify. By helping more people purchase or lease e-bikes, you will decrease car traffic, demand for parking, costs related to roadway construction/maintenance, noise, air pollution, climate emissions, and road fatalities/injuries while increasing economic activity, revenue for local businesses, community connectedness, public health, and public land available for trees, seating, parks, playgrounds, housing, and other more effective land uses. Due to the cost-saving effect of increased bike ridership and bike infrastructure, the e-bike incentive program may well net cost savings for the City, County, and state, something that is especially needed and beneficial given the budget deficit and crisis.

You can find more information about the original program proposal and related grassroots campaign at
https://url.avanan.click/v2/r01/___https://eBikesSF.org___.YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo2OTQwMTAzZTQ0ZGE0OWYxM2E4MWI2OTRhYmVhMzc1Yjo3OmFjZTA6MGExM2JjNzk4YWI2YWMyZmM0M2EyYjNkZGQ3ZWMyZDdhZjY4NzM2MTRkMjdkNzQwYmQ2NmU1NTcwZDliZTc1YTp0OlO6Tg.

In order for this program to be created and have its full potential impact, we need you to secure funding for the program. Will you commit to doing everything in your power to secure as much funding as possible as soon as possible?

Thank you.

Doug Bright
doug.bright@gmail.com
739 11th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94118

Item 28

From:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides
Cc:	Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); De Asis, Edward (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS-Operations
Subject:	FW: Dogpatch and NW Potrero Hill Green Benefit District Annual FInancial Report FY24-25
Date:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025 4:28:00 PM
Attachments:	GBD FY24-25 FInancial Review.pdf GBD_23-24AnnualReport_v06-compressed.pdf FY2025-2026 GBD APPROVED Budget OVERVIEW.pdf

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Dogpatch & NW Potrero Hill Green Benefit District, submitting the GBD Annual Independent Financial Review for the Fiscal Year ending June 30,2025, the GBD Approved Budget Overview for FY 25-26, and the GBD Annual Report for FY 23-24.

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: Donovan Lacy <donovan@greenbenefit.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 1:22 PM
To: Cassiol, Jimmer (DPW) <Jimmer.Cassiol@sfdpw.org>; Alvarez, Ramses (DPW) <ramses.alvarez@sfdpw.org>
Cc: Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Dogpatch and NW Potrero Hill Green Benefit District Annual FInancial Report FY24-25

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

Hello,

I hope this finds you well.

Per the Dogpatch and Northwest Potrero HIll Green Benefit District (GBD) Annual Reporting, please find attached the GBD Annual Independent Financial Review for the Fiscal Year ending June 30,2025, the GBD Approved Budget Overview for FY 25-26, and

the GBD Annual Report for FY 23-24.

Our Annual Report for FY 24-25 will be provided in Q1 2026 along with our Mid-Year Spend Down Report, as this will initiate our new 15-year Charter.

Please let me know if you have any questions and if you need any additional information.

Cheers,

Donovan Lacy, Executive Director
Dogpatch & NW Potrero Hill Green Benefit District
GreenBenefit.org
206-910-9503



IRYNA
Accountancy Corporation

DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT

(A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION)

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

WITH

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REVIEW

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2025

DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JUNE 30, 2025

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REVIEW REPORT 1

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Statement of financial position 2

Statement of activities 3

Statement of functional expenses 4

Statement of cash flows 5

Notes to financial statements 6

IRYNA
Accountancy Corporation

1000 Broadway 200-C, Oakland, CA 94607 | (510) 467-9506 | io@irynacpa.com | www.irynacpa.com

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REVIEW REPORT

To the Board of Directors of
DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT
San Francisco, California

We have reviewed the accompanying financial statements of DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT (a nonprofit organization), which comprise the statement of financial position as of June 30, 2025, and the related statements of activities, functional expenses, and cash flows for the year then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements. A review includes primarily applying analytical procedures to management's financial data and making inquiries of entity management. A review is substantially less in scope than an audit, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion regarding the financial statements as a whole. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement whether due to fraud or error.

Accountant's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to conduct the review engagement in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services promulgated by the Accounting and Review Services Committee of the AICPA. Those standards require us to perform procedures to obtain limited assurance as a basis for reporting whether we are aware of any material modifications that should be made to the financial statements for them to be in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. We believe that the results of our procedures provide a reasonable basis for our conclusion.

We are required to be independent of DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements related to our review.

Accountant's Conclusion

Based on our review, we are not aware of any material modifications that should be made to the accompanying financial statements in order for them to be in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.



Iryna Accountancy Corporation
Oakland, California
September 12, 2025

DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION
JUNE 30, 2025

	Without Donor Restrictions	With Donor Restrictions	Total
ASSETS			
CURRENT ASSETS			
Cash and cash equivalents	$ 459,618	$ 114,268	$ 573,886
Accounts receivable, current	10,847	-	10,847
Prepaid expenses	3,160	-	3,160
Total current assets	473,625	114,268	587,893
Accounts receivable, noncurrent	10,603	-	10,603
Security deposits	3,020	-	3,020
Total assets	$ 487,248	$ 114,268	$ 601,516
LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS			
CURRENT LIABILITIES			
Accounts payable	$ 37,702	$ -	$ 37,702
Accrued expenses	18,886	-	18,886
Total current liabilities	56,588	-	56,588
Total liabilities	56,588	-	56,588
NET ASSETS			
Without donor restrictions			
Board-designated	417,611	-	417,611
Undesignated	13,049	-	13,049
With donor restrictions			
Purpose and time restrictions	-	114,268	114,268
Total net assets	430,660	114,268	544,928
Total liabilities and net assets	$ 487,248	$ 114,268	$ 601,516

See independent accountant's review report and notes to financial statements.

DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT

STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2025

	Without Donor Restrictions	With Donor Restrictions	Total
SUPPORT AND REVENUES			
Assessment revenue	$ 709,038	$ -	$ 709,038
Contributions	29,048	105,669	134,717
Grants	99,779	-	99,779
Other	65	-	65
In-kind contributions	15,499	-	15,499
Net assets released from restrictions	121,238	(121,238)	-
Total support and revenues	974,667	(15,569)	959,098
EXPENSES			
Program services	908,552	-	908,552
General and administrative	121,372	-	121,372
Fundraising	-	-	-
Total expenses	1,029,924	-	1,029,924
Change in net assets	(55,257)	(15,569)	(70,826)
Net assets, beginning of year	485,917	129,837	615,754
Net assets, end of year	$ 430,660	$ 114,268	$ 544,928

See independent accountant's review report and notes to financial statements.

DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT

STATEMENT OF FUNCTIONAL EXPENSES
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2025

	Programs			Supporting		Total
	Maintenance/ Capital Improvement	Accountability	Total	General/ Administrative	Fundraising	
Salaries and wages	$ 22,622	$ 97,919	$ 120,541	$ 66,908	$ -	$ 187,449
Payroll taxes and fringe benefits	1,886	10,277	12,163	5,774	-	17,937
Workers' compensation	-	99	99	1,060	-	1,159
Accounting fees	-	-	-	15,250	-	15,250
Capital improvement	209,639	-	209,639	-	-	209,639
Communication and outreach	-	31,336	31,336	-	-	31,336
Esprit Park	40,168	-	40,168	-	-	40,168
In-kind	13,164	-	13,164	2,335	-	15,499
Insurance	-	-	-	6,508	-	6,508
Meetings and events	-	25,634	25,634	-	-	25,634
Office operating expenses	-	-	-	2,547	-	2,547
Park and green space	268,356	-	268,356	-	-	268,356
Professional services	-	4,180	4,180	20,990	-	25,170
Repairs and supplies	1,473	-	1,473	-	-	1,473
Sidewalk and public realm	169,319	-	169,319	-	-	169,319
Occupancy	12,480	-	12,480	-	-	12,480
Total	$ 739,107	$ 169,445	$ 908,552	$ 121,372	$ -	$ 1,029,924

See independent accountant's review report and notes to financial statements.

DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT

STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2025

CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES		
Change in net assets	$	(70,826)
Adjustments to reconcile change in net assets to net		
cash provided (used) by operating activities:		
(Increase) decrease in operating assets:		
Accounts receivable		52,103
Prepaid expenses		7,195
Increase (decrease) in operating liabilities:		
Accounts payable		6,449
Accrued expenses		11,092
Net cash provided (used) by operating activities		6,013
Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents		6,013
Cash and cash equivalents, beginning of year		
Unrestricted cash and cash equivalents		438,036
Restricted cash and cash equivalents		129,837
Total cash and cash equivalents, beginning of year	$	567,873
Cash and cash equivalents, end of year		
Unrestricted cash and cash equivalents		459,618
Restricted cash and cash equivalents		114,268
Total cash and cash equivalents, end of year	$	573,886

See independent accountant's review report and notes to financial statements.

DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Note 1. Nature of Activities and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

Nature of Activities

DOGPATCH & NORTHWEST POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT (the Organization) is a nonprofit organization that was incorporated on August 28, 2015, as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the State of California. The Organization provides services in two districts in San Francisco: Dogpatch and Northwest Potrero Hill.

The Organization's mission is to create, expand, enhance, clean, and maintain open spaces, parks, play areas, plazas, parklets, gardens, sidewalk greenings, and other such physical public realm areas within the boundaries of Dogpatch and Northwest Potrero Hill districts. The Organization promotes sound ecological practices and green infrastructure with a locally controlled, sustainable, and transparent funding structure, and supports community volunteer efforts.

The Organization collaborates with landowners, tenants, developers, condominium owners, renters, and advocates for open spaces, parks, and gardens. The Organization was established to incorporate the vision of land occupiers with the Organization's vision and mission. In 2025, the Organization successfully renewed its charter for 15 years and refocused on its mission of leveraging local funding, governance, advocacy, and volunteerism to create and maintain green, resilient, and vibrant urban spaces.

The Organization separates its activities into two programs: Maintenance and improvements, and Accountability and Citizen Services.

- Maintenance

The Organization hires and oversees landscape maintenance and janitorial contractors. Landscape maintenance is provided to the green spaces of Dogpatch and Northwest Potrero Hill districts. These are largely green spaces created by neighbors on properties owned and managed by a variety of City of San Francisco and California state agencies such as Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Caltrans, etc. The Organization provides janitorial services that include sidewalk cleaning, trash removal, and graffiti abatement.

- Capital Improvements

Capital projects include creation, expansion, and improvement of public spaces – parks, sidewalk gardens and other green spaces, plazas, and pedestrian paths. The Organization adds amenities such as workout equipment, bocce courts, seating, a walking labyrinth, pathways, irrigation systems, retaining walls and planted areas.

- Accountability and Citizen Services

The Organization connects and communicates with residents and businesses and advocates for their interests to City of San Francisco and California state departments and elected officials, bringing funding and other resources to the district and helping to facilitate district-enhancing projects. The Organization nurtures community engagement and involvement.

Basis of Accounting

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, which involves the application of accrual accounting; consequently, revenues and gains are recognized when earned, and expenses and losses are recognized when incurred.

Note 1. Nature of Activities and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

Cash and Cash Equivalents

The Organization considers all highly liquid investments available for current use with an initial maturity of three months or less to be cash equivalents. The carrying amount approximates fair value because of the short maturity of those instruments.

Leases

The Organization uses Accounting Standards Codification ("ASC") 842. The Organization has a policy election not to separate non-lease components from lease components, therefore, the Organization accounts for lease and non-lease components as a single lease component. The Organization elected the short-term lease recognition exemption for all leases that qualify.

The Organization determines if a contract contains a lease at inception of the arrangement based on whether there is the right to obtain substantially all of the economic benefits from the use of an identified asset and whether the Organization has the right to direct the use of an identified asset in exchange for consideration. Right of use ("ROU") assets represents the Organization's right to use an underlying asset for the lease term and lease liabilities represent the obligation to make lease payments arising from the lease. ROU assets are recognized as the lease liability, adjusted for lease incentives received.

Lease liabilities are recognized at the present value of the future lease payments at the lease commencement date. The interest rate used to determine the present value of the future lease payments is the risk-free discount rate, which is determined using a period comparable to the lease term, because the interest rate implicit in most of the leases is not readily determinable. Lease payments may be fixed or variable; however, only fixed payments or in-substance fixed payments are included in the lease liability calculation.

Variable lease payments may include costs such as common area maintenance, utilities, real estate taxes or other costs. Variable lease payments are recognized in operating expenses in the period in which the obligation for those payments is incurred.

Operating leases are included in operating lease ROU assets, operating lease liabilities, current and operating lease liabilities, non-current on the statement of financial position. Finance leases are included in property and equipment, net, accrued and other current liabilities, and other long-term liabilities on the statement of financial position. For operating leases, lease expense is recognized on a straight-line basis in operations over the lease term. For finance leases, lease expense is recognized as depreciation and interest; depreciation on a straight-line basis over the lease term and interest using the effective interest method.

The Organization has evaluated its lease situation under the new standard and found it to be not applicable as of June 30, 2025.

Net Assets

Financial statement presentation follows the requirement of the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB). The Organization is required to report information regarding its financial position and activities according to two classes of net assets: without donor restrictions and with donor restrictions.

Net Assets Without Donor Restrictions – Net assets available for use in general operations and not subject to donor (or certain grantor) restrictions. The governing board can designate, from net assets without donor restrictions, net assets for an operating reserve and board-designated endowment. There were no board-designated endowments as of June 30, 2025.

Note 1. Nature of Activities and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

Net Assets With Donor Restrictions – Net assets subject to donor (or certain grantor) imposed restrictions. Some donor-imposed restrictions are temporary in nature, such as those that will be met by the passage of time or other events specified by the donor. Other donor-imposed restrictions are perpetual in nature, where the donor stipulates those resources be maintained in perpetuity. Donor-imposed restrictions are released when a restriction expires, that is, when the stipulated time has elapsed, when the stipulated purpose for which the resource was restricted has been fulfilled, or both. There were no donor-imposed restrictions perpetual in nature as of June 30, 2025.

Board Designation of Net Assets Without Donor Restrictions

It is the policy of the Board of Directors of the Organization to review its plans for future services periodically and to designate appropriate sums of net assets without donor restrictions to further capital projects and the overall mission of the Organization.

Contributions

Contributions receivable are unconditional promises to give that are recognized as contributions when the promise is received. Contributions receivable that are expected to be collected in less than one year are reported to have a net realizable value. Contributions receivable that are expected to be collected in more than one year are recorded at fair value on the date of promise. That fair value is computed using a present value technique applied to anticipated cash flows. Amortization of the resulting discount is recognized as additional contribution revenue. The allowance for uncollectible contributions receivable is determined based on management's evaluation of the collectability of individual promises.

All contributions are reported as increases in net assets without donor restrictions unless use of the contributed assets is specifically restricted by the donor. Amounts received that are restricted by the donor to use in future periods or for specific purposes are reported as increases in net assets with donor restrictions, consistent with the nature of the restriction. Unconditional promises with payments due in future years have an implied restriction to be used in the year the payment is due and therefore are reported as restricted by time until the payment is due unless the contribution is clearly intended to support activities of the current fiscal year or is received with permanent restrictions. Conditional promises, such as matching grants, are not recognized until they become unconditional, that is, until all conditions on which they depend are substantially met.

Receivables

Accounts receivable are primarily unsecured non-interest-bearing amounts due from grantors on a cost reimbursement or performance contracts or members' dues. The Organization considers all accounts receivable to be fully collectible at June 30, 2025. However, an allowance for doubtful accounts equal to 50% of receivables was recorded due to the nature of activities.

Contributions receivable, including pledges and grants receivable are unconditional promises to give that are recognized as contributions when the promise is received. Contributions receivable that are expected to be collected in less than one year are reported at net realizable value. Contributions receivable that are expected to be collected in more than one year are recorded at fair value on the date of promise. That fair value is computed using a present value technique applied to anticipated cash flows. The Organization has evaluated the value of the discount and concluded that it was not material for recognition.

Note 1. Nature of Activities and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

Donated Assets and Professional Services

Donated marketable securities and other noncash donations are recorded as contributions at their estimated fair value at the date of donation. Donated property and equipment are also recorded as contributions at their estimated fair value at the date of donation. Such donations are reported as increases in net assets without donor restrictions unless the donor has restricted the donated assets to a specific purpose. Assets donated with explicit restrictions regarding their use and contributions of cash that must be used to acquire property and equipment are reported as restricted contributions. Absent donor stipulations regarding how long those donated assets must be maintained, the Organization reports expiration of donor restrictions when the donated or acquired assets are placed in service as instructed by the donor. The Organization reclassifies net assets with donor restrictions to net assets without donor restrictions at that time.

Contributed services, which require specialized skills and which the Organization would have paid for if not donated, are recorded at their market value at the time the services are rendered. Donated services that do not meet the criteria for recognition, but which are, nonetheless, central to the Organization's operations are not reflected in the financial statements.

Concentration of Revenue

The Organization received approximately 74% of its revenue from property owners' assessments.

Each property owner in the Management Plan for Dogpatch and Northwest Potrero Hill Green Benefit District (GBD) pays an assessment based on a formula calculated on objective parcel criteria, as defined in The Management Plan. This assessment is collected twice a year through owners' personal tax bills. The GBD assessment is collected and enforced by the City and County of San Francisco's Treasurer and Tax Collector that in turn, transfers the assessment payments to the Organization.

Revenue Recognition

The Organization recognizes revenue on the accrual basis of accounting. Service income is recognized as revenue in the period in which the service is provided. Grants are recognized as revenue in the period in which they are awarded in writing, if not conditional. The Organization's primary revenue sources are grants and assessments.

The Organization recognizes revenue as performance obligations are satisfied.

The Organization recognizes contributions when cash, securities or other assets; an unconditional promise to give; or a notification of beneficial interest is received. Conditional promises to give - that is, those with a measurable performance or other barriers and a right of return - are not recognized until the conditions on which they depend have been met.

Fair Value of Financial Instruments

The following methods and assumptions were used by the Organization in establishing the fair value of its financial statements: the carrying amounts of cash, receivables, prepaid expenses and accounts payable, accrued expenses, and other current liabilities approximate fair value because of the short maturity of these instruments. The carrying amounts of long-term receivables and payables are approximately fair value as these receivables and payables earn or are charged interest based on the prevailing rates.

Note 1. Nature of Activities and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosures of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Functional Allocation of Expenses

The costs of providing various programs and other activities are summarized on a functional basis in the statement of functional expenses. Expenses that can be identified with a specific program or support service are charged directly to that program or support service. Costs common to multiple functions have been allocated among the various functions benefited based on the management estimate. General and administrative expenses include those costs that are not directly identifiable with any specific program, but which provide for the overall support and direction of the Organization. Salaries and related expenses are allocated based on employees' direct time spent on program or support activities or the best estimate of time spent. Expenses, other than salaries and related expenses, which are not directly identifiable by program or support services, are allocated based on the management's best estimate.

The main categories of expenses are allocated as follows:

Expense	Method of Allocation
Payroll and related expenses	Time and effort
Capital improvement	Function and usage
Park and green space	Function and usage
Sidewalk and public realm	Function and usage

Advertising

Non-direct-response advertising costs are expensed when the advertising first occurs. The Organization had no advertising expenses for the year ended June 30, 2025.

Prepaid Expenses

Prepaid expenses are amortized over the period of future benefit.

Income Taxes

The Organization is a not-for-profit organization that is exempt from both federal and state income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and is exempt from California franchise taxes under similar state provisions. Accordingly, no provision for income taxes has been made in the accompanying financial statements. It is the opinion of management that all income earned has been related to the Organization's tax-exempt status, and there has been no unrelated business income.

Note 2. Concentrations of Credit Risk

FASB ASC 825 requires disclosure of significant concentrations of credit risk arising from all financial instruments. Financial instruments that potentially subject the Organization to concentrations of credit risk are primarily cash and accounts receivable. The Organization places its cash and in banks that are insured in limited amounts by the U.S. Government. Due to operational requirements, the Organization's checking and other deposit accounts may be maintained with a balance in excess of the $250,000 federally insured limit.

As of June 30, 2025, deposits in the amount of $327,532 were not FDIC insured.

Note 3. Net Assets with Donor Restrictions

Net assets with donor restrictions are restricted for the following purposes or periods for the year ended June 30, 2025, was as follows:

Purpose	06/30/2024	Additions	Released	06/30/2025
Esprit Park Renovation	$ 46,844	$ -	$ (40,167)	$ 6,677
NW Potrero Hill	1,680	3,840	-	5,520
Dogpatch	2,647	15,479	(8,126)	10,000
17th Street Mural	-	6,350	(3,517)	2,833
20th Street Project	28,585	20,000	(48,585)	-
22nd Street Project	27,643	-	-	27,643
22nd Street Steps	-	55,000	(900)	54,100
Renewal Campaign	21,688	5,000	(19,193)	7,495
Progress Park	750	-	(750)	-
Total	$ 129,837	$ 105,669	$ (121,238)	$ 114,268

Note 4. Donated Services and Other In-Kind Contributions

Donated services are recognized as contributions if the services (a) create or enhance nonfinancial assets or (b) require specialized skills, are performed by people with those skills, and would otherwise be purchased by the organization.

During the year ended June 30, 2025, the Organization received a significant amount of donated services from unpaid volunteers who assist in fundraising and program services that do not satisfy the criteria for recognition under FASB ASC 958-605-25-16.

The total value of in-kind contributions has been included in the statement of activities. Donated professional services, goods and equipment, and meeting spaces for the year ended June 30, 2025 were as follows:

	Amount	Function
Professional services, accounting	$ 2,000	Administrative
Professional services, designer	8,539	Program - Capital improvements
Goods and equipment	4,625	Program - Capital improvements
Meeting space	335	Administrative
Total	$ 15,499	

Note 4. Donated Services and Other In-Kind Contributions (Continued)

Professional services

The Organization received in-kind professional bookkeeping services valued at $2,000, based on 16 hours at a fair market rate of $125 per hour. Additionally, the Organization received professional services from a landscape architecture and urban design firm that donated 78.82 hours at rates averaging approximately $108/hour. The value of these professional services of $8,539 was determined based on the actual billable fair market value charged by personnel assigned to the project. This results in a total contribution of $10,539 for the in-kind professional services.

Goods and equipment

The Organization received 8 benches, 18 assorted garden tools, 1 folding table, 6 trees, 2 metal benches, and 1 native plant for a total of $4,625. The value of these goods and equipment was based on their fair market value, determined by the vendor that sells such goods in its normal business activities.

Meeting spaces

The Organization received donated meeting spaces valued at $335, including $275 for board meetings and $60 for executive committee meetings, with the valuation based on comparable local rental rates.

Management estimates approximately 1,920 volunteer hours involving 129 volunteers during the year ended June 30, 2025 for a variety of activities such as weeding, planting, watering, board meetings, outreach and education, event coordination, and implementation. No amount for this time has been recognized in the accompanying statement of activities as this volunteer time does not meet the criteria required for recognition.

Note 5. Liquidity and Availability of Financial Assets

The following reflects the Organization's financial assets as of the statement of financial position date, reduced by amounts not available for general use because of contractual or donor-imposed restrictions within one year of the statement of financial position date.

Cash and cash equivalents	$	573,886
Accounts receivable, current		10,847
Less those unavailable for general expenditures within one year, due to:		
Restricted by donor with time or purpose restrictions		114,268
Financial assets available to meet cash needs for general expenditure within one year	$	470,465

$470,465 of financial assets are available to cover the Organization's liquidity needs. The Organization has a goal to maintain sufficient financial assets on hand to meet the total of next fiscal year's projected general and administrative expenses, which are expected to be approximately $121,372 (based on the total supporting expenses for the year ended June 30, 2025). Therefore, the Organization accumulated sufficient amount of liquid assets to sustain its liquidity needs within the next 12 months.

Note 6. Operating Lease

The Organization entered into a lease agreement for office space in San Francisco, CA, starting on July 1, 2023, for a term of three years. The lease can be terminated by both parties at any time. The base monthly lease payment begins at $1,000, with a 4% annual increase. As of June 30, 2025, the Organization has incurred an operating lease expense of $12,480.

Note 7. Accrued Vacation

Accrued vacation represents unpaid employee vacation benefits, recognized as liabilities based on the vacation hours earned and current pay rates. As of June 30, 2025, the accrued vacation liability amounted to $18,886.

Sick leave benefits are accumulated for each employee; however, employees do not have a vested right to these benefits. As a result, accumulated sick leave benefits are not recognized as liabilities, as the payment of these benefits is not considered probable.

Note 8. Fiscal Sponsorship

The Organization serves as a fiscal sponsor for certain charitable projects that do not have their own tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Under these arrangements, the Organization retains full legal and fiduciary responsibility for the use of the funds and activities conducted under the sponsored projects. The Organization ensures that all sponsored project expenditures align with its tax-exempt purpose and meet all regulatory and reporting requirements.

Contributions received on behalf of fiscally sponsored projects are recognized as revenue when received, in accordance with FASB ASC 958-605 (Revenue Recognition for Not-for-Profit Entities). Expenses incurred by the projects are recorded as program service expenses in the Organization's financial statements. Net assets associated with each project are tracked individually using fund accounting.

For the year ended June 30, 2025, the Organization received $55,000 in contributions, recorded in the contributions on the statements of activities. The Organization incurred no expenses on behalf of its sponsored projects. All activities under sponsored projects are subject to the Organization's internal controls, oversight, and reporting requirements.

Note 9. Subsequent Events

The Organization's management evaluated subsequent events through September 12, 2025, the date these financial statements were available to be issued. Management concluded that no material subsequent events have occurred since June 30, 2025, that required recognition or disclosure in such financial statements.

IRYNA ACCOUNTANCY CORPORATION
1000 Broadway 200-C
Oakland, CA 94607
(510) 467-9506 Tel
(510) 280-9756 Fax
info@irynacpa.com
www.irynacpa.com

DOGPATCH & NW POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT
Fiscal Year 2025-2026
Financial Overview

	DOGPATCH (85%)				NW POTRERO HILL (15%)				GBD TOTAL			
	25/26 Budget	24/25 Approved Budget	*24/25 Year-end Projection*	*25/26 Budget vs. Year-end Projection*	*25/26 Budget*	24/25 Approved Budget	*24/25 Year-end Projection*	*25/26 Budget vs. Year-end Projection*	*25/26 Budget*	24/25 Approved Budget	*24/25 Year-end Projection*	*25/26 Budget vs. Year-end Projection*
REVENUE												
Prior Year Carryover	*$ 344,514*	$ 382,219	*$ 392,890*	*$ (48,376)*	*$ 74,428*	$ 51,753	*$ 73,692*	*$ 736*	*$ 418,942*	$ 433,972	*$ 466,581*	*$ (47,639)*
Assessments	*746,374*	615,081	*615,115*	*131,258*	*135,813*	104,073	*104,079*	*31,734*	*882,186*	719,154	*719,194*	*162,992*
General Benefits	*15,303*	30,113	*29,500*	*(14,196)*	*2,701*	4,334	*4,351*	*(1,650)*	*18,004*	34,447	*33,851*	*(15,847)*
Total Assessment Revenue	***$ 1,106,191***	**$ 1,027,413**	***$ 1,037,505***	***$ 68,686***	***$ 212,941***	**$ 160,160**	***$ 182,121***	***$ 30,820***	***$ 1,319,132***	**$ 1,187,573**	***$ 1,219,626***	***$ 99,506***
Prior Year Carryover	*$ 37,642*	$ 145,573	*$ 131,151*	*$ (93,509)*	*$ 7,833*	$ 24,616	*$ 18,022*	*$ (10,189)*	*$ 45,475*	$ 170,189	*$ 149,173*	*$ (103,698)*
Grants & Donations	*15,000*	157,072	*144,693*	*(129,693)*	*-*	99,987	*63,851*	*(63,851)*	*15,000*	257,059	*208,544*	*(193,544)*
Total Non-Assessment Revenue	***$ 52,642***	**$ 302,645**	***$ 275,844***	***$ (223,202)***	***$ 7,833***	**$ 124,603**	***$ 81,873***	***$ (74,040)***	***$ 60,475***	**$ 427,248**	***$ 357,716***	***$ (297,242)***
TOTAL REVENUE	***$ 1,158,833***	**$ 1,330,058**	***$ 1,313,349***	***$ (154,516)***	***$ 220,774***	**$ 284,763**	***$ 263,994***	***$ (43,220)***	***$ 1,379,607***	**$ 1,614,821**	***$ 1,577,342***	***$ (197,735)***
EXPENSES												
Assessment Expenses	*$ 746,821*	$ 710,017	*$ 692,991*	*$ 53,830*	*$ 145,325*	$ 109,846	*$ 107,693*	*$ 37,632*	*$ 892,145*	$ 819,863	*$ 800,684*	*$ 91,462*
Non-Assessment Expenses	*52,642*	293,133	*236,031*	*(183,389)*	*7,833*	124,266	*72,058*	*(64,225)*	*60,475*	417,399	*308,089*	*(247,615)*
TOTAL EXPENSES	***$ 799,463***	**$ 1,003,150**	***$ 929,022***	***$ (129,559)***	***$ 153,157***	**$ 234,112**	***$ 179,751***	***$ (26,594)***	***$ 952,620***	**$ 1,237,262**	***$ 1,108,773***	***$ (156,153)***
YEAR-END CARRYOVER	***$ 359,370***	**$ 326,908**	***$ 384,327***	***$ (24,957)***	***$ 67,617***	**$ 50,651**	***$ 84,243***	***$ (16,626)***	***$ 426,988***	**$ 377,559**	***$ 468,569***	***$ (41,583)***

ANNUAL REPORT

GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT
SF CA
DOGPATCH NW POTRERO HILL

Dogpatch & NW Potrero Hill
Green Benefit District
2023–24

23-24





The GBD is a registered nonprofit community benefit district, the only one of San Francisco's 19 benefit districts devoted to urban greening.

Funded by district property owner assessments, grants, and donations.

Governed by a 15-member, elected board of directors.

Managed by a hired executive director.

Chartered by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for 10 years—July 2015 to June 2025.

Renewal in process now, voting scheduled for Spring 2025.

GreenBenefit.org

Photography by James Bueti, Jason Corning, Craig Cozart, Scott R Kline and the GBD

Illustration by Christine Innes

Graphic Design by Connie Oh

DOGPATCH & NW POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT

Nurturing Community Through Urban Greening

Using the power of local funding and governance, advocacy, and volunteerism to create and care for green, resilient and vibrant urban spaces.


GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT
SF CA
DOGPATCH
NW POTRERO HILL

SINCE IT'S FOUNDING IN 2015, THE GBD HAS...

Increased community-maintained green and public space in the district from 2 to 7 acres.

That's 360% more green and public space.

The ratio of city-maintained park space to GBD-created and maintained green and public space in the district is also 2:7.



Existing greenspace in 2015

Quadrupled the value of property owner assessments.

$5M in property owner assessments has been leveraged, through grants, maintenance agreements, and advocacy, to create $21M in improvements to Dogpatch & NW Potrero Hill.

$2M
Grants and donations

$5M
District property owner assessments

$14M
Civic and private sector improvements

$21 Million

Total worth of improvements

THE GREEN BENEFIT DISTRICT IS UP FOR RENEWAL IN 2025!

Hi neighbors, we need your votes!


We're renewing our charter so we can continue to create community through urban greening in our neighborhood for another 15 years.

Renewal is the city's process to make sure the services the GBD provides are what the community wants and that our money is being used wisely. It's a chance for property owners in Dogpatch and Northwest Potrero Hill to decide they want to continue the GBD.

We're confident the answer will be a resounding YES after all that's been accomplished in the first 10 years. We're also expanding our boundaries to add 2 new additional spaces to our district.

Be sure to sign the petition and vote for the GBD this year — help us keep up the great work together!

RENEW THE GBD!



NW POTRERO HILL

1. Potrero Gateway
2. Vermont Greenway & Eco-Patch
3. Fallen Bridge Park
4. Benches Park Plaza & Garden
5. Benches Dog Station
6. Expansion Zone

DOGPATCH

7. Esprit Park Renovation
8. 20th & Minnesota roadway & sidewalk improvements (Amazon)
9. Minnesota Flyover
10. IM Scott School Native Sidewalk Gardens
11. 22nd St Caltrain Entrance
12. Scooter & Bike Parking
13. Woods Yard Park
14. 22nd St Greenway
15. Iowa St Garden
16. Angel Alley Upgrades & Lighting
17. Pennsylvania Ave Garden & Pedestrian Path
18. Gears Garden
19. Gears Meadow
20. Streetscape & Pedestrian Improvements
21. Tennessee St Pedestrian Patch & Street Trees
22. Progress Park Fitness
23. Progress Park Bocce, Maze
24. Progress Dog Run Upgrades
25. Minnesota Grove Pedestrian & Irrigation Upgrades
26. New Sidewalk & Street Trees (Minnesota St Project)
27. Minnesota Grove Upgrades & Extension
28. 25th St Gardens
29. Expansion Zone

200 ACRES / 70 BLOCKS / 1727 PROPERTIES

As part of the renewal process, in 2025 we're thrilled to expand the GBD!

In NW Potrero Hill, we're expanding the district to include the south side of 19th Street to the north side of 20th Street, spanning from Kansas to Utah. In Dogpatch, the district will include Tunnel Top Park; extending north of 25th Street from Pennsylvania to Texas Street; along with the north side of Cesar Chavez Street.

Both of these areas are contiguous to existing zones, are valued and **compatible** to our current zones, are financially viable to cover added maintenance costs, and have strong **support** from property owners in the area who are highly committed to joining the GBD.

GBD THROUGHOUT 2023–2024

Projects we're so proud of our work to create and maintain beautiful spaces.

LIST OF TYPES OF PROJECTS GOES HERE PLANTING | GUIDED TOURS | PLANT LIFE EDUCATION











2024 DOGPATCH MUSIC SERIES

Four afternoons of free music, ice cream, face painting and fun.

AUGUST 26 | SEPTEMBER 9 & 13 | OCTOBER 7, 2023









EVENTS

GBD PERFORMANCE METRICS

TRASH REMOVED
54,725 LBS

COMPOST REMOVED
23,617 LBS

160
GRAFFITI SITES ABATED

709
NEEDLES COLLECTED

218
311 REPORTS FILED

1,954
VOLUNTEER HOURS

58K
DOG WASTE BAGS DISTRIBUTED

LAINEZ, INC.



Lainez crew weeds, prunes, and plants GBD parks and greenspaces; providing daily landscaping, maintenance, and construction.

AIM TO PLEASE



Aim To Please crew provides daily cleaning maintenance as they clean sidewalks, address dumped trash, and remove graffiti.

PROGRESS PARK





22 23 24

Parcel transformed into a sprawling neighborhood park that is a favorite among both local residents and visitors alike.

This vibrant green space offers a welcoming environment for recreation, relaxation, and community gatherings, making it a cherished destination for everyone.







MINNESOTA GROVE



25 26 27

What was once an unimproved street and sidewalk right-of-way is transformed into a lush green oasis.


This green space provides a serene retreat for visitors and artists alike, enhancing the cultural atmosphere of the area and offering a refreshing contrast to the surrounding artistic community.







BENCHES PARK





4 5

Situated at the end of the 18th Street footbridge that spans Highway 101, this is one of two charming small parks.

The inviting green space enhances the area, providing a pleasant backdrop for pedestrians and cyclists while fostering a sense of community and connection for all who pass through.







PROJECTS

ANGEL ALLEY



16

Once overlooked and in disrepair, this narrow street is a charming, beautifully landscaped, and well-lit passageway. It has become a cherished spot for both the local community and visitors, who enjoy its inviting atmosphere and vibrant greenery.

This revitalized pathway not only enhances the area's aesthetic appeal but also fosters a sense of connection and belonging among all who walk through it.





BEFORE TRANSFORMATION

VERMONT GREENWAY & ECO-PATCH





2

A Caltrans parcel has been revitalized into a flourishing greenway and eco-patch designed to encourage the return of native flora and fauna to the region.

This transformation not only enhances enjoyment of the natural landscape but also promotes biodiversity by creating a welcoming habitat for local wildlife. This features a safer streetscape, making it more accessible and enjoyable for pedestrians and cyclists.





BEFORE TRANSFORMATION

MINNESOTA FLYOVER





8 9

A transformed under-roadway area, which has faced challenges in the past, soon to be a lively community amenity.

This revitalized space features greenery, seating areas, and engaging features that promote social interaction and provide a welcoming environment for residents and visitors alike. Additionally, in collaboration with Amazon, 20th Street has added a new sidewalk, enhancing safety and accessibility for pedestrians.

OPENING SPRING 2025!







IOWA ST NATIVE PLANT GARDEN

15 **Enhanced area surrounding the train station and the nearby commercial corridor that incorporates native habitats to restore and celebrate the local ecosystem.**









BEFORE TRANSFORMATION

TENNESSEE ST @ 23RD ST

21 **Once an unimproved street that was used as a dumping ground, it has now been transformed into a welcoming space for pedestrians and those parking their vehicles.**










BEFORE TRANSFORMATION

WOODS YARD

13 **The front yard of MUNI maintenance has been transformed into a picturesque town square. This charming space serves as a gathering spot for the community, featuring inviting greenery seating, and artwork.**









22ND ST. CALTRAIN ENTRANCE

11 **A thoughtfully designed and beautifully enhanced entrance now greets visitors at one of the city's two train stations.**







PENNSYLVANIA AVE

17 **A once-neglected strip overrun with weeds and litter has been revitalized into a beautiful pedestrian walkway and garden.**







PROGRESS DOG RUN

24 **Neglected freeway parcel in a tough area now draws positive activity**







SAN BRUNO DOG STATION

4 5 City sidewalk right of way





STREET TREES & SIDEWALK GARDENS









GEARS MEADOW

18 19 Caltrans 280 Freeway parcel



25TH ST


28 City sidewalk right of way





INDIANA @ 25TH ST

22 23 24 Caltrans 280 Freeway parcel





ANDREA BAÑAS

A LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

To Our Esteemed Community Members, Stakeholders, and Partners,

As we close another vibrant chapter for the Dogpatch and Northwest Potrero Hill Green Benefit District (GBD), I am filled with pride and gratitude for the progress we have made together. This past year marks not only the continuation of our mission to enhance our community's green spaces but also my first year serving in this role. I have been inspired daily by your commitment and passion for creating a healthier, more sustainable environment.

The GBD was established in 2015 with a vision to cultivate a thriving community that prioritizes ecological well-being and social connection. Over the years, we have seen significant transformations: from the development of new parks and green spaces like the Vermont Greenway & Eco-Patch and the Iowa Street Garden to the revitalization of existing green spaces like Progress Park and Benches Garden, each project has contributed to our shared goal of environmental stewardship, safer public spaces and an engaged community.

As we prepare for the renewal of our charter, I am filled with excitement about the future. Our community's enthusiasm and support have been pivotal in our accomplishments, and together, we stand on the brink of new opportunities. This renewal will allow us to expand our initiatives and deepen our impact, ensuring our neighborhoods remain vibrant and resilient for years to come.

Looking ahead, we have an array of exciting projects on the horizon. Key initiatives include expanding our district's impact through additional tree and plant plantings, enhancing biodiversity with pollinator gardens, and creating more community gathering spaces that foster connection and engagement. We are also developing educational programs aimed at empowering residents with the knowledge and skills to champion sustainability in their daily lives.

Throughout my first year here, I have witnessed firsthand the incredible potential within our community. I am eager to harness this energy as we embark on these new projects. Collaboration will be vital; we invite each of you to join us in shaping our future, whether through volunteering, participating in community events, or sharing your ideas.

Thank you for your unwavering support and dedication to the GBD. Together, we are not just envisioning a greener future; we are actively creating it. I look forward to working alongside each of you as we take our next steps forward.

With admiration and appreciation,

Andrea Bañas
Executive Director



DONOVAN LACY

A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

I am honored to be President of the Board of the Green Benefit District. I moved to Dogpatch more than 14 years ago and was drawn to the industrial architecture, untamed open spaces, proximity to the waterfront and downtown and the deep sense of community.

I have watched the empty lots and derelict properties converted to green public open spaces, successfully strengthening the sense of community that initially drew me to the neighborhood.

The GBD is a key to this transformation. Working to harness and enhance the power of community members, city and state organizations; the GBD transforms unused land into green open public space. This in turn nurtures our community, bringing together a host of new and existing residents, including many families with young children.

In October of 2023 we welcomed our new Executive Director, Andrea Bañas. Throughout the year we worked on large projects including the Vermont Gateway, broke ground on the Minnesota Flyover and worked with the city on the required ADA improvements at the Minnesota Grove.

Our annual Music Series and Woods Yard Tree Lighting highlight our incredible green public open spaces and build and strengthen our community.

I am just as proud of the GBD's commitment to doing the little things that often go unnoticed to keep our community green, clean and vibrant. From enhanced trash collection, street cleaning and graffiti remediation, to planting and watering of street gardens, to working with our City Agencies to ensure that our public spaces receive the services that they require. It is this consistency that makes the GBD an indispensable part of our community.

My proudest accomplishment of the GBD is our commitment to managing and maintaining these spaces long after the ribbon cuttings. As we look to the coming year, I am keenly aware of the monumental task ahead of us to renew the GBD's charter.

I am confident that with our committed Executive Director, Andrea Bañas, dedicated volunteer Board Members, and our engaged residents and business owners we will succeed in renewing the GBD and set the stage to continue the work that has made our community such a great place to live and work.

I look forward to seeing you around the neighborhood.

Donovan Lacy
Board President

2023–24
BOARD OF DIRECTORS & STAFF


The fifteen Directors of the GBD are elected by the property owners who finance its activities through their assessments. They serve as genuine directors, as their interests and expertise guide and drive the GBD's efforts.




BILL BARNES
Director / NWP Tenant



KATHERINE DOUMANI
Director / DP Property Owner / Tenant



SUSAN ESLICK
Treasurer / Greenspace Advocate



BARB FRITZ
Director / DP Property Owner



JASON KELLY JOHNSON
Director / DP Property Owner



KANWAR KELLEY
Director / NWP Property Owne



DONOVAN LACY
President / DP Property Owner



JOYCE LAVEY
Director / NWP Tenant



DAPHNE MAGNAWA
Director / NWP Property Owner

We also welcome our new members seated to serve 2024–25: Rebecca Groves, Matt Lewis, and John Lister, who will take the seats of Kanwar Kelley, Michael Plater, and Bill Barnes respectively.



REBECCA GROVES



MATT LEWIS




JOHN LISTER



PATRICE MARTIN
Director / DP Property Owner



TERRI MCFARLAND
Director / Greenspace Advocate



SARAH MIERS
Vice President / DP Property Owner



MICHAEL PLATER
Director / DP Property



RICHARD ROMERO
Director / DP Tenant



PAUL SELMANTS
Director / NWP Tenant



SHAWN TROEDSON
Secretary / DP Property Owner



ANDREA BAÑAS
Executive Director / Staff



ANH WONG
Bookkeeper / Staff

FINANCES

Property owner assessments provide the GBD's base funding. Assessment funds must be allocated within 10% of the guidelines specified by the GBD's property owner-approved Management Plan. Public Works and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors oversee the organization's finances and operation. An independent audit review is conducted each year.

The GBD operates on the same fiscal year as City government – from July 1 to June 30. Because assessment revenue for a fiscal year beginning July 1 is not received until the following January, the GBD must roll over 50% of its annual operating budget (for July through December) from each prior year.

Assessments are expended proportionally in the zone where they are collected. For FY23/24, 87% of collected funds came from Dogpatch and 13% from NW Potrero Hill.

More detailed financial information is online at **GreenBenefit.org**

GENERAL BENEFIT

The general benefit is the amount of non-assessment funds that must be raised each fiscal year.

2023/24 GENERAL BENEFIT REQUIREMENT

Dogpatch		
Maintenance / Capital Improvement	$	23,918
NW Potrero Hill		
Maintenance / Capital Improvement	$	3,554
Total General Benefit Requirement	**$**	**27,472**

2023/24 NON-ASSESSMENT REVENUE

Cash		
Grants	$	182,736
Donations	$	82,957
Total Grants & Donations	**$**	**265,693**
Non-Cash		
Maintenance / Capital Improvement	$	113,595
Total Non-Assessment Revenue	**$**	**379,288**

ASSESSMENT RATES

Assessment rates are determined by property use and size.

1. Determine the primary parcel use.
2. Find the assessment rate per sq. ft. according to parcel use.
3. For commercial, industrial, and residential uses, multiply building square footage by the assessment rate. For parking lots, vacant lots, and open space, multiply lot square footage by the assessment rate.

Commercial, Residential, Parking Lot, Vacant	100%	$0.0951
Industrial	50%	$0.0476
Park, Greenspace	25%	$0.0237
Inaccessible	0%	$0.0000

STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES — JUNE 30, 2024

CURRENT ASSETS

Checking/Savings		
Checking	$	22,803
Savings	$	545,069
Total Checking/Savings	**$**	**567,872**
Accounts Receivable		
Allowance Uncollectible Assessment	$	(21,206)
Accounts Receivable – Assessment	$	23,623
Accounts Receivable – Grant	$	71,136
Total Accounts Receivable	**$**	**73,553**
Total Current Assets	**$**	**641,425**

OTHER ASSETS

Prepaid Expenses	$	10,355
Mail Box Deposit	$	20
Caltrans Security Deposit	$	3,000
Total Other Assets	**$**	**13,375**
Total Assets	**$**	**654,801**

LIABILITIES & NET ASSETS

Current Liabilities		
Accounts Payable	$	31,253
Accrued Expenses	$	7,794
Total Current Liabilities	**$**	**39,047**
Total Liabilities	**$**	**39,047**
Net Assets		
Without donor restrictions – Board Designated	$	485,918
With donor restrictions	$	129,836
Total Net Assets	**$**	**615,754**
Total Liabilities & Net Assets	**$**	**654,801**

BUDGET SUMMARY — JULY 1, 2024 – JUNE 30, 2025

DOGPATCH

REVENUE	BUDGET	APPROVED	VARIANCE
Prior Year Carryover	$ 382,219	$ 379,013	$ 3,205
Assessments	615,081	613,860	1,220
General Benefits	30,113	24,281	5,831
Total Assessment Revenue	**$ 1,027,412**	**$ 1,017,155**	**$ 10,257**
Prior Year Carryover	$ 145,573	$ 196,259	$ (50,686)
Grants & Donations	157,072	130,777	26,295
Total Non-Assessment Revenue	**$ 302,645**	**$ 327,036**	**$ (24,391)**
Total Revenue	**$ 1,330,057**	**$ 1,344,191**	**$ (14,134)**
EXPENSES			
Assessment Expenses	$ 710,016	$ 634,937	$ 75,080
Non-Assessment Expenses	293,133	181,463	111,670
Total Expenses	**$ 1,003,149**	**$ 816,399**	**$ 186,750**
YEAR-END CARRYOVER	**$ 326,908**	**$ 527,792**	**$ (200,884)**

NW POTRERO HILL


REVENUE	BUDGET	APPROVED	VARIANCE
Prior Year Carryover	$ 51,754	$ 71,469	$ (19,715)
Assessments	104,073	91,726	12,347
General Benefits	4,334	4,999	(665)
Total Assessment Revenue	**$ 160,161**	**$ 168,194**	**$ (8,033)**
Prior Year Carryover	$ 24,616	$ 14,985	$ 9,631
Grants & Donations	40,000	169,067	(129,067)
Total Non-Assessment Revenue	**$ 64,616**	**$ 184,052**	**$ (119,436)**
Total Revenue	**$ 224,777**	**$ 352,246**	**$ (127,469)**
EXPENSES			
Assessment Expenses	$ 109,847	$ 116,440	$ (6,593)
Non-Assessment Expenses	64,279	159,436	(95,157)
Total Expenses	**$ 174,126**	**$ 275,876**	**$ (101,750)**
YEAR-END CARRYOVER	**$ 50,652**	**$ 76,370**	**$ (25,718)**

BUDGET SUMMARY (CONT'D)

TOTAL BUDGET

REVENUE	BUDGET	APPROVED	VARIANCE
Prior Year Carryover	$ 433,973	$ 450,482	$ (16,509)
Assessments	719,154	705,587	13,567
General Benefits	34,447	29,281	5,167
Total Assessment Revenue	**$ 1,187,574**	**$ 1,185,349**	**$ 2,224**
Prior Year Carryover	$ 170,189	$ 211,244	$ (41,055)
Grants & Donations	197,072	299,844	(102,772)
Total Non-Assessment Revenue	**$ 367,261**	**$ 511,088**	**$ (143,827)**
Total Revenue	**$ 1,554,834**	**$ 1,696,437**	**$ (141,603)**
EXPENSES			
Assessment Expenses	$ 819,863	$ 751,377	$ 68,486
Non-Assessment Expenses	357,412	340,899	16,513
Total Expenses	**$ 1,177,275**	**$ 1,092,275**	**$ 85,000**
YEAR-END CARRYOVER	**$ 377,560**	**$ 604,161**	**$ (226,602)**

BUDGET BREAKDOWN





Dogpatch & NW Potrero Hill
Green Benefit District
1459 18th Street #369
San Francisco, CA 94107

GreenBenefit.org
Report a problem or ask a question.
Sign up to receive the Green Sheet monthly news blast.
Get information on GBD board election, projects, meetings, and events.

GBD 2025 Board Elections
Sign up on the GBD website in Winter 2025.
Election by district property owners in March 2025.

GBD Annual Meeting
Spring 2025

Renewal in process now, voting scheduled for Spring 2025.

NONPROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
PERMIT NO. 925